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THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD
BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA
On the other hand there is no evidence that there ever was a time when "all they which are in Asia" (AV) turned away from obedience to Paul. Whatever may have been the disloyalty and disobedience of individuals—and this certainly existed; see, e.g., Acts 20:29 f.—yet, certainly the NT does not show that all that were in Asia, the Christian community as a whole, in Ephesus and Miletus and Laodices and Hierapolis and Colossae and other places, repudiated his apostolic authority. If the words "all they which are in Asia" refer to all the Christians from the proconsular province of Asia, who happened to be in Rome at the time of Paul's second imprisonment there, it can easily be understood that they should turn away from him at that testing time. It is impossible to say exactly why they did so; they were friends of the prisoner in the Mamertine, they would be involved in the same imprisonment as had overtaken him, and probably also in the same death penalty.

It is altogether in favor of a reference to Rome, that what is said about Phyleguss and Hermogenes and their turning away from Paul is immediately followed by a reference to Onesiphorus and to his great kindness which he showed, when he sought the apostle out very diligently in Rome. On the whole, therefore, a reference to Rome and to the manner in which these persons, named and unnamed from Asia, had deserted Paul, seems most probable. See PHYLEGUS. JOHN RUTHERFORD

HERMON, hér'mon ( gif7, her'môn; B. 'Ampav, Haermon): The name of the majestic mountain in which the Anti-Lebanon range terminates to the S. (Dt 3:8, etc.). It reaches a height of 9,200 ft. above the sea, and extends some 10 to 20 miles from N. to S. It was called Siryon by the Sidonians (Dt 3:9; cf Ps 29:6), and Senir by the Amorites (Dt 3:9). It is also identified with Sion (Dt 4:48). See SION; SEREN; SION. Sometimes it is called "Mt. Hermon" (Dt 3:8; Josh 11:17; Mic 5:2; etc.); at other times simply "Hermon" (Josh 11:3; Ps 89:12, etc.). Once it is called "Hermons" (gif7, gif7, hermonim). AV mistakenly renders this "the Hermontes" (Ps 42:6). It must be one of the triple summits of the mountain. There are three distinct heads, rising near the middle of the mass, the two higher being toward the E. The eastern declivities are steep and bare; the western slopes are more gradual; and while the upper reaches are barren, the lower are well wooded; and as one descends he passes through fruitful vineyards and orchards, finally entering the rich fields below, in Wady el-Teim. The Aleppo pine, the oak, and the poplar are plentiful. The wolf and the leopard are still to be found on the mountain; and it is the last resort of the brown, or Syrian, bear. Snow lies long on the summits and shoulders of the mountain; and in some of the deeper hollows, esp. to the N., it may be found most of the year.

Mt. Hermon is the source of many blessings to the land over which it so proudly lifts its splendid form. Refreshing breezes blow from its cold heights. Its snows are carried to Damascus and to the towns on the seacoast, where, mingled with the sharab, "drink," they mitigate the heat of the Syrian summer. Great reservoirs in the depths of the mountain, fed by the melting snows, find outlet in the magnificent springs at Hasbeiyeh, Tell el-Kady, and Bamiq, while the dew-clouds of Hermon bring a benediction wherever they are carried (Ps 133:3).

Hermon marked the northern limit of Joshua's victorious campaigns (Josh 13:1, etc.). It was part of the dominion of Og (ver 5), and naturally come under Israelitish influence of the remote and solitary heights must have attracted worshippers from the earliest times; and we cannot doubt that it was a famous sanctuary in far antiquity. Under the highest peak are the ruins of Ksar 'Amr, which may have been an ancient sanctuary of Baal. Qumran speaks of a temple on the summit much frequented by the surrounding peoples; and the remains of many temples of the Rom period have been found on the sides and at the base of the mountain. The sacredness of Hermon may be inferred from the allusion in Ps 69:12 (cf En 6:6; and see also BAAL HERMON).

Some have thought that the scene of the Transfiguration should be sought here; see, however, TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF.

The modern name of Hermon is Jebel eth-Thâlîj, "mount of snow," or Jebel esh-sheikh, "mount of the elder," or "of the chief."

Little Hermon, the name now often applied to the hill between Latrun and Gilboa, possibly the Hill of Moreh, on which is the sanctuary of Neby Daby, has no Bib. authority, and dates only from the Middle Ages.

W. EWING

HERMONITES, hér'mon-ites: In Ps 43:6 AV, where RV reads "Hermonts." See HERMON.

HEROD, her'ud: The name Herod (Herôd, Herōd) is a familiar one in the history of the Jews and of the early Christian church. The name itself signifies "heroic," a name not wholly applicable to the family, which was characterized by craft and knavery rather than by heroism. The forebears of the Herodian family are inseparably connected with the last flickerings of the flame of Judaism, as a national power, before it was forever extinguished in the great Jewish war of rebellion, 70 AD. The history of the Herodian family is not lacking in elements of greatness, but such elements were and in whomsoever found, they were in every case dimmed by the insufferable egotism which disfigured the family, root and branch. Some of the Herodian princes were undeniably talented; but these talents, wrongly used, left no marks for the good of the people of Israel. Of nearly all the kings of the house of Herod it may truly be said that at their death "they went without being deserted," unmissed, unmourned. The entire family history is one of incessant brawls, suspicion, intrigue and shocking immorality. In the baleful and waning light of the rule of the Herodians, Christ lived and died, and under it the foundations of the Christian church were laid.

The Herodians were not of Jewish stock. Herod the Great encouraged the circulation of the legend of the family descent from an illustrious Bab Jew (Ant, XIV, 1, 3), but it has no historic basis. It is true the Idumaens were at the time nominal Jews, since they were subdued by John Hyrcanus in 125 BC, and embodied in the Asmoncean kingdom through an enforced circumcision, but the national antagonism remained (Gen 27:41). The Herodian family sprang from Antipas (d. 78 BC), who was appointed governor of Idumaea by Alexander Jannaeus. His son Antipater, who suc-
ceeded him, possessed all the cunning, resourcefulness, and unbridled ambition of his son Herod the Great. He had an open eye for two things—the unconquerable strength of the Roman power and the pitiable weakness of the decadent Asmonean house, and on these two factors he built the house of his hopes. He craftily chose the side of Hyrcanus II in his internecine war with Aristobulus his brother (69 BC), and induced him to seek the aid of the Romans. Together they supported the claims of Pompey and, after the latter’s defeat, they availed themselves of the magnanimity of Caesar to submit to him, after the crushing defeat of Pompey at Pharsalus (48 BC). As a reward, Antipater received the procuratorship of Judaea (47 BC), while his innocent dupe Hyrcanus had to satisfy himself with the high-priesthood. Antipater died by the hand of an assassin (43 BC) and left four sons, Phasael, Herod the Great, Joseph, Pheroras, and a daughter Salome. The second of these sons raised the family to its highest pinnacle of power and in raising the always welcome tribute-money for the Roman government, gained for him additional power at court. His advance became rapid. Antony appointed him “tetrarch” of Judaea in 41 BC, and although he was forced by circumstances temporarily to leave his domain in the hands of the Parthians and of Antigonus, this, in the end, proved a blessing in disguise. In this final spasm of the dying Asmonean house, Antigonus took Judaea by storm, and Phasael, Herod’s oldest brother, fell into his hands. The latter was governor of the city, and foreseeing his fate, he committed suicide by dashing out his brains against the walls of his prison. Antigonus incapacitated his brother Hyrcanus, who was captured at the same time, from ever holding the holy office again by cropping off his ears (Ant, XIV, xiii, 10). Meanwhile, Herod was at Rome, and through the favor of Antony and Augustus he obtained the crown of Judaea in 37 BC. The fond ambition of his heart was now attained, although he had literally to carve out his own empire with the sword. He made quick work of the task, cut his way back into Judaea and took Judaea by storm in 37 BC.

The first act of his reign was the extermination of the Asmonean house, to which Herod himself was related through his marriage with Mariamme, the grandchild of Hyrcanus. Antigonus was slain and with him 45 of his chief adherents. Hyrcanus was recalled from Babylon, to which he had been banished by Antigonus, but the high-priesthood was bestowed on Aristobulus, Herod’s brother-in-law, who, however, soon fell a victim to the suspicion and fear of the king (Ant, XV, iii, 3). These outrages against the purest blood in Judaea turned the love of Mariamme, once cherished for Herod, into a bitter hatred. The Jews, loyal to the dynasty of the Maccabees, accused Herod before the Roman court, but he was summarily acquitted by Antony. Hyrcanus, mutilated and helpless as he was, soon followed Aristobulus in the way of death, 31 BC (Ant, XV, vi, 1). When Antony, who had ever befriended Herod, was conquered by Augustus at Actium (31 BC), Herod quickly turned to the powers that were, and, by subtle flattery and timely support, won the imperial favor. The boundaries of his kingdom were now extended by Rome. And Herod proved equal to the greater task. By a decisive victory over the Arabs, he showed, as he had done in his earlier Galilean government, what manner of man he was, when aroused to action.

The Herodian Family Tree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Doris Antipater (exec. 4 BC)</th>
<th>by Maryanne Aristobulus (murdered 7 BC)</th>
<th>Herod (king of Calchis) d. 48 AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phasael</td>
<td>Alexander (murdered 7 BC)</td>
<td>Herod Agrippa (king of Calchis) d. 100 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod the Great (king of Judaea 37 BC-4 AD)</td>
<td>by Maryanne daughter of Simon</td>
<td>Bernice (Acts 25 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipas d. 78 BC</td>
<td>Herod Philip ( Mk 6)</td>
<td>Drusilla (Acts 24 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipater (Proc. Judaea 47-43 BC)</td>
<td>by Malchus</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Antipas, d. 39 AD (tetr. of Gal.)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheroras</td>
<td>Archelaus (ethn. of Judaea 4 BC-6 AD)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salome</td>
<td>by Cleopatra</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod Philip (tetr. of E. Jud. territory 48C-34 AD)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herod had, besides, five other wives (Ant, XVII, i, 3; BJ, i, xvii, 4) and seven other children, who died early, or at least do not figure in history.

glory. Pheroras was nominally his co-regent and, possessed of his father’s cunning, maintained himself to the end, surviving his cruel brother, but he cuts a small figure in the family history. He, as well as his sister Salome, proved an endless source of trouble to Herod by the endless family brawls which they occasioned.

With a different environment and with a different character, Herod the Great might have been worthy of the surname which he now bore only as a tribute of inane flattery. What we know of him, we owe, in the main, to the exhaustive treatment of the subject by Jos in his Antiquities and Jewish War, and from Strabo and Dio Cassius among the classics. We may subsue our little sketch of Herod’s life under the heads of (1) political activity, (2) evidences of talent, and (3) character and domestic life.

1. Political activity.—Antipater had great ambitions for his son. Herod was only a young man when he began his career as governor of Galilee. Jos’ statement, however, that he was only “fifteen years old” (Ant, XIV, ix, 2) is evidently the mistake of some transcriber, because we are told (XVII, viii, 1) that “he continued his life till a very old age.” That was 42 years later, so that Herod at this time must have been at least 25 years old. His activity and success in ridding his dominion of dangerous bands of freebooters, and his still greater success
The Arabsians were wholly crushed, and submitted themselves unconditionally under the power of Herod (Ant, XV, v, 5). Afraid to leave a remain-der of his own dynasty, he sacrificed his own son, Antipater, against his own son by Mariamne, the only human being he ever seems to have loved (28 BC), his mother-in-law Alexandra (Ant, XV, vi, 8), and ultimately, shortly before his death, even his own sons by Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus 7 BC (Ant, XVI, xi, 7). In his emulation of the habits and views of life of the Romans, he continually offended and defied his Jewish subjects, by the introduction of Roman sports and heathen temples in his dominion. His ingratitude to all the Jews in regard to their baneful, and slowly a distinct party arose, partly political, partly religious, which called itself the Herodian party, Jews in outward religious forms but Gentiles in their dress and in their whole view of life. They were a bitter offence to the rest of the nation, but were associated with the Pharisees and Sadducees in their opposition to Christ (Mt 22 16; Mk 3 6; 12 13). In vain Herod tried to win over the Jews, by royal charity in time of famine, and by yielding, wherever possible, to their bitter prejudices. They saw in him only a usurper of the throne of David, maintained by the strong arm of the hated Roman oppressor. Innumerable plots were made against his life, but, with almost sublime courage, Herod triumphed (Ant, XV, viii). He robbed his own people that he might give munificent gifts to the Romans; he did not even spare the grave of King David, which was held in almost idolatrous reverence by the people, but rifled it of its treasures (Ant, XV, vii, 1). The last days of Herod were embittered by endless court intrigues and conspiracies, by an almost insanely suspicious on the part of the aged king, and by increasing indications of the restlessness of the nation. Like Augustus himself, Herod was the victim of an incurable and loathsome disease. His temper became more irritable, as the malady made progress, and he made both himself and his court unutterably miserable. The picture drawn by Jos (Ant, XVII) is hideous and tragic in its vividness. In his last will and testament, he remained true to his life-long fawning upon the Roman power (Ant, XVII, vi, 1). So great became his suffering toward the last that he made a fruitless attempt at suicide. But, true to his character, one of the last acts of his life was an order to execute his son Antipater, who had instigated the murder of his half-brothers, Alexander and Aristobulus, and another order to slay, after his death, a number of nobles, who were guilty of a small outbreak at Jesus, whose family were confined in the hippodrome (Ant, XVI, vi, 5). He died in the 37th year of his reign, 34 years after he had captured Jerusalem and slain Antigonus. Jos writes this epitaph: ‘A man he was of great barbarity toward all men equally, and a slave to his passions, but above the consideration of what was right. Yet he was favored by fortune as much as any man ever was, for from a private man he became a king, and though he were encompassed by ten thousand dangers, he got clear of them all and continued his life to a very old age’ (Ant, XVII, viii, 1).

(2) **Evidences of talent.**—The life of Herod the Great was not a fortuitous chain of favorable accidents. He was unquestionably a man of talent. In a family like that of Antipas and Antipater, talent must necessarily be hereditary, and Herod inherited it more largely than any of his brothers. His whole life exhibits in no small degree statecraft, power of organization, shrewdness. He knew men and he knew how to use them. He enjoyed the friendship of Roman emperors, and had a faculty of convincing the Romans of the righteousness of his cause, in every contingency. In his own dominions he was like Ishmael, his hand against all, and the hand of all against him, and yet he maintained himself in the government for a whole generation. His Galilean gift he employed on the whole generation. His Galilean gift he employed with great determination and great generalship. His Judaean conquest proved the same thing, as did his Arabian war. Herod was a born leader of men. Under a different environment he might have developed into a truly great man, and had his character been coordinate with his gifts, he might have done great things for the Jewish people. But by far the greatest talent of Herod was his singular architectural taste and ability. Here he reminds one of the old Egyptian Pharaohs. Against the laws of Judaism, which he pretended to obey, he built at Jerus a magnificent theater and an amphitheater, of which the ruins remain. The one was within the city, the other outside the walls. Thus he introduced into the artistic sphere of the Jewish life the frivolous spirit of the Greeks and the Romans. To offset this cruel infraction of all the maxims of orthodox Judaism, he tried to placate the nation by rebuilding the temple of Zerubbabel and making it more magnificent than even Solomon's temple had been. This work was accomplished between 19 BC and 11 or 9 BC, although the entire work was not finished till the procuratorship of Albinus, 62-64 AD (Ant, XV, iv, 5, xvi, vii, 1). The temple was so transcendentally beautiful that it ranked among the world's wonders, and Jos does not tire of describing its glories (Bj, V, v). Even Titus sought to spare the building in the final attack on the city (Bj, VI, iv, 5). Besides this, Herod rebuilt and beautified Strato's Tower, which he called after the emperor, Caesar. He spent 12 years in this gigantic work, building a theater and an amphitheater, and above all in achieving the apparently impossible by creating a harbor where there was none before. This was accomplished by constructing a gigantic mole far out into the sea, and so enduring was the work that the remains of it are seen today. The Romans were so appreciative of the work done by Herod that they made Caesarea the capital of the new regime, after the passing away of the Herodian power. Besides this, Herod rebuilt Samaria, to the utter disgust of the Jews, calling it Sebaste. In Jerusalem he built the three great towers, Antonia, Phasaelus and Mariamne, which survived even the catastrophe of the year 70 AD. All over Herod's dominion were found the evidences of this constructive passion. Antipatris was built by him, on the site of the ancient Kapharahaba, as well as the stronghold Phasaelus near Jericho, where he was destined to see so much suffering and ultimately to die. He even reached beyond his own domain to satisfy this building mania at Ascalon, Damascus, Tyre and Sidon, Tripoli, Ptolemais, nay even at Athens and Locasemum. But the universal character of these operations itself occasioned the bitter-
est hatred against him on the part of the narrow-minded Jews.

(3) Characteristics and domestic life.—The personality of Herod was, in a word, tyrannical. He was possessed of great physical strength. His intellectual powers were far beyond the ordinary; his will was indomitable; he was possessed of great tact, when he saw fit to employ it; in the great crises of his life he was never at a loss what to do; and no one has accused Herod the Great of cowardice. There were in him two distinct individualities, as was the case with Nero. Two powers struggled in him for the mastery, and the lower one at last gained complete control. During the first part of his reign there were evidences of large-heartedness, of great possibilities in the man. But the bitter experiences of his life, the endless whisperings and warnings of his court, the irremediable spirit of the Jews, as well as the consciousness of his own wrongdoing, changed him into a Jewish Nero, a tyrant, who bathed his own house and his own people in blood. The demons of Herod’s life were jealousy of power, and suspicion, its necessary companion.

The unfae incarnation of brute lust, which in turn became the burden of the lives of his children. History tells of few more immoral families than the house of Herod, which by intermarriage of its members so entangled the genealogical tree as to make it a veritable puzzle. As these marriages were nearly all within the line of forbidden consanguinity, under the Jewish law, they still further embittered the people of Israel against the Herodian family.

When Herod came to the throne of Judea, Phasael was dead. Joseph his younger brother had fallen in battle (Ant., Xv, xvi, 10), and only Philetaerus and Salome survived. The first, as we have seen, nominally shared the government with Herod, but was of little consequence and only proved a thorn in the king’s flesh by his endless interference and plotting.

To him were allotted the revenues of the East Jordanic territory. Salome, his sister, was ever neck-deep in the intrigues of the Herodian family, but had the cunning of a fox and succeeded in making Herod believe in her unchangeable loyalty, although the king had killed her son-in-law and her nephew, Aristobulus, his own son. The will of Herod, made shortly before his death, is a convincing proof of his regard for his sister (Ant., XVIII, viii, 1).

Genealogical relations were very unhappy. Of his marriage with Doris and of her son, Antipater, he reaped only misery, the son, as stated above, ultimately falling a victim to his father’s wrath, when the crown, for which he plotted, was practically within his grasp. Herod appears to have been deeply in love with Mariamne, the grandchild of Hyrcanus, in so far as he was capable of such a feeling, but his attitude to the entire Asmonean family and his fixed determination to make an end of it changed whatever love Mariamne had for him into deadly hate, as well as her two sons, full victims to Herod’s insane jealousy of power. Like Nero, however, in a similar situation, Herod felt the keenest remorse after her death.

As his sons grew up, the family tragedy thickened, and the court of Herod became a veritable bed of mutual recriminations, intrigues and catastrophes. The trials and executions of his own conspiring sons were conducted with the acquiescence of the Rom power, for Herod was shrewd enough not to lose his stand, and was particularly pleased when the condition of the Jewish court understood at Rome, that Augustus, after the death of Mariamne’s sons (7 BC), is said to have exclaimed: “I would rather be Herod’s hog than his son.” At the time of his death, the remaining sons were these: Herod, son of Mariamne, Simon’s daughter; Archelaus and Antipas, sons of Malthace, and Herod Philip, son of Cleopatra of Jerus. Alexander and Aristobulus was kind, through the persistent intrigues of Antipater, the eldest son and heir presumptive to the crown, and he himself fell into the grave he had dug for his brothers.

By the final testament of Herod, as ratified by Rome, the kingdom was divided as follows: Archelaus received one-half of the kingdom, with the title of king, really “ethnarch,” governing Judea, Samaria and Idumæa; Antipas was appointed “tetrarch” of Galilee and Perea; Philip, “tetrarch” of Trachonitis, Gaulonitis and Panæas. To Salome, his intriguing sister, he bequeathed Jamnia, Ashdod and Phasaelus, together with 500,000 drachmas of coined silver. All his kindred were liberally provided for in his will, “so as to leave them all in a wealthy condition” (Ant., XVII, viii, 1). In his death he had been better to his family than in his life. He died unmourned and unbeleved by his own people, to pass into history as a name soiled by violence and blood. As the waters of Callirhoe were unable to cleanse his corrupting body, three days were spent in washing away the stains of a tyrant’s name. The only time he is mentioned is in Mt 2 and Lk 1. In Mt he is associated with the wise men of the East, who came to investigate the birth of the “king of the Jews.” Learning their secret, Herod found out from the priests and scribes of the people where the Christ was to be born and ordered the “massacre of the innocents,” with which his name is perhaps more generally associated than with any other act of his life. As Herod died in 4 BC and some time elapsed between the massacre and his death (Mt 2 19), we have here a clue to the approximate fixing of the true date of Christ’s birth. Another, in this same connection, is an eclipse of the moon, the only one mentioned by Jos (Ant., XVII, vi, 4; text and note), which was seen shortly before Herod’s death. This eclipse occurred on March 13, in the year of the Julian Period, 4710, therefore 4 BC.

Herod Antipas was the son of Herod the Great and Malthace, a Samaritan woman. Half Idumæan, half Samaritan, he had therefore not a drop of Jewish blood in his veins, and “Galilee of the Gentiles” seemed a fit dominion for such a prince.

He ruled as “tetrarch” of Galilee (Lk 3 1) from 4 BC till 39 AD. The gospel picture we have of him is far from prepossessing. He is superstitious (Mt 14 11), for he in his cunning (Lk 13 31) and wholly immoral. John the Baptist was brought into his life through an open rebuke of his gross immorality and defiance of the laws of Moses (Lev 18 16), and paid for his courage with his life (Mt 14 10; Ant., XVIII, v, 2).

On the death of his father, although he was younger than his brother Archelaus (Ant., XVII, ix, 4 f.; BJ, II, ii, 3), he contested the will of Herod, who had given to the other the major part of the dominion. Rome, however, sustained the will and assigned to him the “tetrarchy” of Galilee and Perea, as it had been set apart for him by his father. Herod (Ant., XVII, vii, 4) made war with Archelaus and Philip, his half-brother, son of Mariamne, daughter of Simon, he imbibed many of the tastes and graces and far more of the vices of the Romans. His first wife was a daughter of Asa, of the tribe of Judah, but he sent her back to her father at Petra, for the sake of Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, whom he had met and seduced at Rome. Since the latter was the daughter of Aristobulus, his half-brother, and therefore his niece, and at the same time the
wife of another half-brother, the union between her and Antipas was doubly sinful. Aretas repaid this insolence to his daughter by a destructive war (Ad Th Xv 11). He elevated Bithynia to the rank of a city and of course in the place of the deposed queen he set up his own daughter, Eunice over him and wholly dominated his life (Mt 14 3-10). He emulated the example of his father in a mania for erecting buildings and beautifying cities. Thus he built the wall of Sephoris and made the place his capital. He elevated Bethsaida to the rank of a city and of course in the place of the deposed queen he set up his own daughter, Eunice over him and wholly dominated his life (Mt 14 3-10).

Another example of this inherited or cultivated building-mania was the work he did at Betharamphtha, which he called "Julia," after the daughter of Tiberius. He ingeniously proscribed Archelaus, the brother of his subjects was punitively bad (Mt 8 15). If his life was less marked by enormities than his father's, it was only so by reason of its inevitable restrictions. The least glimpse the Gospels afford of him shows him in the final tragedy of the life of Christ. He is then atJerusalem. Pilate in his perplexity had sent the Saviour bound to Herod, and the utter inefficiency and flippancy of the man is revealed in the account the Gospels give us of the incident (Lk 23 12). It was by the courtesy of a Galilean that Herodias prevailed on Herod Antipas to accompany her to Rome to demand a similar favor. The machinations of Agrippa and the accession of Caligula, however, proved his undoing, and he was banished to Lyons in Gaul, where he died in great misery (Ant, XVIII, vii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 6).

Herod Philip was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. At the death of his father he inherited Gaulonitis, Trachonitis and Panas (Ant, XVII, viii, 1). He was apparently utterly unlike the rest of the Herodian family, retiring, dignified, moderate and just. He was also wholly free from the intriguing spirit of his brothers, and it is but fair to suppose that he inherited this totally un-Herodian character and disposition from his mother. He died in the year 34 AD, and his son Antipas (who was three years his junior) succeeded him as his nephew and the son of Aristobulus, together with the tetrarchy of Lyssanias (Ant, XVIII, iv, 6; XIX, v, 1).

Herod Archelaus was the oldest son of Herod the Great by Malthace, the Samaritan. He was a man of violent temper, reminding one a great deal of his father. Educated like all the Herodian princes at Rome, he was the Herodian princes of Rome, he was made heir apparent to his father, the greatest part of the Herodian kingdom fell to his share, with the title of "ethnarch." The will was contested by his brother Antipas before the Roman court. While the matter was being debated by the Roman court, Herod Archelaus incurred the hatred of the Jews by the forcible repercussion of a rebellion, in which some 3,000 people were slain. They therefore opposed his claims at Rome, but Archelaus, in the face of all this opposition, received the Roman support (Ant, XVII, viii, 4). It is very ingeniously suggested that the episode may have been the foundation of the parable of Christ, found in Lk 19 12-27. Archelaus, once invested with the government of Judaea, ruled with a hard hand, so that Judaea and Samaria were both soon in a chronic state of unrest. The two nations, bitterly as they hated each other, became friends in this common cause, in order to complain of the conduct of Archelaus, and this time they were successful. Archelaus was warned by a dream of the coming disaster, whereupon he went at once to Rome to defend himself, but wholly in vain. His government was taken from him, his possessions were all confiscated by the Roman power and he himself was banished to Vienna in Gaul (Ant, XVII, xiii, 2, 3). He, too, displayed some of his father's taste for architecture, in the building of a royal palace in Jericho, named after himself Archelais. He was married first to Mariamne, and after his divorce from her to Glaphyra, who had been the wife of his half-brother Alexander (Ant, XVII, xiii). The only mention made of him in the Gospels is found in Mt 2 22.

6. Herod of Tyre, brought up the line of Agrippa I the Asmonean blood. And it is worthy to note even more that Agrippa preferred against him, however, proved his undoing, and he was banished to Lyons in Gaul, where he died in great misery (Ant, XVIII, vii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 6).

Herod Philip was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. At the death of his father he inherited Gaulonitis, Trachonitis and Panas (Ant, XVII, viii, 1). He was apparently utterly unlike the rest of the Herodian family, retiring, dignified, moderate and just. He was also wholly free from the intriguing spirit of his brothers, and it is but fair to suppose that he inherited this totally un-Herodian character and disposition from his mother. He died in the year 34 AD, and his son Antipas (who was three years his junior) succeeded him as his nephew and the son of Aristobulus, together with the tetrarchy of Lyssanias (Ant, XVIII, iv, 6; XIX, v, 1).

Herod Archelaus was the oldest son of Herod the Great by Malthace, the Samaritan. He was a man of violent temper, reminding one a great deal of his father. Educated like all the Herodian princes at Rome, he was made heir apparent to his father, the greatest part of the Herodian kingdom fell to his share, with the title of "ethnarch." The will was contested by his brother Antipas before the Roman court. While the matter was being debated by the Roman court, Herod Archelaus incurred the hatred of the Jews by the forcible repercussion of a rebellion, in which some 3,000 people were slain. They therefore opposed his claims at Rome, but Archelaus, in the face of all this opposition, received the Roman support (Ant, XVII, viii, 4). It is very ingeniously suggested that the episode may have been the foundation of the parable of Christ, found in Lk 19 12-27. Archelaus, once invested with the government of Judaea, ruled with a hard hand, so that Judaea and Samaria were both soon in a chronic state of unrest. The two nations, bitterly as they hated each other, became friends in this common cause, in order to complain of the conduct of Archelaus, and this time they were successful. Archelaus was warned by a dream of the coming disaster, whereupon he went at once to Rome to defend himself, but wholly in vain. His government was taken from him, his possessions were all confiscated by the Roman power and he himself was banished to Vienna in Gaul (Ant, XVII, xiii, 2, 3). He, too, displayed some of his father's taste for architecture, in the building of a royal palace in Jericho, named after himself Archelais. He was married first to Mariamne, and after his divorce from her to Glaphyra, who had been the wife of his half-brother Alexander (Ant, XVII, xiii). The only mention made of him in the Gospels is found in Mt 2 22.

Of Herod, son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, Simon's daughter, we know nothing except that he married Herodias, the daughter of his dead half-brother Aristobulus. He is called Philip in the NT (Mt 20 23), and it was from him that Antipas derived from Herodias away. Herod's history is wholly unknown, as well as that of Herod, the brother of Philip the tetrarch, and the oldest son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem.

Two members of a Herodian family are named Agrippa. They are of the line of Aristobulus, who through Mariamne, granddaughter of Antipas, of Lyssanias, and the grandson of Herod the Great and Mariamne. Educated at Rome with Claudius (Ant, XVIII, vii, 1), he was possessed of great shrewdness and tact. Returning to Judaea for a little while, he came back to Rome in 37 AD. He hated his uncle Antipas and left no stone unturned to hurt his cause. His mind was far-seeing, and he cultivated, as his grandfather had done, every means that might lead to his own promotion. He, therefore, made fast friends with Caligula, Agrippa's half-brother, and was made king of the tetrarchy of Galilee and Perea. He then crowned himself with the title of king, and his rather outspoken advocacy of the latter's claims led to his imprisonment by Tiberius. This proved the making of his fortune, for Caligula did not forget him, but immediately on his accession to the throne, liberate Agrippa and bestowed on him, who up to that time had been merely a private citizen, the "tetrarchies" of Philip, his uncle, and of Lyssianias, with the title of king, although he did not come into the possession of the latter till two more years had gone by (Ant, XVIII, vi, 10). The foolish ambition of Herod Antipas led to his undoing, and the emperor, who had heeded the accusation of Agrippa against his uncle, bestowed on him the additional territory of Galilee and Perea in 39 AD. Agrippa kept in close touch with the imperial government, and when, on the assassination of Caligula, the imperial crown was offered to the indifferent Claudius, it fell to the lot of Agrippa to lead the latter to accept the proffered honor. This led to further imperial favors and further extension of his territory, Judaea and Samaria being added to his domain, 30 AD. The fondest dreams of Agrippa had now been realized, his father's fate was avenged and the old Herodian power had been restored to its old seat. He ruled with great munificence and was very tactful in his contact with the Jews. With this end in view, several years before, he had moved Caligula to recall the
command of erecting an imperial statue in the city of Jerusalem; and when he was forced to take sides in the struggle between Judaism and the nascent Christian sect, he did so in a moment, but assumed the rôle of his bitter persecutor, slaying James the apologist with the sword and harrying the church whenever possible (Acts 12).

He died, in the full flush of his power, of a death, which, in its harrowing details received the fatality of fate (Acts 12 20–23; Ant. XIX, vii, 2). Of the four children he left (Bd. II, xi, 6), three are known to history—Herod Agrippa II, king of Calchis, Bernice of immoral celebrity, who consorted with her own brother, the prince of human and Divine law, and became a byword even among the heathen (Juv. Sat. vi.150–60), and Drusilla, the wife of the Roman governor Felix (Acts 24 24). According to tradition the latter perished in the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD, together with her son Agrippa. With Herod Agrippa I, the Herodian power had virtually run its course.

Herod Agrippa II was the son of Herod Agrippa I and Cypros. When his father died in 44 AD he was a youth of only 17 years and consequently too young to govern the country.

7. Herod Agrippa II

The Herodian government sought the place under the care of a procurator. Agrippa had received a royal education in the palace of the emperor himself (Ant. XX, ii, 1). But by his father he had gotten his people, as is proven by his intercession in behalf of the Jews, when they asked to be permitted to have the custody of the official high-priestly robes, till then in the hands of the Romans and used only on stated occasions (Ant. XX, i, 1). On the death of his uncle, Herod of Calchis, Claudius made Agrippa II “tetrarch” of the territory, 48 AD (Bd. II, xii, 1; XIV, v; Ant. XX, v, 2). As Jos tells us, he espoused the cause of the Jews whenever he could (Ant. XX, vi, 2). Four years later (52 AD), Claudius extended the dominion of Agrippa by giving him the old “tetrarchies” of Philip and Lysanias. Even at Calchis they had called him king; now it became his official title (Ant. XX, vii, 1). Still later (55 AD), Nero added some Galilean and Peraean cities to his domain. His whole career indicates the predominating influence of the Asmonean blood, which had shown itself in his father’s career also. If the Herodian taste for architecture reveals itself there and there (Ant. XX, vii, 11; IX, iv), there is a total absence of the cold disdain with which the Herodians in general treated their subjects. The Agrippas are Jews.

Herod Agrippa II figures in the NT in Acts 25 13; 26 32. Paul there calls him “king” and appeals to him as to one knowing the Scriptures. As the brother-in-law of Felix he was a favored guest on this occasion. His relation to Bernice his sister was a scandal among Jews and Gentiles alike (Ant. XX, vii, 3). In the fall of the Jewish nation, Herod Agrippa’s kingdom went down. Knowing the futility of resistance, Agrippa warned the Jews not to rebel against Rome, but in vain (Bd. II, xvi, 2–5; XVII, iv; XVIII, ix, XIX, iii). When the war began he boldly sided with Rome and fought under its banner, getting wounded by a sling-stone in the siege of Gamala (Bd. IV, i, 3). The oration by which he sought to persuade the Jews against the rebellion is a masterpiece of its kind and became historical (Bd. II, xvi). When the inevitable came and the whole Jewish nation fell into the hands of the king of Herod Agrippa II had been destroyed, the Romans remembered his loyalty. With Bernice his sister he removed to Rome, where he became a praetor and died in the year 100 AD, at the age of 70 years, in the beginning of Trajan’s reign.

LITERATURE.—Jos. Ant. and BJ; Strabo: Dio Cassius.

Among all modern works on the subject the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (5 vols) is perhaps still the best.

HENRY E. DOKER

HERODIANS, hερό′διανοι (Hρσδιανοι, Hερό-δiανοι): A party twice mentioned in the Gospels (Mt 22 16; Mk 12 13; 3 6) as acting with the Pharisees in opposition to Jesus. They were not a religious sect, but, as the name implies, a court or political party, supporters of the dynasty of Herod. Nothing is known of them beyond what the Gospels state. Whatever their political aims, they early perceived that Christ’s pure and spiritual teaching was not in harmony with the kingdom of God and was intolerable to all these, and that Christ’s influence with the people was antagonistic to their interests. Hence, in Galilee, on the occasion of the healing of the man with the withered hand, they readily joined with the more powerful party of the Pharisees in plots to crush Jesus (Mk 3 6); and again, in Jerusalem, in the last week of Christ’s life, they renewed this alliance in the attempt to entrap Jesus on the question of the tribute money (Mt 22 16). The warning of Jesus to His disciples to “beware of the leaven of Herod” (Mk 8 15) may have referred to the insidious spirit of this party.

JAMES ORR

HERODIAS, hερό′δια (Hρσδια, Hερό-δια): The woman who compassed the death of John the Baptist. According to Antipas’ wife (Mk 6 14 12; Mk 6 14–29; cf also Lk 3 19.20; 9 7–9). According to the Gospel records, Herodias had previously been married to Philip, but had deserted him for his brother Herod the tetrarch. For this Herod was reproved by John (cf Lev 18 16; 20 21), and Herod, therefore, to please Herodias, bound him and cast him into prison. According to Mt 14 5 he would even then have put John to death, but “feared the multitude,” which regarded John as a prophet. But Mk 6 19 relates it was Herodias who esp. desired the death of John, but that she was withstood by Herod whose conscience was not altogether dead. This latter explanation is more in harmony with the sequel. At Herod’s birthday feast, Herodias induced her daughter Salome, whose dancing had so charmed the tetrarch, to as ask her reward the head of John the Baptist on a charger. This was given her and she then brought it to her mother.

Herodias was daughter of Aristobulus, son of Herod the Great, by Mariamne, daughter of Hyrcanus. Her second husband (cf above) was Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea (c 4–39 AD), son of Herod the Great by Malthace. Herod Antipas was thus the step-brother of Aristobulus, father of Herodias. Regarding the first husband of Herodias, to whom she bore Salome, some hold that the Gospel accounts are at variance with that of Jos. In Mt 14 3; Mk 6 17; Lk 3 19, he is called Philip the brother of Herod (Ant. XVII, vii). But in Mt 3 and Lk 3 19 the name Philip is omitted by certain important MSS. According to Jos, he was Herod, son of Herod the Great by Mariamne daughter of Simon the high priest, and was thus a step-brother of Herod Antipas (cf Jos. Ant. XVIII, vi, 4). It is suggested in explanation of the discrepancy (1) that Herod, son of Mariamne, bore a second name Philip, or (2) that there is confusion in the Gospels with Herod-Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, and who was in the kingdom of Jewish nation that was known as Herodias (cf also A. B. Bruce, Epitome Gr Test., I, 381; A. C. Headlam, art. “Herodii” in HDB, II, 359, 360). According to Jos (Ant. VIII, vii, 2; XVII, vii, 1) the ambition of Herodias proved the ruin of Herod Antipas. Being jealous of the power of Agrippa her brother, she induced Herod to de-
mand of Caligula the title of king. This was refused through the machinations of Agrippa, and Herod was banished. But the pride of Herodias kept her still faithful to her husband in his misfortune.

C. M. Kerr

HERODION, her-ô'di-on (Hêrodiōn; WH Ἡροδίων): A Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16:11). The name seems to imply that he was a freedman of the Herods, or a member of the household of Aristobulus, the grandson of Herod the Great (ver 10). Paul calls him "my kinsman," i.e. "a Jew" (see Junias, 1).

HERON, her'ôn (τὰ θηριά, 'anaplhâ; χαραδρός; Lat Ardea cinerea): Herons are mentioned only in the abomination lists of Lev 11:19 (in "ibis") and Dt 14:18. They are near relatives of crane, stork, ibis and bittern. These birds, blue, white or brown, swarmed in Europe and wintered around Merom, along the Jordan, at the headwaters of the Jabbok and along its marshy bed in the dry season. Herons of Southern Africa that summered in the Holy Land loved to nest on the banks of Merom, and raise their young among the bulrushes, papyrus, reeds and water grasses, although it is their usual habit to build in large trees. The white herons were small, the blue, larger, and the brown, close to the same size. The blue were 3½ ft. in length, and had a 5½ ft. sweep. The beak, neck and legs constituted two-thirds of the length of the body, which is small, lean and bony, taking its appearance of size from its long loosely feathered. Moses no doubt forbade these birds as an article of diet, because they ate fish and in older specimens would be tough, dark and evil-smelling. The very poor of our western and southeastern coast states eat them.

Gene Stratton-Porter

HESED, he'zed, SON OF. See Ben-hesed.

HESHON, hesh'bon (חֶשְוָן, hesḥôn; 'Ereṣhôv; Hesbôn): The royal city of Sihon King of the Amorites, taken and occupied by the Israelites under Moses (Nu 21:25 f., etc.). It lay on the southern border of Gad (Josh 13:26), and was one of the cities fortified by Reuben (Nu 32:37). It is reckoned among the cities of Gad given to the Merarite Levites (Josh 21:39). In later lit. (Isa 15:4; 16:8 f; Jer 48:23-45; 49:3) it is referred to as a city of Moab. It passed again into Jewish hands, and is mentioned by Jos (Ant. XIII, xv, 4) as among their possessions in the country of Moab under Alexander Jannaeus. The city, with its district called Hesebonitis, was also under the jurisdiction of Herod the Great (Ant. XV, vii, 5, where it is described as lying in the Peraea). Onom places it 20 Roman miles from the Jordan. It is represented by the modern Hesbân, a ruined site in the mountains over against Jericho, about 16 miles E. of the Jordan. It stands on the edge of Wady Hesbân in a position of great strength, about 600 ft. above 'Ain Hesbân. The ruins, dating mainly from Roman times, spread over two hills, respectively 2,930 ft. and 2,984 ft. in height. There are remains of a temple overlooked from the W. by those of a castle. There is also a large ruined reservoir; while the spring in the valley forms a succession of pools (Cant 7:4). The city is approached from the valley by a steep path passing through a cutting in the rock, which may have been closed by a gate (Conder, Heth and Moab, 142). On a hill to the W., el-Kurmiyyeh, is a collection of dolmens and stone circles (Musil, Arabia Petraea, I, 383 ff.).

W. W. Ewing

HESMON, hes'mon (חָשְׁמִון, hesh'môn): An unidentified place on the border of Judah toward Edom (Josh 15:27). This may have been the original home of the Hasmoneans.

HETH, hâth (הֶת): The eighth letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as h (guttural h). It came also to be used for the number 8. For name, etc., see Alphabet.

HETH, heth (הֵת, heth): In Gen 23:10 the ancestor of the Hittites. As the various peoples who occupied Canaan were thought to belong to one stock, Gen 10:15 (1 Ch 1:13) makes Heth the (22) son of Canaan. In Gen 23 the "sons of Heth" occupy Hebron, but they were known to have come there from the north. A reference to this seems to be preserved in the order of the names in Gen 10:15,16, where Heth is placed between Sidon and the Jebusites. See Hittites.

HETHLON, heth'lon (חֶתְלוֹן, hethôn; Pesh hetrôn): Name of a place associated with Zedad on the ideal northern boundary of Israel, as given in Ezk 47:15 and 48:1, but at least in Nu 3:8, while the LXX evidently transcribed the text it had. In accordance with the opinion they hold as to the boundary line of Northern Israel, van Kasteren and Buhl seek to identify Hethlon with Atlan on the river Oenomiyeh. Much more in harmony with the line of the other border towns given is its identification with Heilata to the N.E. of Tripoli. The "way of Hethlon" would then coincide with the Eleutherus valley, between Homs and the Mediterranean, through which the railway now runs, and to this identification the LXX seems to give testimony, indicating some path of "desert" from the Band a.

W. M. Christie

HEWER, hê'ër (חֵיֶר, hôtêh): Applies esp. to a wood-worker or wood-gatherer (of Arab. hattib, "a woodman") (Josh 9:21,23,27; 2 Ch 2:10; Jer 46:22). Gathering wood, like drawing water, was a menial task. Special servants were assigned to the work (Dt 29:11). Joshua set the Gibeonites to hewing wood and drawing water as a punishment for their trickery, whereas it was not for the oath which the Israelites had sworn, the Gibeonites would probably have been killed. See Drawer of Water.
HEZEREKH, hez-e-ki (יהزة, ‘hizkia). See HIZEK.

HEZEKIAH, hez-e-ka (`Hizkiah'), hiṣ’hāyā):
(1) King of Judah. See special art.
(2) A son of Neziah, of the royal family of Judah (1 Chron 3:18, RV “Hizkiah”).
(3) An ancestor of Zephaniah (Zeph 1:1, AV “Hizkiah”).
(4) One of the returned exiles from Babylon (Ezra 2:16; Neh 7:21).

HEZEKIAH (`Hizkiah'), hiṣ’hāyāh, “Jeh has strengthened”; also written `Hizkiah, ḥiṣ’hāyāh, “Jeh has strengthened him”; Ezechias, Hezekia: One of the greatest of the kings of Judah; reigned (according to the most self-consistent chronology) from c 715 to c 680 BC.

On the OT standard of loyalty to Jeh he is eulogized by Jesus Sirach as one of the three kings who alone did not “commit trespass” (Sir 49:4), the other two being David and Josiah. The Chronicler represents him (2 Chron 29:1) as a king who “clavè to Jeh” (2 Kings 18:6) that the Heb mind sums up his royal and personal character.

I. Sources for His Life and Times.—The historical accounts in 2 Kings 18-20:29 are derived in the main from the

1. Scripture source annals, though the latter seems Annals also to have had the Temple archives to draw upon. For “the rest of his acts,” 2 Kings refers to a source then still in existence, but now lost, “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah” (2 Kings 20:20), and 2 Chronicles to “the vision of Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel” (2 Kings 20:20).

In this last-mentioned source (if this is the original of our Book I Kings) there is other information, called out by the course of the history, there is a narrative section (Isa 36-39) recounting the Sennacherib crisis much as do the other histories, but incorporating also a passage of Jaina prophecy (37:22-32) and a “writing of Hezekiah king of Judah” (38:10-20).

Lastly, in Sir 48:17-25, there is a summary of the good and wise deeds of Hezekiah, drawn from the accounts that we already have.

Of these sources the account in 2 Kings is most purely annalistic, originating at a time when religious and political values, in the Heb mind, were inseparable. In 2 Chronicles the religious coloring, esp. in its later developed annalistic, and legal aspects, have of course been decided on. Sirach, with the mind of a man of letters, is concerned mainly with eulogizing H. in his “praise of famous men” (cf Sir 44:60), from the viewpoint of the Heb. However, we have the reflection of the moral and spiritual situation in Jesus, as realized in the fervid prophetic consciousness; and in the prophecy of his younger contemporary Micah, the state of things in the outlying country districts nearest the path of invasion, where both the iniquities of the ruling classes and the horrors of war were felt most keenly. Doubtless also many devotional echoes of these times of stress are deducible from the Psalms, so far as we can fairly identify them.

It is in Hezekiah’s times esp. that the Assyrian inscriptions become illuminating for the history of Israel; for one important thing they furnish certain fixed dates to which the chronology of the OT can be adjusted. Of Sennacherib’s campaign of 701, for instance, no fewer than six accounts are at present known (see G. A. Smith, Jerus, II, 154, n.), the most detailed being the “Taylor Cylinder,” now in the British Museum, which in the main agrees, or at least is not inconsistent, with the Scripture history.

II. Events of His Reign.—From his weak and unprincipled father Ahaz (cf 2 Chron 28:16-20), Hezekiah inherited not only a disorganized realm but a grievous burden of Assyrian dominion and tribute, and the constant peril and suspense of greater encroachments from that arrogant and arbitrary power: the state of things foretold in Isa 7:20; 8:7f. The situation was aggravated by the fact that not only the nation’s weakness but its spiritual propensities had incurred it: the dominant classes were aping the sentiments, fashions and cultus of the East (cf Isa 2:6-8), while the neglected common people were exposed to the corruptions of the state from the wisdom of piety only by his vainglory in revealing the resources of his realm to the envows of Merodach-baladan. In 2 Kings 18:5, the earliest estimate, his special distinction, beyond all other Judaean kings, before or after, was that he “trusted in Jehovah, the God of Israel.”
Hezekiah's opportunity to rise against Assyrian domination seems to have been taken about 704.

How so pious a king came to do it in spite of Isaiah's strenuous warnings, both against opposition to Assyria and alliance with other powers, is not very clear. The present writer ventures to suggest the view that the beginning was forced or perhaps sprung upon him by his princes and nobles. In the year before, Sargon, dying, had left his throne to Sennacherib, and, as at all ancient changes of sovereignty, this was the signal for a general effort for independence on the part of subject provinces. That was also the year of Heze-

Pool of Hezekiah.

kah's deadly illness (2 K 20; Isa 38), when for a time we know not how long he would be incapacitated for active administration of affairs. Not unlikely on his recovery he found his realm committed beyond withdrawal to an alliance with Egypt and perhaps the leadership of a coalition with Philistia, in which case personally he could only make the best of the situation. There was nothing for it but to confirm this coalition by force, which he did in his Phil campaign mentioned in 2 K 18. Meanwhile, in the same general uprising, the Chaldaean Merodach-baladan, who had already been expelled from Babylon after an 11-year reign (721-710), again seized that throne; and in due time envoys from him appeared in Jerusalem, ostensibly to congratulate the king on his recovery from his illness, but really to secure his aid and alliance against Assyria (2 K 20 12-15; Isa 39 1-4). Hezekiah, flattered by such distinguished attention from so distant and powerful a source, by revealing his resources committed what the Chronicler calls the one impious indiscretion of his life (2 Ch 32 31), incurring also Isaiah's reproof and adverse prediction (2 K 20 17 1; Isa 39 6 1). The conflict with Sennacherib was now inevitable; and Hezekiah, by turning the water supply of Jerusalem from the Gihon spring to a pool within the walls and closing it from without, put the capital in readiness to stand a siege. The faith evoked by this wise work, confirmed by the subsequent deliverance, is reflected in Ps 66. This inciting of a hazardous war, however, with its turmoils and treacheries, and the presence of uncouth Arab mercenaries, was little to the king's desire or disposition, seems indicated in Ps 120, which with the other Songs of Degrees (Pss 120-134) may well reflect the religious faith of this period of Hezekiah's life.

The critical moment came in 701, when Sennacherib, who the year before had reconquered Babylon and expelled Merodach-

4. The Assyrian Crisis

The

5. Invasion of Judah

Hezekiah's dynasty (perhaps Isa 21 1-9 refers to this, was free to invade his rebellious liverance provinces in the W. It was a vig-

orous and sweeping campaign; in which, beginning with Sidon and advancing down

Declarations, 1386

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

The spirit of this unspirited state of things furnishes the best keynote of Hezekiah's reforms in religion, which according to the Chronicler he set about as soon as he came to the throne (2 Ch 29 3). It is the(std. März 1951) who gives the fullest ac-

count of these reforms (2 Ch 29-31); naturally, from his priestly point of view and access to ecclesiastical archives. Hezekiah began with the most pressing constructive need, the opening and cleansing of the Temple, which his father Ahaz had closed and deserted (2 Ch 29 24), and went on to the reorganization of its liturgical and choral service. In connection with this work he appointed a Passover observance, which, on a scale and spirit unknown since Solomon (2 Ch 30 26), he designed as a religious reunion of the devout of all Israel, open not only to Jerus and Judah, but to all who would accept his invitation from Samaria, Galilee, and beyond the Jordan (2 Ch 30 5-12 18). The immediate result of the enthusiasm engendered by this Old Home Week was a vigorous popular movement of iconoclasm against the idolatrous high places of the land. That this was not a fanatical impulse to break something, but a touch of real spiritual quickening, seems evidenced by one incident of it: the breaking up of Moses' old brazen serpent and calling it what it had come to mean, w'hekol, "a piece of brass" (2 K 18 4); the movement seems in fact to have had in it the sense, however quaint, that old religious forms had become hurtful and effete superstitions, hindering spirituality. Nor could the movement stop with the old fetish. With it went the demolition of the high places themselves and the breaking down of the pillars (medubba) and falling of the sacred groves ('ashèrâh), main symbols of a debasing nature-

cult. This reform, on account of later reactions (see under MANASSEH), has been deemed ineffective; rather, its effects were inward and germinal; nor were they less outwardly than could reasonably be expected, before its meanings were more deepened and centralized.

All this, on the king's part, was his response to the spiritual influence of Isaiah, with whose mind his first great reform was in one. As a devout disciple in the school of prophetic ideas, he earnestly desired to maintain the prophet's insistent atti-

dude of "quietness and confidence" (cf Isa 30 15). The words of Judah. It was, of course, almost negative in its nature, of abstaining from revolt and entangling alliances with foreign powers. This, however, in the stress and suspense of the times, did not pre-

clude a quiet preparation for emergencies; and doubtless the early years of his reign were notable, not only for mild and just administration through-

out his realm, but for measures looking to the fortifying and defence of the capital. His work of repairing and extending the walls and of strength-

ening the citadel (Millo), as mentioned in 2 Ch 32 5, had probably been in progress long before the Assyrian crisis was imminent. Nor was he backward in coming to an understanding with other nations, as to the outlook for revolt against Assyria. He could not learn his lesson of faith all at once, esp. with a factious court pulling the other way. He did not escape the suspicion of Sargon (d. 705), who for his Egypt leanings counted him among the "plot-
ers of secession" (cf COT 100); while the increasing prosperity and strength of his realm marked him for a leading role in an eventual uprising. He weathered at least one chance of rebellion, however, in 711, probably through the strenuous exertions of Isaiah (see Isa 20 1 ff).
through the coast lands, he speedily subdued the Phili cities, defeating them and their southern allies (whether these were from Egypt proper or from its extension across the Sinai peninsula and Northern Arabia, Mu'ri, is not quite clear) at Eltekeh; in which campaign, according to his inscription, he took 46 walled towns besides his spoil and deported over 200,000 of their inhabitants. This, which left Jerus a blockaded town (in fact he says of Hezekiah: "Himself I shut up like a bird in a cage" [Jer 32 17-19]), seems referred to in Ps 7 9 (cf. Isa 6 11 f.). Its immediate effect was to bring Hezekiah to terms and extort an enormous tribute (2 K 18 14-16). When later, however, he was treacherous enough to disregard the compact thus implied (perhaps Isa ch 33 refers to this), and demanded the surrender of the city (2 K 18 17-19 7; Isa 36 2-37 7), Hezekiah besought the counsel of Isaiah, who bade him refuse the demand, and predicted that Sennacherib would "hear tidings" and return to his own land; which prediction actually came to pass, and suddenly Hezekiah found himself free. A deliverance so great, and so signalizing the forthputting of faith, could not but produce a momentous revulsion in the nation's mind, like a new spiritual birth in which the whole of the "rebirth" idea, took power in Israel; its immediate effect seems portrayed in Ps 124 and perhaps Ps 126, and its deep significance as the birth of a nation in a day seems summarized long afterward in Isa 66 7-9; cf 37 3; 2 K 19 35.

A second summons to surrender, sent from Libnah by letter (2 K 19 1 ff; Isa 37 8 ff), is treated by the Scripture historians as a later feature of the same campaign; but recent research seems to make it possible, nay probable, that this belonged to another campaign of Sennacherib, when Taharkas of Ethiopia (Tērakāh, 2 K 19 9; Isa 37 9) came to power in Egypt, in 681. If this was so, there is room in Hezekiah's latter years for a decade of peace and prosperity (of Ch 32 22-23.27-30), and in Isaiah's old age for a collection and revision of his so wonderfully vindi cated prophecies. The historians' evident union of the two stories on one narrative line, which this crisis was, makes his task, obscure; but the tone of confirmed confidence and courage seems decidedly higher. The discontinuity of Sennacherib in this case was brought about, not by a rumor of rebellions at home, as in 2 K, but by an actual defeat (2 K 19 35 f.; Isa 36 f.), which event the Scripture writers interpreted as a miracle. The prophetic sign of deliverance (2 K 19 29; Isa 37 30) may be referred to the recovery of the devastated lands from the ravage inflicted by Sennacherib in his first campaign (cf also Ps 126 5 f).

III. His Character.—Our estimate of Hezekiah's character is most consistently made by regarding him as a disciple of Isaiah, who was earnestly minded to carry out his prophetic ideas. As, however, these were to begin with only the initial ideas of a spiritual "remnant," the king's sympathies must needs be identified at heart, not with his imperious nobles and princes, but with a minority of the common people, whose religious faith did not become a recognizable influence in the state until after 701. In the meantime his zeal for purer worship and juster domestic administration, which made him virtually king of the remnant, made him a wise and sagacious prince over the whole realm. Isaiah's gift of prophecy, as it were a Mesianic projection of the saner and clearer-seeing era that his domestic policy adumbrated — a time when king and nobles rule in righteousness, when man can lean on man, when things good and evil are seen as they are and called by their right names. When it came to dealing with the foreign situation, however, esp. according to the I saianic program, his task was exceedingly difficult, as it were a pioneer venture in faith. His effort to maintain an attitude of steadfast trust in Jeh, with the devout quietism which, though bad in itself, looked like a supine passivity, would lead his rest lessly scheming nobles to regard him as a pious weakening; and not improbably they came to deem him almost a negligible quantity, and forced his hand into diplomacy and coalitions that were foreign to his mind. Some such insolent attitude of theirs seems to be portrayed in Isa 28 14-22. This was rendered all the more feasible, perhaps, by the period of incapacitation that must have attended his illness, in the very midst of the nation's critical affairs. Isaiah's words (33 17 ff) may be an allusion at once to his essential kingship, to the abey ance of its manifestation due to his disease, and to the constricted condition into which, meanwhile, the realm had fallen. This exceedingly critical episode of Hezekiah's career does not seem to have had its rights with students of the era. Considering the trials that his patient faith must have had, always at cross-purposes with his nobles (cf Ps 130 6 f); that now by and by became a heartening example to his people; that his illness seemed to augur the very perpetuity of the Davidean dynasty, we have reason for regarding him as well-nigh a martyr to the new spiritual uprise of faith which Isaiah was laboring to bring about. In the Mesianic ideal which, in Isaiah's sublime conception, was rising into personal form, it fell to his lot to adumbrate the first kingly stage, the stage of committal to Jeh's word and will and abiding the event. It was a cardinal element in that composite ideal which the Second Isaiah puts to its ultimate in his portrayal of the servant of Jeh; another element, the element of sacrifice, has yet to be added. Meanwhile, as with the king so with his remnant-realm, the new venture of faith, the new appreciation of spiritual vitality, or, as the prophet calls it, a new heart (cf Isa 66 17 f.; 37 3; 66 7 f, for the stages of it). The event of deliverance, not by men's policies but by Jeh's miraculous hand, was the speedy vindication of such trust (2 K 20 19); the next decade witnessed a confirming and solidifying of spiritual integrity in the remnant which made it a factor to be reckoned with in the trying times that succeeded (see under MANASSEH). The date of Hezekiah's death (probably not long after 890) is not certainly known; nor of the death of his mentor Isaiah (tradition puts this by martyrdom under Manasseh); but if our view of his closing years is correct, the king's death crowned a consistent character of strength and spiritual steadfastness; while the unsurpassable greatness of Isaiah speaks for itself.

IV. Reflection of His Age in Literature.—The sublime and mature utterances of Isaiah alone, falling in this time, are sufficient evidence that in Hezekiah's age, Israel reached its golden literary prime. Among the idealists and thinkers throughout the nation a new spiritual vigor and insight were awaked. Of their fellowship was the king himself, who even in life continued to regard Solomon as patron of piety and letters. The compilation of the later Solomonic section of the Proverbs (Prov 26-29), attributed to the "men of Hezekiah," indicates the value attached to the
accumulations of the so-called Wisdom literature; and it is fair to assume that these men of Hezekiah did not stop with compiling, but stamped upon the body of Proverbs as a whole that sense of it as a philosophy of which it is an integral part. But it is impossible to determine just when, or how, this addition came to be included. It is possible that it was added at a later date, perhaps at the time of Manasseh (2 K 21 16), when the Solomonic influence had again been introduced into the court. It may well be, as one of the historians of the monarchical period says, that the kings of Judah, who made such a practice of adding to the sacred books of their ancestors, may have added this one, as an introduction to the next section, which is the History of the Reign of Hezekiah (2 K 23 18-20), a section that is quite different in spirit from the preceding. It is possible that the men of Hezekiah may have added the section as a way of introducing the new philosophy of God's kingdom, which is the subject of the next section.

HEZEKIAH'S SICKNESS. See Dial of Ahaz.

HEZEKIAH, THE MEN OF: A body of men of letters to whom is ascribed the compilation of a supplementary collection of Solomonic proverbs (Prov 25 1). See Proverbs, Book Of, II, 5; Hezekiah, 1, 2.

HEZION, hê'zîön (יהזון, hezôn; LXX B, Ἀθήνα, A, Ἀθηνᾶ, Αθηνᾶ): An ancestor of Ben-hadad, king of Syria (1 K 15 18).

HEZIB, hê'zîb: (1) (יהזיב, hēzib; LXX B, Χεζέβ, Chēzēb, A, Ἡζῆβ, Ἡζήβ): A Levite in the time of David (1 Ch 24 15). (2) (LXX Ἡζίβ, Ἡζῆβ): A chief of the people in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 10 20).

HEZRO, hez'ro, HEZRAI, hez'ra'i, hez'ri (יהזֵר, hezôr; LXX 2 S 23 35; 1 Ch 11 37, but the Kērē of 2 S 23 35 is הָצַר hezray. The ancient VSS almost unanimously support the form Hezra): A Carmelite, i.e. an inhabitant of Carmel. See Carmelite. One of David’s thirty “mighty men.”

HEZRON, hê'zrôn (יהזָרְון, hezôrôn, and הָצַר, hez'ar; LXX Ἀσπόπος, Aspōn): (1) A son of Reuben (Gen 46 9; Ex 6 14), and head of the family of the Hezronites (Nu 26 6). (2) A son of Perez, and grandson of Judah (Gen 46 12; Nu 26 21; 1 Ch 2 5 9 18 21 24 25; 4 1), a direct ancestor of David (Ruth 4 18 f). He appears also in the genealogy of Our Lord (οἶκος, Οἰκός) (Mt 1 3; Lk 3 33).

HEZRONITES, hê'zrôn-its (יהזָרְיִים and הָצַריים, ha-hez'ronî, LXX ᾿Ασπόπωλεῖ, ho Aspōneî): The name of the descendants of Hezron the son of Reuben (Nu 26 6), and of the descendants of Hezron the son of Perez (26 21).

HIDDAL, hid'dâl, hi-dâl (הִידַל, hîddal): Alex. ‘Aḥa‘el, Hahath: One of David’s thirty “mighty men” (2 S 23 30), described as “of the brooks of Gaash.” In the §§ in 1 Ch 11 32 the form of the name is “Hurai” (יהוּרָי, hūray).

HIDDEKEL, hid'dè-kel (הִדֶּקֶל, hiddekel): One of the rivers of Eden (q.v.) (Gen 2 14, RVm “that is, Tigris”; so LXX Tigras, Tigris), said to flow E. to Assyria, usually identified with the Tigris, which rises in Armenia near Lake Van and, after flowing S.E. through 8 degrees of latitude, joins the Euphrates in Babylonia to form the Shatt el’Arab, which runs for 100 miles through a delta which has been formed since the time of Abraham, and now enters the Pers Gulf through 2 branches. About one-third of the distance below its source, and soon after it emerges from the mountains of Kurdistan, the Tigris passes by Mosul, the site of ancient Nineveh, and, lower down at Bagdad, approaches within a few miles of the Euphrates. Here and for many miles below, since the level is lower
HIDDEN, hid·n: The tr of ἑκάσταν, “to hide,” “to bury” (Job 3:16), and has more than once appeared store up” (15 20). The number of years is hidden to the oppressor; RV “even the number of years that are laid up for the oppressor,” m “and years that are numbered are laid up” (Job 24:1). “Why, fewer times are not hidden from the Almighty?” m “Why are the laying laid up by the Almighty?” m as AV with “Why is it?" prefixed; Ps 83:3, “They consulted [RV “consult’it”] against thy hidden ones” (Sanctum); or magpāntum (from gaphan), “hidden things or places” (Ob 2:6, “How are his hidden things sought out?” RV “treasures,” ARV “sought out”); of παλάτ, “to be wonderful,” “difficult” (Dt 30:11, “This commandment . . . is not hidden from thee,” RV “too hard for thee,” m “or wonderful”); or ἰδέας, ἱθαπαν, “to hide one’s self” (Prov 28:12, RV “When the wicked arise, men hide themselves,” m “Heb must be searched for”); of κρυπτός, “hidden,” “secret” (1 Pet 3:4, “the hidden man of the heart”); 1 Cor 4:5, krupton, “the hidden things of darkness” (2 Cor 4:2, “the hidden things of the world”); RV “of Apollo the wise.” (Ps. 36:9), “to hide away,” trop., not to reveal or make known (1 Cor 2:7, “But we speak God’s wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden”; cf Eph 3:9; Col 1:26).

Among the occurrences of hidden in Apoc we have (2 Esdr 4 of Almighty God. Search the secrets of the heart” (Rev S) He who had all things and searcheth out all hidden things in the secrets of the heart” (RV “hidden things”) into the steps (RV “traces”) of hidden things; (1 Cor 15:26, “The hidden things of God” (Ps. 37:9, “Ecclesiastes 12:10”); “to make a place” and “to make any word is hidden from him.” (Ps. 37:9, “Ecclesiastes 12:10”); “to make a place” and “to make any word is hidden from him.”

W. L. WALKER

HIEL, hi'el (חיאל, ἱείλ; ’Αχιλλ, Achil): A Bethelite who according to 1 K 16:34 rebuilt Jericho, and in fulfillment of a curse pronounced by Joshua (Josh 6:26) sacrificed his two sons. This seems to have been a custom prevalent among primitive peoples, the purpose being to ward off ill luck from the inhabitants, esp. in a case where the destructive fire had involved a man who was resigned to rebuild. Numerous instances are brought to light in the excavations of Gezer (Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer, ch x). At first the very best was claimed as a gift to the deity—e.g., his own sons; then some less valuable member of the community. When civilization prevented human sacrifice, animals were offered instead. The story of Abraham offering Isaac may be a trace of this old custom, the tenor of the story implying that at the time of the writing of the record, the custom was coming to be in disrepute. A similar instance is the offering of his eldest son by the king of Edom to appease the deity and win success in battle (2 K 3:27; cf Mic 6:7). Various conjectures have been made as to the identity of this king. Ewald regarded him as a man of wealth and enterprise (unternehmender reicher Mann); Cheyne following Niebuhr makes it Jehu in disguise, putting 1 K 16:34 after 2 K 10:33; Winckler explains as folklore. W. N. STEARNS

HIERAPOLIS, hi'-er-ap'ö-liß (Ἱέραπολις, Hier-ápolis, “sacred city”): As the name implies, Hierapolis was a holy city. It was situated 6 miles from Laodicea and twice that distance from Colossae, on the road from Nardis to Apameia. Though it is history is not well known, it seems to have been of Lydian origin, and once bore the name of Kydra. The Phrygian god Sabazios was worshipped there under the name Ezekhidon, and represented by the symbol of the serpent. Other local deities were Leto and her son Arimenes. Though called the holy city, Hierapolis was peculiarly regarded as the stronghold of Satan, for there was a Plutonium, or a hole reaching far down into the earth, from which smoke issued at times. RV “Why, fewer times are not hidden from the Almighty?” m “Why are the laying laid up by the Almighty?” m as AV with “Why is it?” prefixed; Ps 83:3, “They consulted [RV “consult’it”] against thy hidden ones” (Sanctum); or magpāntum (from gaphan), “hidden things or places” (Ob 2:6, “How are his hidden things sought out?” RV “treasures,” ARV “sought out”); of παλάτ, “to be wonderful,” “difficult” (Dt 30:11, “This commandment . . . is not hidden from thee,” RV “too hard for thee,” m “or wonderful”); or ἰδέας, ἱθαπαν, “to hide one’s self” (Prov 28:12, RV “When the wicked arise, men hide themselves,” m “Heb must be searched for”); of κρυπτός, “hidden,” “secret” (1 Pet 3:4, “the hidden man of the heart”); 1 Cor 4:5, krupton, “the hidden things of darkness” (2 Cor 4:2, “the hidden things of the world”); RV “of Apollo the wise.” (Ps. 36:9, “Ecclesiastes 12:10”); “to make a place” and “to make any word is hidden from him.” (Ps. 37:9, “Ecclesiastes 12:10”); “to make a place” and “to make any word is hidden from him.”

E. J. BANKS

HIERIEH, hi'-er-i'é-el (Ἱερείθη, Hierithel): 1 Ead 9:21. In Exr 8:9 the name is Jehiel.

HIERIELUS, hi'-er-i-lús (Ἰερείλος, Ierielos). See JEREILUS.

HIREMOTH, hi'-er'em'-oth (Ἱερεμόθ, Jeremoth): (1) 1 Ead 9:27 = Jeremoth (Exr 10:26). (2) 1 Ead 9:30 = Jeremoth (Exr 10:29, m “and Ramoth”).

HIRMAS, hi'-úrmäs (Ἱερμᾶς, Hiermas): 1 Ead 9:26, corresponding to Ramiah in Exr 10:25.

HIGGAION, hi'-gá'yôn, hi'-gá'on (חִ֣גְיָ֔ון, higgya'ôn), higgya’ôn: The meaning of this word is uncertain. Two interpretations are possible: the one based on an allied Arab, root gives “a deep vibrating sound,” the other derived from the Gr VSS of Ps 9:16, where we read kiggayón Șelah, takes it to mean an instrumental interlude. See Psalms.

HIGH DAY: Is found in Gen 29:7 as a rendering of the Heb יַבָּ֖ה, yom gādol, lit., “great day.” The Heb means the day at its height, broad daylight, as contrasted with the time for getting the cattle to their sheds for the night (cf Fr. grand jour). In Jn 19:31, "highday" renders μεγάλης
HIGHEST

The term "high" is used in the Bible to denote elevated places, both natural and human-made. The word is used in reference to places of worship, altars, and the physical world of mountains and hills.

**The Highest, hî'st (חֵם, 'elyon, [C]hî'st, hupesitos):** The term "'elyon," used frequently of God and commonly tr. "Most High" (Ps 18:13, "The Highest gave his voice," RV "Most High"); 87:5, "the highest himself," RV "Most High"; Ezek 41:7, "the lowest [chamber] to the highest"); of cameryn, the foliage of a tree (as if the wool or rich of trees), the highest branch (Ezk 17:32, RV "top," "lofty top"); of rô'sh, "head," "top" (Prov 8:26, "the highest part of the dust of the world"); AVM, "the chief part," RV "the beginning of,

_In highminded,

.. etc.; highminded," etc., see protoklisia, "the first ruling-place (at table), the chief place at the table, the middle place on the t'rdphlm, "top," "the highest room," RV "chief seat"); "room" was introduced by Tindall; Wielic had "the first place"); protokathedria, "prôtos, 'first,' kathedra, 'seat"); the first or chief seat is rendered (Lk 20:46) "the highest seats," RV "chief seats," Wielic "the first chairs.

The Highest as a term for God appears (2 Esd 4:11,43, RV "Most High"); Wend 6:3, hupesitos; Exclus 28:7, RV "Most High"). See also God, Names of.

W. L. Walker

**HIGHMINDED, hî'mind-ed:** In modern usage denotes elevation of mind in a good sense, but formerly it was used to denote upliftedness in a bad sense, pride, arrogance. It is the tr. of ἑυπελαπρόνεο, "to be highminded," "proud,

"haughty." (Rom 11:20, "Be not highminded, but fear." 1 Tim 6:17, "Charge them that are rich... that they be not highminded"); of tuphô, "to wrap in mist or smoke," "to wrap in conceit, to make proud," etc. (2 Tim 3:4, "Traitors, heady, highminded," RV "puffed up"); of 1 Tim 3:6; 8:4) "No one can be highminded without thinking better of himself, and worse of others, than he ought to think!") (Crabb, English Synonymes.

W. L. Walker

**HIGH, MOST.** See God, Names of.

**HIGH PLACE:** (1) "High place" is the normal term for bamâh, a word that means simply "elevation" (Jer 26:15; Ezek 36:2, etc.; 1. General of the use in Job 9:5 of the waves of the sea. For the term as a proper noun, see RAMOTH. In AV of Ezek 16:24,25,31-39, "high places" is the tr. of רָמָן, râman (RV "lofty places"); a common word (see RAMAH) of exactly the same meaning, indistinguishable from bamâh in ver 16. In three of these vs of Ezek (24:31-39) râmâh is paralleled by רָבוֹת, râbôh, which again has the same sense ("prominent place" in AV, ERV), and the "vaulted place" of ARV (ERVvm) is in disregard of Heb parallelism. In particular, the high places are places of worship, specifically of idolatrous worship. So the title was transferred from the elevation to the sanctuary on the elevation (1 K 11:7-14:23; of the burning of the "high place" in 2 K 23:15), and so came to be used of any idolatrous shrine, whether constructed on an elevation or not (note how in 2 K 16:4; 2 Ch 28:4 the 'high places' are distinguished from the 'hills').

In Ezek 16:16 a portable structure seems to be in point. (2) The use of elevations for purposes of worship is so widespread as to be almost universal,

Tell Taanach (a Typical Canaanite High Place).
not idols used in worship). Other necessary features of a high place of the larger size were ample provision of water for lustral purposes, kitchens where the sacrifices could be cooked (normally by boiling), and tables for the sacrificial feasts. Normally, also, the service went on in the open air, but slight shelters were provided frequently for some of the objects. If a regular priest was attached to the high place (not always the case), his dwelling

must have been a feature, unless he lived in some nearby village. Huts for those practiseing incubation (sleeping in the sanctuary to obtain revelations through dreams) seem not to have been uncommon. But formal temples were very rare and "houses of the high places" in 1 K 12 31; 13 22; 2 K 17 29-32; 23 19 may refer only to the slighter structures just mentioned (see the comm.). In any case, however, the boundaries of the sanctuary were marked out, generally by a low stone wall, and ablutions and removal of the sandals were necessary before the worshipper could enter.

For the ritual, of course, there was no uniform rule. The gods of the different localities were different, and in Pal a more or less thorough rededication of the high places to Jeh had taken place. So the service might be anything from the orderly worship of Jeh under so thoroughly an accredited leader as Samuel (1 S 9 11-24) to the wildest orgiastic rites. That the worship at many high places was intensively licentious is certain, but it must be emphasized against the statements of many writers that there is no evidence for a specific phallic cult, and that the explorations have revealed no unmistakable phallic emblems. The gruesome cemetery for newly born infants at Gezer is only one of the proofs of the prevalence of child-sacrifice, and the evidence for human sacrifice in other forms is unfortunately only too clear. See Gezer, and illustration on p. 1224.

(1) The opposition to the high places had many motives. When used for the worship of other gods their objectionable character is obvious, but even the worship of Jeh in the high places was intermixed with heathen practices (Hos 4 14, etc). In Am 5 21-24, etc, sacrifice in the high places is denounced because it is regarded as a substitute for righteousness in exactly the same way that sacrifice in the Temple is denounced in Jer 7 21-24. Or, sacrifice in the high places may be denounced under the best of circumstances, because in violation of the law of the one sanctuary (2 Ch 33 17, etc).

(2) In 1 S, sacrifice outside of Jerus is treated as an entirely normal thing, and Samuel presides in one such case (1 S 9 11-24). In 1 K the practice of using high places is treated as legitimate before the construction of the Temple (1 K 3 2-4), but after that it is condemned unequivocally. The primal sin of Northern Israel was the establishment of high places (1 K 12 31-33; 13 2-3 f), and their continuance was a chief cause of the evils that came to pass (2 K 17 10 f), while worship in them was a characteristic of the mongrel throng that repopulated Samaria (2 K 17 32). So Judah sinned in building high places (1 K 14 23), but the editor of K notes with other irregularities that even the pious kings (Asa, 1 K 15 14; Jehoshaphat, 22 43; Jehoash, 2 K 12 3; Amaziah, 14 4; Azariah, 16 4; Jotham, 16 35) did not put them away; i.e. the editor of K has about the point of view of Dt 12 8-11, according to which sacrifice was to be restricted to Jerus until the country should be at peace, but afterward the restriction should be absolute. The practice had been of such long standing that Hezekiah's destruction of the high places (2 K 18 4) could be cited by Rabshakeh as an act of apostasy from Jeh (2 K 18 22; 2 Ch 32 12; Isa 36 7). Under Manasseh they were rebuilt, in connection with other idolatrous practices (2 K 21 3-9). This act determined the final punishment of the nation (vs 10-15), and the general reformation of Josiah (ch 23) came too late. The attitude of the editor of Ch is still more condemning. He explains the sacrifice at Gibeon as justified by the presence of the Tabernacle (1 Ch 16 39; 21 29; 2 Ch 1 3); it states that "fear not the high places" (2 Ch 21 16; of 1 K 19 10.14), and (against K) credits Asa (2 Ch 14 3.5) and Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 17 6) with their removal. (This last notice is also in contradiction with 2 Ch 29 35, but 16 17a is probably meant to refer to the Northern Kingdom, despite 17b.) On the other hand, the construction of high places is added to the sins of Jehoram (2 Ch 21 11) and of Ahaz (2 Ch 28 4.5).

(3) Among the prophets, Elijah destroyed the temple or altar of God as a terrible sin (1 K 19 10.14). Amos and Hosea each mention the high places by name only once (Am 7 9; Hos 10 8), but both prophets have only denunciation for the sacrificial practices of the Northern Kingdom. That, however, these sacrifices were offered in the wrong place is not said. Isa has nothing to say about the high places, except in 36 7, while Mic 1 5 equates the sins of Jerus with those of the high places (if the text is right), but promises the continued chastisement of Jerus. In Jer 7 31; 19 6; 32 35; Ezk 6 3.6; 16 16; 20 29; 43 7, idolatry or abominable practices are in point (so probably in Jer 17 3, while Jer 48 35 and Isa 16 12 refer to non-Israelites).

(4) The interpretation of the above data and their historical import depend on the critical position taken as to the general history of Israel's religion. See Religion of Israel; Criticism; Deuteronomy, etc.

Literature.—See, esp., Idolatry, and also Alma, Amos, etc. For the archaeological lit. see Palestine.

Burton Scott Easton

HIGH PRIEST. See Priest, High.

HIGH THINGS: The tr of huppelōs, "high," "lofty," "elevated" (Rom 12 16, "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate," AVm be "contented with mean things," RV "Set not your mind on high things, but condescend to [m ("Or be carried away with")] things [m ("them!") that are lowly"); high things are proud things, things regarded by the world as high.

High thing is huppelos, "a high place," "elevation," etc (2 Cor 10 5, "casting down every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God," "like a lofty tower or fortress built up proudly by the enemy"). In Jth 10 8; 13 4, huppelos is rendered "exaltation."
HILL, hîlān (םלוא, hîlān); A city in the hill country of Judah, probably W. or S.W. of Hebron, assigned with its suburbs to the Levites (1 Ch 6:58 [Heb 48]). The form of the name in Josh 15:51; 21:18 is HOLON (q.v.).

HILKHA, hil-ka' (יהלוך, hîlḵōḵ), הילקוח, "Jeh is my portion" or "Jeh's portion": The name of 8 individuals in the O.T. or 7, if the person mentioned in Neh 13:21 was the same person who stood with Ezra at the reading of the law (Neh 8:3). The latter appears as Ezrâ in 1 Esd 9:43. Five of this name are clearly associated with the priesthood, and the others are presumably so. The etymology suggests this. Either interpretation of the name expresses the person's claim on Jeh or the parent's recognition of Jeh's claim on him.

1. The person mentioned above (Neh 8:4, etc.).
2. A Levite of the sons of Merari (1 Ch 6:45).
3. Another Levite of Merari, son of Hosah (1 Ch 26:11).

Is he the "porter," i.e., "doorkeeper" of 1 Ch 16:38?
4. Father of the Gemariah whom Zedekiah of Judah sent to Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 29:3).

5. The man in 2 K 18:18ff who is evidently more famous as the father of Eliakim, the major-domo of Hezekiah's palace (Isa 22:20ff; 36:3ff). Probably the father's name is given in this and several cases to distinguish between two persons of otherwise identical name.

6. A priest of Anathoth, father of Jeremiah (Jer 1:1).

7. The son of Shallum, and the best known of the same name (1 Ch 6:13). He is great-grandfather of Ezra through his son Azariah (1 Esd 8:1, cf. 1 Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11). He discovered the lost Book of the Law during the repairing of the Temple (2 K 22:4ff); became chief leader in the ensuing reformation in 621 BC (2 K 23:4; 2 Ch 34:9ff; 35:8). He showed the recovered book to Shaphan the scribe, who, in turn, brought it to the notice of the king. At Josiah's request he led a deputation to Huldah the prophetess to "enquire of the Lord concerning the new situation created by the discovery. The book discovered is usually identified with the Book of Dt. See Deuteronomy.

HENRY WALLACE

HILL, HILL COUNTRY, hîl' kun-tri: The common tr of three Heb words: הילך, gîb'kāh, from root meaning "to be curved," is almost always trd "hill"; it is a peculiarly appropriate designation for the very rounded hills of Pal; it is never used for a range of mountains. Several times it occurs as a place-name, "Gibeah of Judah" (Josh 15:50; 16:13; "Gibeah of Benjamin" or "Sahul" (Jgs 19:12-16); "Gibeah of Phinehas" (Josh 24:33m), etc. (see Gibeah). Many such hills were used for idolatrous rites (1 K 14:23; 9:5; 2 K 17:10; Jer 2:20, etc.).

2. הילך, har, frequently trd in AV "hill," is r in AV usually trd "mountain" (cf Gen 7:19; Josh 15:9; 19:16; and many other references), or "hill-country." Thus we have the "hill-country of the Amorites" (Dt 7:19.20); the "hill-country of Gilead" (Dt 3:12); the "hill-country of Ephraim" (Josh 17:15.16.18; 19:50; 20:7, etc.); the "hill-country of Judah" (Josh 11:21; 20:7; 21:11.12; 2 Ch 7:1.4; etc.); and of [ש הילך, hîlḵōḵ, הילקוח] 1 K 39:65; the "hill-country of Naphtali" (Josh 20:7). For geographical designations see Palestine; Country; Ephraim; Judah, etc.

3. רָצִים, ṣaphēl, is trd by "hill" in 2 K 5:24; Isa 32:14; Mic 4:8, but may possibly mean "tower" or "fort." In other passages the word occurs with the art. as a place-name. See Ophel.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

HILL, MOUNT, MOUNTAIN:

(1) The commonest word is הַר, har (also תָּל, tāl, and הִנֶּר, herer), which is rendered "hill," "mount," or "mountain." It occurs several hundreds of times.

In a number of places RV changes "hill" to "mountain," e.g., Gen 7:19, mountains covered by flood: Ex 24:4, Horeb; Josh 13:14, mountain before Beth-horon; Ps 46:13, mountain before Beersheba; 1 K 4:33, "mountains." Heights of the mountains are his also: 121a 1, "I will set up mine eyes upon the mountains." The term "hill" remains in Dt 11:11, "land of hills and valleys": 1 K 20:33, "the hill of Zion." 98 8, "hill sings for joy." "Mount" is changed to "hill-country" in Dt 1:7, "hill-country of the Amorites": Jos 11:15, "hill-country of the Anakites": Dt 3:13, "hill-country of Gilead"; and Gen 31:21, "mountain of Gilead." 1:7, "hill of hills" or "hills" is changed to "hill-country." In Dt 1:7: Josh 9:1, 10:40, 11:16; 17:16; 21:11. In Dt 1:41, ARV changes "hill" to "hill-country," while ERV has "mountain." The reasons for these differences of treatment are not in all cases apparent.

(2) The Gr ἴθος, ἴθρος, is perhaps etymologically akin to הַר, har. It occurs often in the NT, and is usually trd "mount" or "mountain." In three places (Mt 5:14; Lk 4:18; 16:16), AV has "hill," which RV retains, except in Lk 9:37, "they were come down from the mountain" (of the transfiguration). The derivative ἵππος, ἱππόν, "hill-country," occurs in Lk 1:39.65.

(3) The common Heb word for "hill" is רָצִים, ṣaphēl, from root meaning to "be curved," is almost always trd "hill"; it is a peculiarly appropriate designation for the very rounded hills of Pal; it is never used for a range of mountains. Several times it occurs as a place-name, "Gibeah of Judah" (Josh 15:50; 16:13; "Gibeah of Benjamin" or "Sahul" (Jgs 19:12-16); "Gibeah of Phinehas" (Josh 24:33m), etc. (see Gibeah). Many such hills were used for idolatrous rites (1 K 14:23; 9:5; 2 K 17:10; Jer 2:20, etc.).

(4) In 1 K 9:11, AV has "hill" for רָצִים, "ma'alah, root רָצִים, 'alāh, to ascend," cf. Arab. عَلَّم, 'alām, "to be high," and عَلَّم, 'alīm, "high,"
Here and elsewhere RV has "ascendent."" (5) EV has "hill" in Isa 5:1 for רָצִים, herer, "horns"; cf Arab. قَرن, qarn, "horn," which is also used for a mountain peak.

(6) רָצ, târ, is trd "mountain" in Dn 2:35,45, but RVm "rock" in Dn 3:35. (7) Arab. مَعَز, muzzābī (Isa 29:3), is trd in AV "mount," in ERV "fort," in ARV "posted troops"; cf עַל, muzzābī, "garrison" (1 S 14:1, etc.), from root עַל, nāqāb, "to set," cf. Arab. كَسْب, nasab, "to set." (8) Arab. صَبْح, sōbāh, from root סָבָה, सवा, "to raise," is in AV and ERV "mount," AVm "engine of shot," ARV "mount." (9) "mountain," is esp. used with Sinai, כַּנְּסִיָּה, "Jebel târ sī'ah." (10) "mountains" and "hills of Pal are the features of the country, and were much in the thoughts of the Bib. writers. Their general aspect is that of vast expanses of rock. As compared with better-watered regions of the earth, the land is sparsely inhabited. Snow remains throughout the year on Hermon and the two highest peaks of Lebanon, although in the summer it is in great isolated drifts which are not usually visible from below. In Pal proper, there are no snow moun-
tains. Most of the valleys are dry wadis, and the roads often follow these wadis, which are to the traveler veritable ovens. It is when he reaches a commanding height and sees the peaks and ridges stretching away one after the other, with perhaps, through some opening to the W., a gleam of the sea like molten metal, that he becomes aware of the vastness and enduring strength of the mountains. At sunset the rosy lights are succeeded by the cool purple shadows that gradually fade into cold gray, and the traveler is glad of the shelter of his tent. The stars come out, and there is no sound outside the camp, except perhaps the cries of jackals or the barking of some goat-herd’s dog. These mountains are apt to repel the casual traveler by their bareness. They have no great forests on their slopes. Steep and rugged peaks like those of the Alpes are entirely absent. There are no snow peaks or glaciers. There are, it is true, cliffs and crags, but the general outlines are not striking. Nevertheless, these mountains and hills have a great charm for those who have come to know them. To the Bib. writers they are symbols of eternity (Gen 49 26; Dt 33 15; Job 15 7; Hab 3 6). They are strong and steadfast, but too they are the creation of God, and they manifest His power (Ps 18 7; 97 5; Isa 40 14 26; Jer 4 14; Nah 1 5; Hab 3 6). The hills were places of heathen sacrifice (Dt 12 2; 1 K 11 7; 2 K 16 4; 17 10; Ezk 6 13; Hos 4 13), and also of sacrifice to Jeh (Gen 22 2; 31 54; Josh 8 30). Zion is the hill of the Lord (Ps 2 6; 136 21; Isa 8 18; Joel 3 21, Mic 4 2).

Many proper names are associated with the mountains and hills of Abarim, Amalekites, Abarim, Amurites, Ararar, Bashall, Baath-hermon, Bashan, Beshan, Beth-hor, BethUEL, Carmel, Cheshalon, Enath, Ephraim, Eprom, Essau, Gaash, Gareb, Geba, Gerizim, Gilbeah, Gibeon, Gihon, Gash, Gopham, Geshon, Hazael, Hebron, Hermon, Hor, Horab, Jeerin, Judah, Lebanon, Mizar, Moreh, Moriah, Naphtali, Nebo, Olivet, Paran, Perazim, Piasgh, Samaria, Ser, Senir, Sephar, Shepher, Simeon, Siion, Surion, Tabor, Zaimon, Zemaraim, Zion. See also "mountain of the east" (Gen 10 30); "mountains of the leopard" (Cant 4 8); "rocks of the wild goats" (Isa 34 2); "hill of the foreshocks" (Gilbeah-Haaaraloth (Josh 5 3)); "mountains of brass" (Zer 6 1); "hill of God" (Gilbeah of God) (1 K 19 15); "mountains of procession of the congregation" (15 13); see also Mt 4 8; 5 1; 14 23; 15 29; 17 1; 26 16; Lk 8 32; Gal 4 26.

ALFRED ELY DAY

HILLEL, hil’el (חִלֶל, hillel, "he greatly praised"); LXX' ΕΗΛΛ, Elid (Elisi): An inhabitant of Pirathon in the hill country of Ephraim, and father of Abdon, one of the judges of Israel (Jgs 12 13). 1. HIN, hin (חִין, hin): A liquid measure containing 12 logs, equal to about 8 quarts. See Weights and Measures.

HIND, hind. See Deer.

HIND OF THE MORNING, THE: The tr of Azjeleh baah-Shahar (ayyjeleth ha-shahar) in the title of Ps 22, probably the "Hinnom儿女", one of the several known songs which the ps was intended to be sung, which possibly had reference to the early habits of the deer tribe in search of water and food, or to the flight of the hind from the hunters in early dawn; or "morning" may symbolize the deliverance from persecution and sorrow.

"The first rays of the morning sun, by which it announces its appearance before being itself visible, are compared to the fork-like antlers of a stag; and this appearance is called, Ps 24 3, the title, 'The hind of the morning,' because those antler rays preceded the red of dawn, which again forms the transition to sunrise" (Delitzsch, Int. Com. Ps, 2403).

According to Hengstberg, the words indicate the subject-matter of the poem, the character, sufferings, and triumph of the person who is set before us. See Psalms. For an interesting Messianic interpretation see Hood, Christmas Events, the Preacher of Wild Waies, 92 ff. M. O. EVANS

HINGE, hin’ge (חרך, poth): Hinges of Jewish sacred buildings in Scripture are mentioned only in connection with the temple’s inner gates, and which doors swing, and which turned in the sockets of the threshold and the lintel, were cased in gold. The proverb: "As the door turneth upon its hinges, so doth the sluggard upon his bed" (Prov 26 14), describes the ancient mode of ingress and egress into important edifices. In the British Museum there are many examples of stone sockets taken from Bab and Assyrian palaces and temples, engraved with the name and titles of the royal builder; while in the Hauran doors of a single slab of stone with stone pivots are still found in situ. Hinges, as we understand the word, were unknown in the ancient world. See House 1.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

HINNOM, hin’om, VALLEY OF (גַּה-הַנִּמּים, ḡ hā-hinnôm, Josh 16 8, 16 16; "south valley of the son of Hinnom") (גַּה-הַנִּמּים, ḡ bhen hinnôm, Josh 16 8, 16 16; 2 Ch 28 3; 33 6; Jer 7 31; 19 26; 32 35; "valley of the children [sons] of Hinnom") (גַּה-הַנִּמּים, ḡ bhe’-hinnôm), 2 K 23 10; or simply "the valley," it. the "hollow" or "cavine" (הַנִּמּים) (2 Ch 26 9; Neh 2 13, 15; 3 13; Jer 31 40, and perhaps, also Jer 23 [the above references are in the Heb text; there are some variations in the LXX]): The meaning of Hinnom is unknown; the expressions ben Hinnom and ben Hinnom would suggest that it is a proper name; in Jer 7 32; 19 6 it is altered by the prophet to "valley of slaughter," and therefore some have thought the original name must have had a pleasing meaning. It was near the walls of Jerusalem, "by the entry of the gate Harsith" (Jer 19 2), the Valley Gate opened into it (Neh 2 13; 3 13). The boundary between Judah and Benja References min ran along it (Josh 16 8; 18 16) and History. It was the scene of idolatrous practices in the days of Ahaz (2 Ch 28 3) and of Manasseh, who "made his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom" (2 Ch 23 6), but Jos 7 22. In the course of his reforms "de- liled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children ["son"] of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech" (2 K 23 10). It was on account of these evil practices that Jeremiah (7 32; 19 6) announced the change of name. Into this valley dead bodies were probably cast to be consumed by the dogs, as is done in the Wady er-Rabâbi today, and fires were here kept burning to consume the rubbish of the city. Such associations led to the Geo-Hinnom (N T "Gehenna") becoming the "type of Hell" (Milton, Paradise Lost, i, 405). See GEBENNA.

The Valley of Hinnom has been located by different writers in each of the three great valleys of Jerusalem. In favor of the eastern or Kidron valley
we have the facts that Eusebius and Jerome (Onom) place "Gehennom" under the eastern wall of Jerusalem and the Moslem geographical
2. Situation writers, Mukaddasi and Nasir-i-Khusru, call the Kidron valley Wady Jahamun. The Jewish writer Kimchi also identifies the Valley of Jehoshaphat (i.e. the Kidron) with Hinnom. These ideas are probably due to the
Identification of the eastern valley, on account of its propinquity to the Temple, as the scene of the last judgment—the "Valley of Jehoshaphat" of Joel 3:2—and the consequent transference there of the scene of the punishment of the wicked, Gehenna, after the ancient geographical position of the Valley of Hinnom, had long been lost. In selecting sacred sites, from the 4th Christian cent. onward, no critical topographical acumen has been displayed until quite modern times. There are three amply sufficient arguments against this view: (1) the Kidron valley is always called a nāḥal and not a 'guy' (see Kidron); (2) the 'Gate of the Cai-
Clearly did not lie to the E. of the city; (3) En-regol, which lay at the beginning of the Valley of Hinnom and to its E. (Josh 15:8; 18:16) cannot be the 'Virgin's fount,' the ancient Gihon (2 S 17:17). See Gihon.
Several distinguished modern writers have sought to identify the Tyropoön Valley (el Wād) with Hinnom, but as the Tyropoön was incorporated within the city walls before the days of Manasseh (see Jerusalem), it is practically impossible that it could have been the same as that of which the Hittites, the Chaldaeans, and the Jebusites were children—a ritual which must have occurred beyond the city's limits (2 K 23 10, etc).
The clearest geographical fact is found in Josh 15: 8; 18:16, where we find that the boundary of Judah and Benjamin passed from
3. Wādy er-En-regol 'by the valley of the son of Rabba' Binim'; if the modern Bir Buqab is En-regol, as is certainly most probable, then the Wādy er-Rabbbā', known traditionally as Hinnom, is correctly so called. It is possible that the name extended to the wide open land formed by the junction of the three valleys; indeed, some would place Tophet at this spot, but there is no need to extend the name beyond the actual gorge. The Wādy er-Rabbbā' commences in a shallow, open valley due W. of the Jaffa Gate, in the center of which lies the Birket Manolia; near the Jaffa Gate it turns S. for about 1/4 of a mile, its course being dammed here to form a large pool, the Birket es Sulān. Below this it gradually curves to the E. and rapidly descends between sides of bare rocky scars, much steeper in ancient times. A little before the valley joins the wide Kidron valley lies the traditional site of Akeldama (q.v.).
E. W. G. Masterman

HIPPÔPOTAMUS, hip'-ő-pót'-a-mus (Job 41:1).

HIRAIH, hî'ra'h (ἡραῖ, hērā́; LXX Eîpôs, Eîrō̇s); a native of Adullam, and a 'friend' of Judah (Gen 38:12). The LXX and the Vulg both describe him as Judah's 'shepherd.'

HIRAM, hî'ra'm (ἡραῖον, hērā́ion; LXX Xiphôs, Chērôm, but Xâûs, Cheîrôm, in 2 S 5:11; 1 Ch 14:1). There is some confusion regarding the form of this name. In the books of S and R the prevailing form is 'Hiram' (ἡραῖον, hērā́ion); but in 1 K 5:10.18 m (Heb 24:32); 7 40 m "Hirom" (ἡραῖον, hērā́ion) is found. In Ch the form of the word is uniformly "Hiram" (ἡραῖον, hērā́ion).

(1) A king of Tyre who lived on most friendly terms with both David and Solomon. After David had taken the stronghold of Zion, Hiram sent messengers and workmen and materials to build a palace for him at Jerusalem (2 S 5:11; 1 Ch 14:1). Solomon, on his accession to the throne, made a league with Hiram, in consequence of which Hiram furnished the new king of Israel with skilled work- men and with cedar trees and fir trees and algum trees from Lebanon for the building of the Temple. In return Solomon gave annually to Hiram large quantities of wheat and oil (1 K 5:4 [Heb 15:4]; 2 Ch 2:3 [Heb 2:17]). "At the end of twenty years, when Solomon had built the two houses, the house of Jeh and the king's house," Solomon made a present to Hiram of twenty cities in the land of Galilee. Hiram was not at all pleased with these cities and contemptuously called them "Cabul." His displeasure, however, with this gift does not seem to have disturbed the amicable relations that had hitherto existed between the two kings, for subsequently Hiram sent to Solomon 120 talents of gold (1 K 9:10-14). Hiram and Solomon maintained merchant vessels on the Medi-terranean and shared mutually in a profitable trade with foreign ports (1 K 10:22). Hiram's servants, chartered by Solomon, taught the sailors of Solomon the route from Ezion-geber and Etholo to Ophir, whence large stores of gold were brought to King Solomon (1 K 9:26; 2 Ch 8:17f).

Jos (Cæp, I, 17, 18) informs us, on the authority of the historians Dius and Menander, that Hiram was the son of Abiab, that he had a large sum of money, and had married a daughter of Solomon, which was at first between the two nations. Finally, Abde- mon, a man of Tyre, did solve the problems, and proposed others which Solomon was unable to explain; consequently Solomon was obliged to pay back to Hiram a vast sum of money. Jos further states (Ant, VIII, ii, 8) that the correspondence carried on between Solomon and Hiram in regard to the building of the Temple was preserved, not only in the records of the Jews, but also in the public records of Tyre. It is also related by Phoenician historians that Hiram gave his daughter to Solomon in marriage.

(2) The name of a skilful worker in brass and other substances, whom Solomon secured from
Hiram king of Tyre to do work on the Temple. His father was a brass-worker of Tyre, and his mother was a woman of the tribe of Naphtali (1 K 7 14), "a woman of the daughters of Dan" (2 Ch 2 14 [Heb 13]; 1 K 7 13 f; 2 Ch 2 13 [Heb 12.15]).

Jesse L. Cotton

HIRCUS, hér-ku'rus. See HYRCANUS.

HIRE, hír: Two entirely different words are trd "hiring" in the OT:
(1) The most frequent one is רכש, sâkhar, vb. רכש, sâkhar, and verbal adj. רכש, sâkhar. (a) As a vb. it means "to hire" for a wage, either money or something else; in this sense it is used with regard to ordinary laborers (1 S 2 5; 2 Ch 24 12), or mercenary soldiers (2 S 10 6; 2 K 7 6; 1 Ch 19 6; 2 Ch 26 6), or a goldsmith (Isa 46 6), or a band of loose followers (Jgs 9 4), or a false priest (Jer 18 4), or a hireling (Ecclus 11 6), or hostil counsellors (Ezr 4 5), or false prophets (Neh 6 12 f). As a verbal adj. it refers to things (Ex 22 15; Isa 7 20) or men (Lev 19 13; Jer 46 21).
(b) As a noun it denotes the wage in money, or something else, paid to workmen for their services (Gen 30 32 f; 31 8; Dt 24 15; 1 K 5 6; Zec 8 10), or the rent or hire paid for a thing (Ex 25), or a work-beast (Zec 8 10). In Gen 30 16 Leah hires from Rachel the privilege of having Jacob with her again, and her conception and the subsequent birth of a son, she calls her hire or wage from the Lord for the gift of her slave girl to Jacob as a concubine (Gen 30 18).

(2) The other word trd hire is רכש, 'ethdhn, once רכש, 'ethman. It is rather a gift (from root רכז, nathân, "to give") than a wage earned by labor, and is used uniformly in a bad sense. It is the gire made else; hirelings (Gen 30 18), or, reversing the usual custom, made by the harlot nation (Ezk 16 31.41). It was also used metaphorically of the gifts made by Israelites to idols, since this was regarded as spiritual harlotry (Isa 23 17f; Mic 1 7; 3 2, also Ps 147 9).

In the Eng. NT the word occurs once as a vb. and 3 times as a noun, the trd μηρος, μηθαος, and its verbal form. In Mt 20 18 and Jas 5 4 it refers to the hiring of ordinary field laborers for a daily wage. In Lk 10 7 it signifies the stipend which is due the laborer in the spiritual work of the kingdom of God. It is a wage, earned by toil, as of other laborers. The word is very significant here and absolutely negatives the idea, all too prevalent, that money received by the spiritual toiler is a gift. It is rather a wage, the reward of real toil.

William Joseph McGlothlin

HIRELING, hî'rlîng (רכש, sâkhrî): Occurs only 6 t in the OT, and uniformly means a laborer for a wage. In Job 7 1f there is reference to the hireling's anxiety for the close of the day. In Isa 16 14 and 21 16 the length of the years of a hireling is referred to, probably because of the accuracy with which they were determined by the employer and the employee. Malachi (3 5) speaks of the oppression of the hireling in his wages, probably by the smallness of the wage or by in some way defrauding him of part of it.

In the NT the word "hireling" (μησιτος, mîshîthos) occurs only in Jn 10 12 f, where his neglect of the sheep is contrasted unfavorably with the care and courage of the shepherd who owns the sheep, who leads them to pasture and lays down his life for their protection from danger and death.

William Joseph McGlothlin

HIS, his: Used often in AV with reference to a neuter or inanimate thing, or to a lower animal (Gen 1 11, "after his kind"); Lev 1 16, "pluck away his crop"; Acts 12 10, "of his own accord"; 1 Cor 15 38, "his own body"). etc. RV substitutes "it."
III. Language
1. Mongol Race
2. Hurrian and Egyptian Monuments
3. Hair and Beard
4. Hittite Dress
5. Hittite Names
6. Vocabulary of Pterium Epistles
7. Tell el-Amarna Tablet

IV. Religion
1. Polytheism: Names of Deities
2. Religious Symbols

V. Script
1. Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic
2. Description of Signs
3. Interpretation of Monuments

Literature

1. OT Notices.—The “sons of Heth” are noticed 12 t and the Hittites 48 t in the OT. In 21 cases the name occurs in the enumeration of races, in Syria and Canaan, which are

II. Races
1. Enumerated of races, in Syria and Canaan, which are non-Semitic. In Heb the term “Hittite” is Solomonic, the earliest known occurrence being in the “land of Akkad,” or “highlands” N. of Mesopotamia.

The chronology of the Hittites has been made clear by the notices of contemporary rulers in Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, and by the names of Hittite scribes, such as Kha, Hatti, and Hittites.

II. History.—The Hittites were known to the Assyrians as Hatti, and to the Egyptians as Hatti, and their history has been very fully recovered from the records of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties, from the Am Tab, from Assyrian annals and, quite recently, from copies of letters addressed to Babylonia.

Hittite names are noticed by Winckler in the ruins of Boghaz-keui ("the town of the pass"), the ancient Pterium in Pontus, E. of the river Halys. The earliest known notice of Hittites is Ezra 9:3; Neh 9:8.

The Hittites have been described as a race of great importance to Bible history, because, taken in conjunction with the Am Tab, with the Kasite monuments of Nippur, with the Babylonian and Assyrian chronicles, and with the Egyptian records of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties, which were previously uncertain by nearly a century, but which may now be regarded as settled with a few years. From the Am Tab it is known that Thothmes IV was contemporary with the father of Adad-nirari of Assyria (Berlin no. 30), and Amenophis IV with Bura-burias of Babylon (Brit. Mus. no. 2); while a letter from Hattu-sil, the Hittite contemporary of Rameses II, was addressed to his successor, as well as to his father. These notices serve to show that the approximate dates given by Brugsch for the Pharaohs are more correct than those proposed by Mahler; and the following table will be useful for the understanding of the dynasty—Thothmes III being known to have reigned 54 years, Amenophis III at least 63 years, and Rameses II, 66 years or more. The approximate dates appear to be thus fixed.

The Hittite race having been expelled from the Delta by Aahmes, the founder of the XVIIIth (Theban) Dynasty, after 1700 BC, the great trade route through Pal and Invasions: Syria was later conquered by Thothmes VIII (1) and the conqueror of the Egyptian Dynasty, who set up a monument on the W. bank of the Nile Delta; but see Gray in Expos.

In later times the “land of the Hittites” (Josh 14; Judges 1) was in Syria and near the Euphrates (see TARTIS, HOTT). Though Uriah (to 28) lived in Jerusalem, and Ahimelech (18) was there, the “kings of the Hittites” are mentioned with the “kings of Syria,” and were still powerful a century later (2 K 7:6). Solomon himself married Hittite wives (1 K 10:29), and a few Hittites seem still to have been left in the S. (2 Ch 8:7), even in his time, if not against the Assyrians (Ezr 9:11; Neh 9:8).
The XVIIIth Dynasty was succeeded, about 1400 BC, or a little later, by the XIXth, and Rameses I appears to have been the 5. Egyptian Pharaoh who made the treaty which invasions: Mursilis, brother of Arandas, controlled by the 19th. But the Dynasty accession of Seti I, son of Rameses I, the Syrian tribes prepared to "make a stand in the country of the Harri" against the Egyptian resolution to recover the suzerainty of their country. Seti I claims to have conquered "Kadesh (on the Orontes) in the Land of the Amorites," and it is known that Mutallis, the eldest son of Mursilis, fought against Egypt. According to his younger brother Hattusil, he was a tyrant, who was finally driven out by his subjects and died before the accession of Kadashman-Turgu (about 1355 BC) in Babylon. Hattusil, the contemporary of Rameses II, then seized the throne as "great king of the Hittites" and "king of Kus" ("Cush," Gen 2:13), a term which in the Akkadian language meant "the West." In his 2nd year Rameses II advanced, after the capture of Ashkelon, as far as Beirut, and in his 5th year he advanced on Kadesh where he was opposed by a league of the natives of "the land of the Kheta, the land of Naharain, and of all the Kati" (or inhabitants of Cilicia), among which concedes the "some 30 years" later, in the reign of Amenophis IV, Durratsa of Matiene was murdered, and his kingdom was attacked by the Assyrians; but Subbuliliuma, though not a friend of Durratsa with whom he disputed the suzerainty of North Syria, sent aid to Durratsa's son Mattipiza, whom he placed on his throne, giving him his own daughter as a wife. A little later (about 1440 BC) Aziru the Amorite, who had been subject to Amenophis III, submitted to this same great Hittite ruler, and was soon able to conquer the whole of Phoenicia down to Tyre. All the Egyptian conquests were thus lost in the last part of the reign of Amenophis III, and in that of Amenophis IV. Only Gaza seems to have been retained, and Burra-burias of Babylon, writing to Amenophis IV, speaks of the Canaanite rebellion as beginning in the time of his father Kuri-galzu I (Am Tab, Brit. Mus. no. 2), and of subsequent risings in his own time (Berlin no. 7) which interrupted communication with Egypt. Assur-yuballidh of Assyria (Brit. Mus. no. 9), acting on the same Pharaoh, states also that the relations with Assyria, which dated back even to the time of Assur-nadin-akhi (about 1550 BC), had ceased. About this earlier period Thothmes III records that he received presents from Assyria. The invasion of Egypt thus left the Hittites independent, in North Syria, about the time when —according to OT chronology—Pal was conquered by Joshua. They probably acknowledged Arandas, the successor of Subbuliliuma, as their suzerain.

Babylon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Ussi</td>
<td>c 1520 BC, Assur-nadin-akhi I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Adumata</td>
<td>c 1520 BC, Bel-tuglat-Assur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assyria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Adumata</td>
<td>c 1520 BC, Bel-tuglat-Assur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Adumata</td>
<td>c 1520 BC, Thothmes IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
<td>c 1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
<td>c 1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses I</td>
<td>c 1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses I</td>
<td>c 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses I</td>
<td>c 1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses I</td>
<td>c 1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses I</td>
<td>c 1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 BC</td>
<td>Rameses II</td>
<td>c 1357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After 1520 BC, the Hittites were ruled by the Vith Dynasty, which lasted until about 1000 BC. During this period, the Hittites were involved in conflicts with the Egyptians and other neighboring powers, such as the Phoenicians and the Assyrians. The Hittites were also influenced by the Neo-Hittite culture, which emerged in the late 12th and early 11th centuries BC, and continued to flourish until the end of the Hittite Empire.

The Hittites were known for their military prowess and their skill in diplomacy, and they were able to maintain their independence for several centuries despite the rise of the Assyrian Empire in the 9th century BC. However, they were eventually conquered by the Medes in the 7th century BC, and their kingdom was absorbed into the Persian Empire.
Hittite King and Daughter.

The Hittite power began now, however, to decline, in consequence of attacks from the W. by hostile Aryan invaders. In the 5th year of Seti Merenptah II, son of Rameses II, these fair “peoples of the North” raided the Syrian coasts, and advanced even to Belbeis and Helopolis in Egypt in alliance with the Libyans W. of the Delta. They were defeated, and Merenptah appears to have pursued them even to Pa-Kan’anu near Tyre. A text of his 5th year (found by Dr. Flinders Petrie in 1898) speaks of this campaign, and says that while “Israel is spoiled” the “Hittites are quieted”: for Merenptah appears to have been on good terms with them, and allowed corn to be sent in ships “to preserve the life of this people of the Hatti.” Dudhali was succeeded by his son “Arumanta the great king of whom a bilingual seal has been found by Dr. Winckler, in Hittite and cuneiform characters; but the con- federacy of Hittite tribes which had so long resisted Egypt seems to have been broken up by these disasters and by the increasing power of Assyria.

A second invasion by the Aryans occurred in the reign of Rameses III (about 1200 BC) when “agita- tion seized the peoples of the North,” and “no people stood before their arms, beginning with the people of the Hatti, of the Kati, of Carchemish and Aradus.” The invaders, including Danai (or early Greeks), came by land and sea to Egypt, but were again defeated, and Rameses III—the last of the great Pharaohs—pursued them far north, and is even supposed by Brugsch to have conquered Cyprus. Among the cities which he took he names Carchemish, and among his captives were “the miserable king of the Hatti, a living prisoner,” and the “miserable king of the Amorites.”

Half a century later (1150 BC) the Assyrians began to invade Syria, and Assur-ri-isu reached Beirût; for even as early as about 1270 BC Tukulti-Ninip of Assyria had conquered the Kassites, and had set a Sem prince on their throne in Babylonia. Early in his reign (about 1130 BC) Tiglath-pileser I claims to have subdued 42 kings, marching “to the fords of the Euphrates, the land of the Hatti, and the upper sea of the setting sun”—or

8. Assyrian Mediterranean. Soldiers of the Hatti Invasions had seized the cities of Sumastri (probably Samosata), but the Assyrians conquered and made his soldiers swim the Euphrates on skin bags, and so attacked “Carchemish of the land of the Hittites.” The Moschians in Cappadocia were apparently of Hittite race, and were ruled by 5 kings: for 50 years they had exacted tribute in Commagene (Northeastern Syria), and they were defeated, though placing 20,000 men in the field against Tiglath-pileser I. He advanced to Kumani (probably Comana in Cappadocia), and to Arini which was apparently the Hittite capital called Arinas (now Irans), W. of Caesaerea in the same region.

The power of the Hittites was thus broken by Assyria, yet they continued the struggle for more than 4 centuries afterward. After the

9. Invasion defeat of Tiglath-pileser I by Marduk-by Assur-nasir-ashkhi of Babylon (1128–1111 našir-pal BC), there is a gap in Assyrian records, and we next hear of the Hittites in the reign of Assur-našir-pal (883–858 BC); he entered Commagene, and took tribute from “the son of Bahian of the land of the Hatti,” and from “Sangara of Carchemish in the land of the Hatti,” so that it appears that the Hittites no longer acknowledged a single “great king.” They were, however, still rich, judging from the spoil taken at Carche- miah, which included 20 talents of silver, beads, chains, and sword scabbards of gold, 100 talents of copper, 250 talents of iron, and bronze objects from the palace representing sacred bulls, bowls, cups and censers, couches, seats, thrones, dishes, instruments of ivory and 200 slave girls, besides embroidered robes of linen and of black and purple stuffs, gems, elephants’ tusks, chariots and horses. The Assyrs advance continued to ‘Azzak in North Syria, and to the Arin river, in the country of the Hittaii who were no doubt Hittites, where similar spoils are noticed, with 1,000 oxen and 10,000 sheep: the posgatu, or “maces” which the Syrian kings used as scepters, and which are often represented on Hittite monuments, are especially mentioned in this record. Assur-našir-pal reached the Mediterranean at Arvad, and received tribute from “kings of the sea coast” including those of Gebal, Sidon and Tyre. He reaped the corn of the Hittites, and from Mt. Amamus in Syria he took logs of cedar, pine, box and cypress.

His son Shalmaneser II (858–823 BC) also in- vaded Syria in his 1st year, and again mentions Sangara of Carchemish, with Sapalumii of the Hittaii. In Commagene the chief of the Gamguns bore the old Hittite name Mutallis. In 856 BC Shalmaneser II attacked Mer’ash and Rimmon- nirari III to ‘Azzak. He tookepsilon in the Hat- tinaii 3 talents of gold, 100 of silver, 300 of copper, 1,000 bronze vases and 1,000 embroidered robes. He also entered as a wife a daughter of Mutallus and another Syrian princess.

Two years later 120,000 Assyrians raid the same region, but the southward advance was barred by the great Syrian league which came to the aid of Irjulens, king of Hamath, who was not subdued till 840 BC. In 836 BC the people of Tubal, and the Kas of Cappadocia and Cilicia, were again attacked. In 831 BC Qurbani, the actual king of the Hattinaii in Syria, was murdered by his subjects, and an Assyrs tartanu or general was sent to restore order. The rebels under Sapalumii had been conquered with Sangara of Carchemish. Adad-nirari III, grandson of Shalmaneser II, was
the next Assyrian conqueror: in 805 BC he attacked 'Azzâz and Arpad, but the resistance of the Syrians was feeble, and presents were sent from Tyre, Sidon, Damascus and Edom. This conqueror states that he subdued "the land of the Hittites, the land of the Amorites, to the limits of the land of Sidon," as well as Damascus, Edom and Philistia.

But the Hittites were not as yet thoroughly subdued, and often revolted. In 738 BC Tiglath-pileser II mentions among his tributaries a chief of the Gagmus bearing and invasions Pîsiris of Carchemish. In 702 BC Sennacherib passed peacefully through the "land of the Hatti" on his way to Sidon: for in 717 BC Sargon had destroyed Carchemish, and had taken many of the Hittites prisoners, sending them away far east and replacing them by Babylonians. Two years later he in the same way took the Hamathites as captives to Assyria. Some of the Hittites may have fled to the S., for in 709 BC Sargon states that the king of Ashdod was deposed by "people of the Hatti plotting rebellion who despised his rule," and who set up Azur instead.

The power of the Hittites was thus entirely broken before Sennacherib's time, but they were not entirely exterminated, for, in 673 BC, Esar-haddon speaks of "twenty-two kings of the Hatti and near the sea." Hittite power still existed in 712 BC (Tarhu-nazi of Meletene) and in 711 BC (Mutallis of Commagene), but after this they disappear. Yet, even in a recently found text of Nebuchadnezzar (after 600 BC), we read that "chiefs of the land of the Hatti, bordering on the Euphrates to the W., where by command of Nergal my lord I had destroyed their rule, were made to bring strong beams from the mountain of Lebanon to my city Babylon." A Hittite population seems to have survived even in Rom times in Cilia and Cappadocia, for (as Dr. Moritzl observed) a king and his son in this region both bore the name Tarkon-dimotos in the time of Augustus, according to Dio Cassius and Tacitus; and this name recalls that of Tarku-timme, the king of Erinhe in Cappadocia, occurring on a monument which shows a head as brought captive before an Assyrian king, while the same name also occurs on the bilingual silver boss which was the head of his scepter, inscribed in Hittite and cuneiform characters.

The power of the Mongol race decayed gradually as that of the Sem Assyrions increased; but even now in Syria the two races remain mingled, and Turkoman nomads still camp even as far S. as the site of Syria Kadesh on the Orontes, while a few tribes of the same stock (which entered Syria in the Middle Ages) still inhabit the plains of Sharon and Esdraelon, just as the southern Hittites dwelt among the Amorites at Jerus and Hebron in the days of Abraham, before they were driven north by Thothmes III.

III. Language.—The questions of race and language in early times, before the early stocks were mixed or decayed, cannot be dissociated, and we have abundant evidence of the racial type and characteristic dress of the Hittites. The late Dr. Birch of the British Museum pointed out the Mongol character of the Hittite type, and his opinion has been very generally adopted. In 1885 Dr. Sayce (The Hittites, 15, 101) calls them "Mongoloid," and says, "They had in fact, according to craniologists, the characteristics of a Mongoloid race." This was also the opinion of Sir W. Flower; and, if the Hittites were Mongols, it would appear probable that they spoke a Mongol dialect. It is also apparent that, in this case, they would be related to the old Mongol population of Chaldæa (the people of Akkad and Sumer or "of the highlands and river valley") from whom the Sem Babylonians derived their earliest civilization.

The Hittite type is represented, not only on their own monuments, but also on those of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egypt Dynasties, including a colored picture of the time of Ramesses III. The type represented has a short head and receding forehead, a prominent and sometimes rather curved nose, a strong jaw and a hairless face. The complexion is yellow, the eyes slightly slanting, the hair of the head black, and gathered into a long pigtail behind. The physiognomy is like that of the Sumerians represented on a bas-relief at Tel-loh (Zirgul) in Chaldæa, and very like that of some of the Kirghiz Mongols of the present time, and of some of the more purely Mongol Turks. The head of Gudea at Zirgul in like manner shows (about 2800 BC) the broad cheek bones and hairless face of the Turkish type; and the language of his texts, in both grammar and vocabulary, is closely similar to pure Turkish speech.

Priest-King and God of Cultivation.

Among Mongol peoples the beard grows only late in life, and among the Akkadians it is rarely represented—excepting in the case of gods and ancient kings. The great bas-relief found by Koldewey at Babylon, and representing a Hittite thunder-god with a long pigtail and (at the back) a Hittite inscription, is bearded, but the pigtailed heads on other Hittite monuments are usually hair-
less. At Isasili-Kaia—the rock shrine near Pterium—only the supreme god is bearded, and all the other male figures are beardless. At Ibrez, in Lycaonia, the gigantic god who holds corn and grapes in his hands is bearded, and the worshipper who approaches him also has a beard, and his hair is arranged in the distinctive fashion of the Sem Babylonians and Assyrians. This type may represent Sem mixture, for M. Chantre discovered at Kara-eyuk, in Cappadocia, tablets in Sem Bab representing traders’ letters perhaps as old as 2000 BC. The type of the Ibrez figures has been said to resemble that of the Armenian peasantry of today; but, although the Armenians are Aryans of the old Phrygian stock, and their language almost purely Aryan, they have mixed with the Turkish and Sem races, and have been said even to resemble the Jews. Little reliance can be placed, therefore, on comparison with modern mixed types. The Hittite pigtail is very distinctive of a Mongolce race. It was imposed on the Chinese by the Munchus in the 17th cent., but it is unknown among Aryan or Sem peoples, though it seems to be represented on some Akkadian seals, and on a bas-relief picturing the Mongolce Sueans in the 7th cent. BC.

The costume of the Hittites on monuments seems also to indicate Mongolce origin. Kings and priests wear long robes, but warriors (and the gods at Ibrez and Babylon) wear short jerkins, and the Turkish shoe or slipper with a curled-up toe, which, however, is also worn by the Heb tribute bearers from Jehu on the “black obelisk” (about 840 BC) of Shalmaneser II. Hittite gods and warriors are shown wearing a high, conical headdress, just like that which (with addition of the Moslem turban) characterized the Turks at least as late as the 15th cent. The short Jerkin also appears on Akkadian seals and bas-reliefs, and, generally speaking, the Hittites (who were enemies of the Lyceans, Danai and other Aryans to their west) may be held to be very clearly Mongolce in physical type and costume, while the art of their monuments is closely similar to that of the most archaic Akkadian and Bab sculptures of Mesopotamia. It is natural to suppose that they were a branch of the same remarkable race which civilized Chaldaea, but which seems to have had its earliest home in Akkad, or the “highlands” near Ararat and Media, long before the appearance of Aryan tribes either in this region or in Iran. The OT statement that the Hittites were akin to the descendants of Ham in Babylonia, and not to the “fair” or “Aryan” peoples, including Medes, Ionians and other Aryan peoples.

As early as 1866 Chabas remarked that the Hittite names (of which so many have been mentioned above) were clearly not Sem, but this has been generally allowed.

5. Hittite Names Those of the Amorites, on the other hand, are Sem, and the type represented, with brown skin, dark eyes and hair, the line features and beards, agrees (as is generally allowed) in indicating a Sem race. There are now some 60 of these Hittite names known, and they do not suggest any Aryan etymology. They are quite unlike those of the Aryan Medes (such as Baga-datta, etc.) mentioned by the Assyrians, or those of the Vannic kings whose language (as shown by recently published bilinguals in Vannie and Assyrian) seems very clearly to have been Italian. It is also very difficult to place the Sem and modern Turkish at once suggest a linguistic connection which fully agrees with what has been said above of the racial type. The common element Turku, or Turkhan, in Hittite names suggests the Mongol element torkhan, meaning a “tribal chief.” Sili again is an Akkadian word for a “ruler,” and nasi is an element in both Hittite and Kassite names.

It has also been remarked that the vocabulary of the Hittite letters discovered by Chantre at Pterium recalls that of the letter written by Dusratra of Matiome to Amenom of ophes III (Am Tab no. 27, Berlin), and that Dusratra adored the Hittite Epistles god Tesseras. A careful study of the language of this letter shows that, in syntax and vocabulary alike, it must be regarded as Mongolce and as a dialect of the Kassite group. The cases of the noun, for instance, are the same as in Akkadian and in modern Turkish. None of the words and terminations are common to the language of this letter and of those discovered by M. Chantre and attributed to the Hittites whose territory immediately adjoined that of the Medes. The majority of these words occur also in Akkadian.

But in addition to these indications we have a letter in the Am Tab (Berlin no. 10) written by a Hittite prince, in his own tongue and in the cuneiform script. It is from Amarna (and not to, as is often wrongly supposed by Knudtzon) a chief named Tarhun-dara, and is addressed to Amenophis III, whose name stands first. In all the other letters the name of the sender always follows that of the recipient. The general meaning of this letter is clear from the known meanings of the “ideograms” used for many words; and it is also clear that the language is “agglutinative” like the Kassite. The suffixes possessive pronouns follow the pl. termination of the noun as in Akkadian, and prepositions are not used as they are in Sem and Aryan speech; the precative form of the vb. has also been recognized to be the same as used in Akkadian. The pronouns mi, “my,” me, “me,” and ti, “thou,” “thy,” are to be found in many living Mongolce dialects (e.g. the Zygirt and Senjirli).
opens with the usual salutation: “Letter to Amenophis III the great king, king of the land of Egypt [Mizzari-na], from Tar-uhn-dara [Tarhoundara-da], king of the land of Arzapi or Arsaq, thus. To me prosperity. To my nobles, my hosts, my cavalry, to all that is mine in all my lands, may there be prosperity; moreover! may there be prosperity; to thy house, thy wives, thy sons, thy nobles, thy hosts, thy cavalry, to all that is thine in thy lands may there be prosperity.” The letter continues to speak of a daughter of the Pharaoh, and of a sum of gold which is being sent in charge of an envoy named Israppa. It concludes (as in many other instances) with a list of presents, these being sent by “the Hittite prince [Nu Hattu] from the land Igait” (perhaps the same as Ikata), and including, besides the gold, various robes and ten chairs of ebony inlaid with ivory.

As far as it can at present be understood, the language of this letter, which bears no indications of either Sem or Aryan speech, whether in vocabulary or syntax, strongly favors the conclusion that the native Hittite language was a dialect of that spoken by the Akkadians, the Kassites and the Miyanas of Matiee, in the same age.

IV. Religion.—The Hittites like their neighbors adored many gods. Besides Set (or Sutekh), the “great ruler of heaven,” and Istar (Ashthoreth), we also find mentioned (in Hattusil’s treaty) gods and goddesses of “the hills and rivers of the land of the Hatti;” “the great sea, the winds and the clouds.” Tessupas was known to the Babylonians as a name of Rimmon, the god of thunder and rain. On a bilingual seal (in Hittite and cuneiform characters), now in the Ashmolean Museum, we find noticed the goddess Ishara, whose name, among the Kassites, was equivalent to Istar. The Hittite gods are represented—like those of the Assyrians—standing erect on lions. One of them (at Samala in Syria) is lion-headed like Nergal. They also believed in demons, like the Akkadians and others.

Their pantheon was thus also Mongolic, and the suggestion (by Dr. Winckler) that they adored Indian gods (Indra, Varuna), and the

2. Religious Pers Mithra, not only seems improbable, but is also hardly supported by the quotations from Sem texts on which this idea is based. The sphinx is found as a Hittite emblem at Eyuk, N. of Pterium, with the double-headed eagle which again, at Taisili-kana, supports a pair of deities. It also occurs at Tel-loh as an Akkadian emblem, and was adopted by the Seljuk Turks about 1000 AD. At Eyuk we have a representation of a procession bringing goats and rams to an altar. At Hattan-bunar the winged sun is an emblem as in Babylonia. At Mer’an, in Syria, the mother goddess carries her child, while an eagle perches on a harp beside her. At Carchemish the naked Istar is represented with wings. The religious symbolism, like the names of deities, thus suggests a close connection with the emblems and beliefs of the Kassites and Akkadians.
was deciphered by George Smith from a Cypriote-Phoenician bilingual, and appears to give the sounds applying to some 60 signs. These signs are confirmed by the short mention of linguals as yet known, and they appear in Akkadian to similar emblems. We have thus, therefore, the basis of a comparative study, by aid of a known language and script—a method similar to that which enabled Sir H. Rawlinson to recover scientifically the lost cuneiform, or Chaldaic, to decipher Egyptian hieroglyphics. See also ARCHEOLOGY OF ASIA MINOR; RECENT EXPLORATION.

LITERATURE.—The Egyptian notices will be found in Brugsch's A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, 1870, and the Assy in Schrader's Canoe and Inscriptions of the ORIENT, 1883. For the Translations of the most important texts see the Memoirs of the Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, vol. 35, December, 1887. The good work of the present day is detailed in Rawlinson's Tell Amarna Tablets, 2d ed., 1894, and in The Hieroglyphs and Hieratic, 1898. Dr. Sayce has given an account of his researches in a small volume, The Hieroglyphs, 1888, but many discoveries by Sir C. Wilson, Mr. D. G. Hogarth, Sir W. Ramsay, and other explorers have since been published, and are scattered in various periodicals. One of the most important works is H. L. Sayce's turn of mind. Their knowledge of the wilderness and its possible dangers would enable them to be to the Israelites "instead of eyes."

The facts recorded of this man are too meager to enable us to answer all the questions that arise concerning him. A difficulty that remains unsolved is the fact that in Jgs 1 10 and 4 11 he is described as a Kenite, while in Ex 3 1 and 18 1, the father-in-law of Moses is spoken of as "the priest of Midian."—Jesse L. COTTON

HOBAB, hōbāb (חֹבָב, hōḇāḇ), hōḇāḇāh: A place "on the left hand," i.e. to the N. of Damascus, to which Abraham pursued the defeated army of Chedorlaomer (Gen 14 15). It is probably identical with the modern Ḥoba, about 30 miles N.W. of Damascus.

HOBHAYAH, hō-ḥi-ya' (חֹבְּיָה, ḥōḇhāyah), "whom Jehovah hides," i.e. "protects": The head of a priestly family that returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. Because they could not trace their genealogy, they were not permitted to serve in the priestly office (Neh 7 63 f.). In the K'r of this passage and in the list of Ezra 2 61, this name appears in the form "Habahiah" (חֹבֵיתָה, ḥōḇhāyah). "Obdā" is the form of the word in 1 Esd. 5 38.

HOCK (חֹצ, ʿāḇar, "to root out"): To hamstring, i.e. to render useless by cutting the tendons of the hock (in AV and RV "hough"). In their self-defense they hacked an ox, 6 AV "digged down a wall") (i.e. their destructiveness maiming those which they could not carry off. See also Josh 11 6 9; 2 8 4.

HOD, hod (חֹד, ḥōḏ, "majesty," "splendor"): LXX A, ὅδων, B, ὅδων, ὤδων. One of the sons of Zophiah, a descendant of Asier (1 Ch 7 37).

HODAVIAH, hō-da-ya'ā. See HODAVIAH.
HODAVIAH, hod-a-vi'a (םֹדְאֶוִ֫יַּא), hōdha'wāh, or hōdha'wāḥa, hōdha'wāhāh; LXX Α', Æphiea, Hō-
dou̇a
(1) One of the heads of the half-tribe of Manasseh on the E. of the Jordan (1 Ch 5 24).
(2) A Benjamite, the son of Hasseenuah (1 Ch 9 7).

(3) A Levite, who seems to have been the head of
an important family in that tribe (2 Chr 20)
In Neh 7 43 the name is Hodevah (םֹדְאֶוִ֫יַּא), hōd-
whā, hōdīwāḥ, hōdīwāḥāh, hōdīwāhāḥ, “splendor of Jeh”
A Levite and founder of a Levite family, seventy-four
of whom returned from exile with Zerubbabel, 538
BC (Neh 7 43). ARV reads another reading “Hodeiah.”
In Ezr 2 40 he is called Hodevah, of which Hodevah and
Hodeiah are slight textual corruptions, and in Ezr 3 9
Judah, a name practically synonymous.

HODEVAH, hō-di'va, hō-di'va (םֹדְאֶוִ֫יַּא), hōdīwāḥ, hōdīwāḥāh, “splendor of Jeh”:
(1) A brother-in-law of Naham (1 Ch 4 19)
and possibly for that reason reckoned a member of
the tribe of Judah. AV “his wife” is wrong.
(2) One of the Levites who explained to
the people the Law as read by Ezra (Neh 8 7)
and let their prayers (Neh 9 5). He is doubtless one
of the two Levites of this name who sealed the
covenant of Nehemiah (Neh 10 13).
(3) One of the chief men of the people
who sealed the covenant of Nehemiah (Neh 10 18).

J. GRAY McALLISTER
HOGLAH, hōg la (םֹגֳלָה), hoghlah, “partridge”:
The third of five daughters of Zelophehad of the
tribe of Manasseh (Nu 26 33). Z. leaving no male
heir, it was made a statute that the inheritance
in such cases should pass to the daughters, if such
there were, as joint heirs, on condition, however,
of marriage within the tribe (Nu 27 1 11; 36 1 12;
Josh 17 31).

HOHAM, ho'ham (והָהָם), hōhām, “whom Jeh
impels[?]” Ges; An Amorite king of Hebron and
one of the five kings of the Amorites who leagued
for war on Gibeon because of its treaty of peace
with Joshua. The five were defeated in the decisive
battle of Beth-horon, shut up in the cave at Mak-
edah in which they had taken refuge, and
the battle in which they were slain, hanged and cast into the
cave (Josh 10 1 27).

HOISE, hoiz: The older form of “hoist” (OE
hoist), to raise, to lift, and is the tr of epatriō, “to
lift up” they . . . hoisted up the mainsail to the wind” (Acts 27 40). RV “and hoisting up
the foresail to the wind”; Wiclif has “let up”;
Tindale “hoisted up.”

HOLD, höld: In ARV frequently “stronghold”
(1) The Holiness of God
In Rev 18 2 for AV “eagle” (πουλακέ̄) RV substitutes,
as in first clause, “hold,” and in m “prison”

HOLDING, höld'ing: Occurs with various shades of meaning: (1) as the tr of tāmākh, “to
acquire,” it has the sense of taking, obtaining (Isa
33 15), RV “that shaketh his hands from taking a
bribe,” ERV, as AV, “holding”); (2) of kal, “to
hold,” “contain,” having the sense of holding
or restraining (Jer 6 11, “I am weary with holding
in”); (3) of kratō, “to receive,” “observe,” “main-
tain” ( Mk 7 3, “holding the tradition of the
elders”); 1 Tim 1 19, ἐκόμ., “holding faith and a
good conscience”; 3 9 “holding the mystery of the
faith in a pure conscience”; (4) holding fast, cleav-
ing to, kratō (Col 2 19, “not holding the head,”
RV “holding fast”); of Acts 3 11; Rev 7 1, “holding
the four winds of the earth, that no wind
should blow”); avĕkham, “to hold over against
one's self,” “to hold fast” (Tit 1 9, RV “holding
the faithful word”); (5) holding forth, epōchō,
“to hold upon, to hold out toward” (Phil 2 16,
“holding forth the word of life, so RV); Lightfoot
has “holding out” (as offering); others, however,
render “holding fast,” preserving in the Christian
faith and life—connecting with being “blameless
and harmless” in ver 15.

W. L. WALKER

HOLINESS, hō-lin'es (םֹדְאֲוִ֫יַּא, kādōshāh, “holy”,
םֹגֳלָה, hōgla, “holiness”): I. In the OT Meaning of the Term
1. The Holiness of God
(1) Absolute holiness and Majesty
(2) Ethical Holiness
2. Holiness of Place, Time and Object
3. Holiness of Men
   (1) Ceremonial
   (2) Ethical and Spiritual
II. In the NT: The Christian Conception
1. Applied to God
2. To Christ
3. To Things
4. To Christians
   (1) As Separated from the World
   (2) As Bound to the Pursuit of an Ethical Ideal
I. In the OT Meaning of the Term. — There has
been much discussion as to the original meaning
of the Sem root קדשׁ, by which the notion
of holiness is expressed in the OT. Some would
connect it with an Assy word denoting purity, clea-
nness; most modern scholars incline to the view
that the primary idea is that of setting off or separa-
tion. Etymology gives but little aid to the
various senses in which the word “holiness” is
employed. In primitive Sem usage “holiness” seems
to have expressed nothing more than that ceremo-
nial separation of an object from common use which
the modern study of savage religions has rendered familiar
under the name of taboo (W. R. Smith, Religion
of the Semites, Lect iv). But within the Bib sphere,
with which alone we are immediately concerned,
holiness attaches itself first of all, not to visible
objects, but to the invisible Jehovah, and to places,
seasons, things and human beings only in so far as
they are associated with Him. And while the idea of
ceremonial holiness runs through the OT, the ethi-
 cal significance which Christian theology attributes to
the term is never wholly absent, and gradually rises in
the course of the revelation into more emphatic
prominence.

As applied to God the notion of holiness is used
in the OT in two distinct senses: (1) First in the
more general sense of separation from all that is
dyand earthly. It thus
notes the holiness of God
awfulness of the Creator in His
distinction from the creature. In
use of the word, “holiness” is little more than an
equivalent general term for “Godhead,” and the
adj. “holy” is almost synonymous with “Divine”
(cf Dnt 4 8 9 15; 6 11). Jehovah’s “holy arm” (Isa
41 10; Ps 18 1) is His Divine name. When
Hannah sings “There is none holy but Jehovah” (1 S 2 2),
Holiness
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the rest of the verse suggests that she is referring, not to His ethical holiness, but simply to His supernatural being.

(2) But, in the next place, holiness of character in the distinct ethical sense is ascribed to God. The injunction, "Be ye holy; for I am holy" (Lev 11 44; 19 2), plainly implies an ethical conception. Men cannot resemble God in His incomparable attributes. They can reflect His likeness only along the lines of those moral qualities of righteousness and love in which true holiness consists. In the Psalms and Prophets the Divine holiness becomes, above all, an ethical reality convinging men of God and demanding of those who would stand in His presence clean hands and a pure heart (Ps 24 3 f).

From the holiness of God is derived that ceremonial holiness of things which is characteristic of the OT religion. Whatever is consecrated to Him is holy (Lev 19; 25; 22; 26). In and of itself, but anything becomes holy by association with Him. Thus His tabernacle and temple in which His glory is revealed is a holy building (Ex 23 29; 2 Ch 36 5); and all its sacrifices (Ex 29 33), ceremonial materials (30 25; Nu 6 17) and utensils (Ex 8 4). The Sabbath, therefore, is holy because it is the Sabbath of the Lord (Ex 20 8-11). "Holiness, in short, expresses a relation, which consists negatively in separation from common use, and positively in dedication to the service of God" (Skinner, 19, p. 205).

The holiness of men is of two kinds: (1) A ceremonial holiness, corresponding to that of impersonal objects and depending upon their relation to God and (2) moral holiness, consisting in the inward and outward conformity of a person to the ideal of perfection set forth in the Law (Nu 6 20-26). Priests and Levites are holy because they have been "hallowed" or "sanctified" by acts of consecration (Ex 29 1; Lev 8 12; 12; 30). The Nazirite is holy because he has separated himself unto the Lord (Nu 6 5). Above all, Israel, notwithstanding all its sins and shortcomings, is holy, as a nation separated from other nations for Divine purposes and uses (Ex 19 6, etc.; cf. Lev 20 24). (2) But out of this merely ceremonial holiness there emerges a higher holiness that is spiritual in its essence. For unless man was made in the image of God and capable of reflecting the Divine likeness. And as God reveals Himself as ethically holy, He calls man to a holiness resembling His own (Lev 19 2). In the so-called "Law of Holiness," (Heb 7 27-28), God's demand for moral holiness is made clear; and yet the moral contents of the Law are still intermingled with ceremonial elements (17 10 ff; 19 19; 21 1 ff). In psalm and prophesy, however, a purely ethical conception comes to view—the conception of a human holiness which rests upon righteousness and truth (Ps 15 1-4) of the possession of a contrite and humble spirit (Isa 57 15). This corresponds to the knowledge of a God who, being Himself ethically holy, esteemeth justice, mercy and lowly and pitifully more highly than sacrifice (Hos 6 6; Mic 6 6-8).

II. In the NT: The Christian Conception.——

The idea of holiness is expressed here chiefly by the word ἁγιός and its derivatives, which correspond very closely to the words of the K downward group in the LXX. They signify the being of Him who is nearest to God, not only in an intellectual sense, but in every sense. The distinctive feature of the NT idea of holiness is that the external aspect of it has almost entirely disappeared, and the ethical meaning has become supreme. The ceremonial idea still exists in some respects (cf. Gal 4 8-9, 15; 1 Pt 1 14; Rev 18 20), but it is subordinate to the idea of holy character and life as manifested in the life of Christ and His people, which is the universal idea of holiness in the NT. In the NT the term "holy" is seldom applied to God, and except in quotations from the OT (Heb 10 6; 2 Pet 1 3) only in the

1. Applied in Johannine writings (Jn 17 11; Rev 4 8; 6 10). But it is constantly used of the Spirit of God (Mt 1 18; Acts 2.2; Rom 5 5, etc.) who, in contrast with OT usage, becomes specifically the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost.

In several passages the term is

2. Applied to Christ (Mt 1 24; Acts 3 to Christ; 14; 4 30, etc.), as being the very type of ethical perfection (cf. Heb 7 26).

In keeping with the fact that things are holy in a derivative sense through their relationship to God, the word is used of Jesus (Mt 4 5), of the OT covenants (Lk 1 76), the OT things, Scriptures (Rom 1 2), the Law (Ex. 12), the Mount of Transfiguration (2 Pet 1 18, etc.), but it is esp. in its application to Christians that the idea of holiness meets us in the NT in a sense that is characteristic and distinctive.

3. Applied to Christians "saints" or holy persons, holiness in the high ethical and spiritual meaning of the word is used to denote the appropriate quality of their life and conduct. (1) Notwithstanding the idea of believers, "saints" conveys in the first place the notion of a separation from the world and a consecration to God. Just as Israel under the old covenant was a chosen race, so the Christian church in succeeding to Israel's privileges becomes a holy nation (1 Pet 2 9), and the Christian individual, as one of the elect people, becomes a holy man or woman (Col 3 12). In Paul's usage all baptized persons are "saints," however far they may still be from the saintly character (cf 1 Cor 1 2 14 with 6 1 ff). (2) But though the use of the name does not imply high ethical character as a realized fact, it always assumes it as an ideal and an obligation. It is taken for granted that the Holy Spirit has taken up His abode in the heart of every regenerate person, and that a work of positive sanctification is going on there. The NT leaves no room for the thought of a holiness divorced from those moral qualities which the holy God demands in those whom He has called to be His people. See SANCTIFICATION.


J. C. LAMBERT

HOLLOW, hol'ō (ὁλός, kapb, kapib, nāḇāḇahh): "Hollow" is the tr of kapb, "hollow" (Gen 32 32, "the hollow of his thigh, the hip-pan or socket, over the sciatic nerve") or ṣēḇā'āṯ, "to be hollow" (Ex 27 8; 38 7; Jer 52 21); of šōā'āl, "hollow" (Isa 40 12, "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand?" [in handfuls]; cf 1 K 20 10; Ezk 13 19); of mākhtōṣāh, "a mortar," "socket of a loom"; (from a root meaning "to hollow"; 15 19, "God clave [RV the hollow place that is in Lehi]"); of ṣāḇḳā'āḇārōth, prob. from kā'ār, "to sink" (Lev 14 37, "the walls of the house with hollow strakes") or ERV, ARV "hollow streaks," or "hollows"); of ʿāḇōl; and 17 19, the "hollow mountains," RV "hollows of the mountains," or "hollows of kōlōmā (2 Macc 1 19, "hollow place of a pit"), RV
"hollow of a well"); of antrôdès (2 5, "a hollow cave," RV "a chamber in the rock"): in "Gr a cavernous chamber").

W. L. WALKER

HOLM-TREE, hôm'trē: 
(1) ἑλμός, terebinth (Isa 44 14, AV "cypress"): The name, from the root meaning (of Arab, tarasè) "to be hard," implies some very hard wood. Vulg has ilex, which is lat for holm oak, so named from its holly-like leaves (holên in OE = "holy"); this tr has now been adopted, but it is doubtful. 
(2) πῦρος, prinos, Sus ver 58. This is the ilex or holm oak. There is a play on the words prinos and prîsai (lit. "saw") in vs 58 and 59 (see Subanna). The evergreen or holm oak is represented by two species in Pal, Queerus ilex and Q. coccifera. The leaf of both species is somewhat like a small holly leaf, is glossy green and usually spiny. The Q. ilex is insignificant, but Q. coccifera is a magnificent tree growing to a height of 40 ft. or more, and often found in Pal flourishing near sacred spots and not infrequently the object of superstitious veneration.

E. W. G. MASTER 

HOLOFERNES, holô-ô-for'nez (Olophénos, Olóphorônas): According to the Book of Jth, chief captain of Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Assyrians (Jth 2 4), who was commissioned to make war upon the West country (whereas the inhabitants the usual tokens of complete subjugation were. The leader of the expedition of H., who thus became the principal persecutor of the Jews, was to compel men everywhere to worship Nebuchadnezzar. He was slain by Judith, the heroine of the book of that name, during the siege of Bethulia. There is no notice of H. except in the Book of Jth. The termination of the word would seem to indicate a Pers origin for the name. The H. of Shakpare and Rabelais is in no way connected with the heroes of the H. of the Apoc.

J. HUTCHISON

HOLON, hôlôn (יִולֶון or יִולֶה, hôleh): 
(1) One of the towns in the hill country of Judah (Josh 15 31), assigned to the Levites of Benjamin (15). In 1 Ch. 6 58 (Heb 58), it is HILEN (which see). The site may be the important ruins of Beit 'Alam (see PEF, I, 313, 321, Sh XXI).
(2) Probably once an important town in the "plain", i.e. plateau, of Moab (Jer 48 21); the site is unknown.

HOLYDAY, hôlî-di: This word occurs twice in AV, viz. Ps 42 4, "is multitude that kept [RV "keeping"] holiday day," and Col 2 16. In the latter case it is a rendering of the Gr word ἑορτὴ, heortê, the ordinary term for a religious festival. RV tr "feast day." In the former instance "keeping holyday day" renders ἱεροσυλλογή, hêrosulôghê. The vb. means to "make a pilgrimage," or "keep a religious festival.
Occasionally the idea of merrymaking prevails, as in 30 10 "eating and drinking," and enjoying themselves merrily. The Psalmist (who was perhaps an exiled priest) remembers with poignant regret how he used to lead religious processions on festival occasions.

T. LEWIS

HOLY GHOST, hôlî gôst: See HOLY SPIRIT.

HOLY GHOST (SPIRIT), SIN AGAINST THE. See BLASPHEMY; Holy Spirit, III, 1, (4).

HOLY OF HOLIES, hôlîz (חֵן חֵן שִׁפַּחַת, hôdheš ha-hôdhashîm, Ex 26 33, 33, ha-Ôhekha, 1 K 16 7, etc; ë φραντι σκηνη, ê prôti skînê, ë prôti skînê, He 9 6 f): The tabernacle consisted of two divisions to which a graduated scale of holiness is attached: "the veil shall separate unto you between the holy place and the most holy" (Ex 26 33). This distinction was never abrogated. In the Ep. to the He these divisions are called the "first" and "second" tabernacles (He 9 6 f). The term "holy place" is not indeed confined to the outer chamber of the sanctuary; in Lev 6 16, it is applied to "the court of the tent of meeting.

But the other is its technical use. In Solomon's temple we have a different usage. The word hêkhal,
"temple," is not at first applied, as after, to the whole building, but is the designation specifically of the holy place, in distinction from the abhār, or "oracle" (cf 1 K 6 3.5.16.17.33, etc; so in Exk 41 1.24, etc). The wider usage is later (cf 2 K 11 10.11.13, etc).

The size of the holy place differed at different times. The holy place of the tabernacle was 20 cubits long by 10 broad and 10 high (30x15x15 ft); that of Solomon's the Holy of Holies was increased to ten, 1 K 7 49), and a table breadth—40 by 20 cubits; but it is noted that in height it was the full internal height of the building, while the Herodian temple has the same dimensions of length and breadth, but Jos and Midrōth give largely increased, though differing, numbers for the height (see Temple, Herod's).

The contents of the holy place were from the beginning ordered to be these (Ex 25 23 ff; 30 1–10): the altar of incense, a golden candlestick (in Solomon's temple increased to ten, 1 K 7 49), and a table of shewbread (increased to ten, 2 Ch 4 8). For the construction, position, history and uses of these objects, see Tabernacle; Temple, and arts. under the several headings. This, as shown by Jos and by the sculptures of the Arch of Titus, seem to be the furniture of the holy place till the end.

As the outer division of the sanctuary, into which, as yet, not the people, but only their representatives in the priesthood, were admitted while yet the symbols of the people's consecrated life (light, thanksgiving) were found in it, the holy place may be said to represent the people's relation to God in the earthly life, as the holy of holies represented God's relation to the people in a perfected communion. In the Ep. to the He, the holy place is not largely dwelt on as compared with the court in which the perfect sacrifice was offered, and the holiest of all into which Christ has now entered (Christ passes "through" the tabernacle into the holiest, 9 11). It pertains, however, evidently to the earthly sphere of Christ's manifestation, even as earth is the present scene of the church's fellowship. Through earth, by the way which Christ has opened up, the Holy Spirit "in spirit, finally in fact, comes with Him into the holiest" (He 10 19; cf 8; see Westcott, Hebrews, 233 f).

W. Shaw Caldecott

HOLY SPIRIT, hō'li spīr'īt:

I. OT TEACHINGS AS TO THE SPIRIT

1. Meaning of the Word

2. The Spirit in Relation to the Godhead

3. In External Nature

4. In Man

5. Importing Powers for Service

(1) Wisdom for Knowledge

(2) Wisdom for Various Purposes

(3) In Prophecy

(4) In Moral Character

5. Predictions of Future Outpouring of the Spirit

II. THE NON-CANONICAL LITERATURE

1. The Spirit in Josephus

2. In the Pseudepigrapha

3. In the Wisdom of Solomon

4. In Philo

III. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NT

1. In Relation to the Person and Work of Christ

(1) Birth of Jesus

(2) Baptism

(3) Temptation

4. Public Ministry

5. Death and Resurrection and Pentecostal Gift

2. The Holy Spirit in the Kingdom of God

(1) Synagogue Teaching

(2) In the Writings of John

(3) In Acts

(4) In Paul's Writings

(a) The Spirit and Jesus

(b) In Bestowing Charismatic Gifts

(c) In the Beginning of Usage of the Christian Life

(d) In the Religious and Moral Life

(e) In the Church

(f) In the Resurrection of Believers

(g) The Holy Spirit in Other NT Writings

LITERATURE

The expression Spirit, or Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit, is found in the great majority of the books of the Bible. In the OT the Heb word uniformly employed for the Spirit as referring to God's Spirit is הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, meaning "breath," "wind" or "breeze..."

The vb. form of the word is הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, "to blow." A kindred vb. is הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, meaning "to breathe," "having breathing room," "to be spacious," etc. The word always used in the NT for the Spirit is the Gr neuter noun πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα, with or without the article, and for Holy Spirit, πνεῦμα ἑαυτοῦ, πνεῦμα ἑαυτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ. In the NT we find also the expressions, "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of the Lord," "the Spirit of the Father," "the Spirit of Jesus," "of Christ." The word πνεῦμα in the Gr is from the Heb הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, הָנְפָר, "to breathe," "to blow." The corresponding word in the Lat is spiritus, meaning "spirit."

I. THE TEACHINGS AS TO THE SPIRIT IN THE OT

1. Meaning of the Word which is "wind," as refers to the ring to Nature, arises the idea of breath in man and thence the breath, wind or breath, of God. We have attempted to trace the meaning the minds of the Bib. writers connected the earlier literal meaning of the word with the Divine Spirit. Nearly all shades of meaning from the lowest to the highest appear in the OT, and it is not difficult to conceive how the original meaning was gradually expanded into the larger and wider. The following are some of the shades of OT usage. From the notion of wind or breath, שׁוּאָה came to signify: (1) the principle of life itself; spirit in this sense indicated the degree of vitality; "My spirit is consumed, my days are extinct" (Job 17 1); also Jgs 15 19; 1 S 30 12); (2) human feelings of various kinds, as anger (Jgs 8 3; Prov 29 11), desire (I sa 26 9), courage (Josh 2 11); (3) intelligence (Ex 35 9; I sa 29 24); (4) the general disposition (Ps 34 18; 51 17; Prov 14 29; 16 18; 29 23).

No doubt the Bib. writers thought of man as made in the image of God (Gen 1 27 f), and it was easy for them to think of God as being like man. It is remarkable that their anthropomorphism did not go farther. They preserve, however, a highly spiritual conception of God as compared with that of surrounding nations. But as the human breath was an invisible part of man, and as it represented his vitality, his life and energy, it was easy to transfer the conception to God in the effort to represent His energetic and transitive action upon man and Nature. The Spirit of God, therefore, as based upon the idea of the שׁוּעַ or breath of man, originally stood for the energy or power of God (I sa 31 3; of A. B. Davidson, Theology of the OT, 117–18), as contrasted with the weakness of the flesh.

We consider next the Spirit of God in relation to God Himself in the OT. Here there are several points to be noted. The first is that there is no indication of belief that the Spirit of God was a material particle or emanation from God. The point of view of Bib. writers is nearly always practical rather than speculative; they did not philosophize about the Divine nature. Nevertheless, they retained a
very clear distinction between spirit and flesh or other material forms. Again we observe in the OT both an identification of God and the Spirit of God, and also a clear distinction between them. The identification is seen in Ps 139:7 where the consciousness of the soul is directly ascribed to God; Jer 31:33; Ezek 36:27. In a great number of passages, however, God and the Spirit of God are not thought of as identical, as in Gen 1:2; 6:3; Neh 9:20; Ps 51:11; 104:29f. Of course this does not mean that God and the Spirit are two distinct beings in the thought of OT writers, but only that the Spirit had functions of His own in distinction from God. The Spirit was God in action, particularly when the action was specific, with a view to accomplishing some particular end or purpose of God. The Spirit came upon individuals for special purposes. The Spirit was thus God immanent in man and in the world. As the angel of the Lord, or angel of the Covenant in certain passages, represents both Jeh Himself and one sent by Jeh, so in like manner the Spirit of Jeh was both Jeh within or upon man, and at the same time one sent by Jeh to man. Do the OT teachings indicate that in the view of a writer like Gen 1:26 the Spirit of Jeh was a distinct person in the Divine nature? The passages in Gen 1:26 is scarcely conclusive. The idea and importance of personality were but slowly developed in Israelitish thought. Not until some of the later prophets did it receive great emphasis, and even then scarcely in the fully developed form. The statement of Gen 1:26 may be taken as the pl. of majesty or as referring to the Divine council, and on this account is not conclusive for the Trinitarian view. Indeed, there are OT passages which compel us to understand the complete NT doctrine of the Trinity and the distinct personality of the Spirit in the NT sense. There are, however, numerous OT passages which are in harmony with the Trinitarian conception and prepare the way for it, such as Ps 139:7; Isa 63:10; 48:16; Hag 2:5; Zec 4:6. The Spirit is grieved, vexed, and, in other ways as well, is conceived of personally, but as He is God in action, God exerting power, this was the natural way for the OT writers to think of the Spirit. A suggestion has been raised as to how the Bib. writers were able to hold the conception of the Spirit of God without violence to their monotheism. A suggested reply is that the idea of the Spirit came gradually and indirectly from the conception of angels which was prevalent among some of the surrounding nations (I. F. Wood, The Spirit of God in Bib. Literature, 30). But the best Israelitish thought developed in opposition to, rather than in analogy with, polytheism. A more natural explanation seems to be that their simple anthropomorphism led them to conceive the Spirit of God as the breath of God parallel with the conception of man’s breath as being part of man and yet going forth from him.

We consider next the Spirit of God in external Nature. “And the Spirit of God moved [was brooding or hovering] upon the face of the waters” (Gen 1:2). The figure is that of a brooding or hovering bird over its nest or brood, which护神了 the pre-existence of the world as an organized universe. Again in Ps 104:28-30, God sends forth His Spirit, and visible things are created into being by the Spirit, as they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground.” In Job 36:13 the beauty of the heavens is ascribed to the Spirit: “By His Spirit the heavens are garnished.” In Isa 32:15 the wilderness becomes a fruitful field as the result of the outpouring of the Spirit. The Bib. writers scarcely took into their thinking the idea of second causes, certainly not in the modern scientific sense. They regarded the phenomena of Nature as the result of God’s direct action through His Spirit. At every point the Bib. writers regard the Spirit as having them from pantheism on the one hand and polytheism on the other.

The Spirit may next be considered in imparting natural powers both physical and intellectual. In Gen 2 7 God originates man’s person al and intellectual life by breathing the Spirit of God into his nostrils “the breath of life.” God in Man

In Nu 15:22 God is “the God of the spirits of all flesh.” In Ex 31:3; 35:31, wisdom for all kinds of workmanship is declared to be the gift of God. So also physical life is due to the presence of the Spirit of God (Job 27:3); and Elihu declares (Job 33:4) that the Spirit of God made him. See also Ezek 37:14 and 39:29. Thus man is regarded by the OT writers, in all the parts of his being, body, mind and spirit, as the direct result of the action of the Spirit of God. In Gen 6:3 the Spirit of God “strewe’d” with or “rules” in or is “humbled” in man in the antediluvian world, is then present in the Spirit’s activity over and above, but within the moral nature of man.

The greater part of the OT passages which refer to the Spirit of God deal with the subject from the point of view of the covenant relations between Jeh and Israel. And the great part of these, in turn, have the greater part of them, these are so numerous that our limits of space forbids an exhaustive presentation. The chief points we may notice.

1. Powers conferred upon judges and warriors.

The children of Israel cried unto Jeh and He raised up a savior for them, Othniel, the son of Kenaz: “And the Spirit of Jeh came upon him, and he judged Israel” (Jgs 3:10). So also Gideon (Jgs 6:34): “The Spirit of Jeh came upon [lit. clothed itself with] Gideon.” In Jgs 11:29 “the spirit of Jeh came upon Jephthah”; and in 13:25 “the Spirit of Jeh began to move” Samson. In 14:6 “the spirit of Jeh came mightily upon him.” In 15:14 we read “the Spirit of Jeh departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from Jeh troubled him.” In all this class of passages, the Spirit imparts special endowments of power without necessary reference to the moral character of the recipient. The end in view is not personal, merely to the agent, but concerns the theocratic kingdom and implies the covenant between God and Israel. In some cases the Spirit exerts physical energy in a more direct way (2 K 2:16; Ezek 2:11; 3:12).

2) Wisdom and skill bestowed for various purposes.

—Intellect is filled with the Spirit of God in wisdom and in understanding to work in gold, and silver and brass, etc, in the building of the tabernacle (Ex 31:2-4; 35:31); and the Spirit of wisdom is given to others in making Aaron’s garments (Ex 32:30). So also bestowed on the builder of the temple (1 K 7:4; 2 Ch 2:14). In these cases there seems to be a combination of the thought of natural talents and skill to which is superadded a special endowment of the Spirit. Pharaoh refers to Joseph as one in whom the Spirit of God is, as fitting
him for administration and government (Gen 41:38). Joshua is qualified for leadership by the Spirit (Nu 27:18). In this and in Dt 34:9, Joshua is represented as possessing the Spirit through the laying on of the hands of Moses. This is an interesting contrast to later developments where the laying on of hands in the NT (Acts 8:17; 19:6) is described as a means of imparting the Spirit, with the result that the Spirit is not laid up in the individual but is realized in the church as a whole.

The Spirit was given to the NT church by the laying on of hands in the NT (Acts 8:17; 19:6). This is the case of Balaam, who was given the Spirit by the laying on of hands in the OT (Num 24:21). The laying on of hands was a sign of the Spirit's presence and was a means of imparting the Spirit to the individual. It was also a sign of the Spirit's presence in the church, and it was a sign of the Spirit's power to give gifts and blessings.

The Spirit was given to people in the Old Testament. For example, the Spirit was given to Samuel, who was called to be a prophet (1Sam 10:6). The Spirit was also given to David, who was called to be the king of Israel (2Sam 7:14). The Spirit was given to the prophets, who were called to prophesy (Jer 1:7). The Spirit was also given to the apostles, who were called to be the leaders of the church (Acts 1:8).

The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel in the Old Testament. For example, the Spirit was given to the people of Israel as a sign of their covenant with God (Exod 19:3). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of sending them into the promised land (Num 11:17). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of enabling them to do great things (Jer 20:11). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of empowering them to overcome their enemies (2Kings 15:22).

The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel in the New Testament. For example, the Spirit was given to the people of Israel as a sign of their new covenant with God (Acts 2:38). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of enabling them to do great things (Eph 3:20). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of empowering them to overcome their enemies (1Cor 12:8). The Spirit was also given to the people of Israel as a means of enabling them to live a holy life (1Pet 1:22).
much difference of opinion. As in the case of the ideal Davídic King which, in the prophet's mind, passes from the lower to the higher and Messianic conception, so, under the form of the Suffering Servant, the "remnant" of Israel becomes the basis for an ideal which transcends in the Messianic sense the original nucleus of the conception derived from the historic events in the history of Israel. The prophet rises in the employment of both conceptions to the thought of the Messiah who is the "anointed" of Jah as endued esp. with the power and wisdom of the Spirit. In Isa 11:1-5 a glowing picture is given of the "shoot out of the stock of Jesse." The Spirit imparts "wisdom and understanding" and endows him with manifold gifts through the exercise of which he shall bring in the kingdom of righteousness and peace. In Isa 42:1 ff, the "servant" is in like manner endowed most richly with the gifts of the Spirit by virtue of which he shall bring forth "justice to the Gentiles." In Isa 61:1 ff occur the notable words cited by Jesus in Lk 4:18, beginning, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," etc. In these passages the prophet describes elaborately and minutely the Messiah's endowment with a wide range of powers, all of which are traced to the action of God's Spirit.

In the latter history of Israel, when the sufferings of the exile ended heathen, there arose a tendency to idealize a past age as the era of the special blessing of the Spirit, coupled with a very marked optimism as to a future outpouring of the Spirit. In Hag 2:6 reference is made to the Mo-saic period as the age of the Spirit, "when ye came out of Egypt, and my Spirit abode among you." In Is. 44:3 the Spirit is to be poured out on Jacob and his seed; and in Is. 65:19 the age to come is to come to Zion under the domin-ant of Jah, and the Spirit is to abide upon the people. The passage, however, which esp. indicates the transition from OT to NT times is that in Joel 2:28-32 which is cited by Peter in Acts 2:17-21. In this prophecy the bestowal of the Spirit is extended to all classes, is attended by marvelous signs and is accompanied by the gift of salvation. Looking back from the later to the earlier period of OT history, we observe a twofold tendency of teach-ings in the relation. The first is from the outward gift of the Spirit for various uses toward a deepening sense of inner need of the Spirit for moral purity, and consequent emphasis upon the ethical energy of the Spirit. The second tendency is toward a sense of the merely human or theocratic national organization in and of itself to achieve the ends of Jah, along with a sense of the need for the Spirit of God upon the people generally, and a prediction of the universal diffusion of the Spirit.

II. The Spirit in Non-Canonical Jewish Literature.—In the Palestinian and Alexandria literature of the Jews there are comparatively few references to the Spirit of God. The two books in which the teachings as to the Spirit are most explicit and most fully developed are of Alexandrian origin, viz., The Wisdom of Solomon and the writings of Philo.

In the OT Apocrypha and in Jos the references to the Spirit are nearly always merely echoes of a long-past age when the Spirit was active among men. In no par-ticular is the contrast between the canonical and non-canonical literature more striking than in the teaching as to the Spirit of God. Jos has a number of references to the Holy Spirit; but nearly always he is to do with the long-past history of Israel. He refers to 22 books of the OT which are of the utmost reliability. There are "more than 600" of like authen-ticy," because there has been an exact succession of prophets" (Cap. 1, 9). Samuel is described as having a large place in the affairs of the kingdom because he is a prophet (Ant. VI, v. 6). God appears to Solomon in sleep and teaches him wisdom (ib. VIII, 11): Balaam prophesies through the Spirit's power (ib. IV, v. 6); and Moses was granted a prophet that his words might be preserved (ib. IV, viii. 49). In Jos we have then simply a testimony to the inspiration and power of the prophet by the books written by them, in so far as we have in him teach-ings regarding the Spirit of God. Even here the action of the Spirit is usually implied rather than expressed.

In the apocryphal writings the Spirit of God is usually refereed to as acting in the OT history of Israel or in the future Messianic age. In the apocalyptic books, the past age of power, when the Spirit was welded, becomes the ground of the hope of the future kingdom of God, and the seven sealing the books becomes the hope of a future kingdom of glory and power. Enoch says to Methuse-lah: "The word come, and the Spirit is poured out upon me" (En 91). In 49:1-4 the Messiah has the Spirit of wisdom, understanding and might. Enoch is represented as describing, his own translation. "He was carried aloft in the chariots of the Spirit" (En 70 for the word chariot of the Spirit is poured out upon me") (En 91). The Spirit is poured out upon me). Sometimes the action of the Spirit is closely connected with the moral life, although this is rare. "The Spirit of God rests" on the man of turno and loving heart (XII, P. 8). In Simeon 4 it is declared that Joseph was a good man and that the Spirit of God rested on him. There appears at times a lament for the Spirit and proph-ecv (1 Macc 9:27; 14:41). The future is depicted in glowing colors. The Spirit is the "Spirit of might, and Spirit of wisdom and Spirit of understanding" (XII P. 18); and the spirit of holiness shall rest upon the redeemed in Paradise (Levi 15); and in Levi 2 the Spirit of insight is given to men with the Christian in the spiritual world and its salvation follows. Generally speaking, this literature is far below the moral and religious insight. Much of it seems childish, although at times we encounter noble passages. There is lacking in it the implied OT mode which is best described as prophetic, in which the writer feels constrained by a duty to the spirit and to write. The OT literature thus possesses a vitality and power which accounts for the strength of its appeal to our religious consciousness.

We note in the next place a few teachings as to the Spirit of God in Wisd. Here the ethical element in character is a condition of the Spirit's indwelling. "Into a malicious spirit the soul wisdom shall not enter: nor dwell in any unrighteousness" (Wisd 9:17). For the spirit of the Lord filleth the world," and in vs. 9.9 there is a return to the conception of un-righteousness as a hindrance to right speaking. In Wisd 7 the Spirit of Wisdom comes in response to prayer. In 7:22-30 is a very beautiful description of wisdom: "In her is understanding, and holy, one only, manifold, subtil, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good, kind to man, steadfast, sure," etc. "She is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspected mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness," etc. No one can know God's counsel except by the Holy Spirit (19:17). The writer of Wisd speaks of the sense of the omnipresence of the Spirit of God, as seen in 1:7 and in 12:1. In the latter passage we read: "For thine incorruptible spirit is in all things." In Philo we have what is almost wholly wanting in other Jewish literature, viz., analytic and reflective thinking as a result of the dualism of the reason of God. The interest in Philo is primarily in the Spirit in its philosophical, and his teachings on the Spirit possess special interest on this account in contrast with Bib. and other extra-Bib. literature. In his Questions and Solutions, 27, 28, he explains the phenomenon in Gen 8:1: "He brought a breath over the earth and the wind ceased." He argues that water is not diminished by wind, but only agitated and dis-
tured. Hence there must be a reference to God's Spirit or breath by which the whole universe obtains security. He has a similar discussion of the point why the word "Spirit" is not used instead of "breath" in Gen in the account of man's creation, and concludes that "to breathe into" here means to "inspire," and that God by His Spirit imparted to man mental and moral life and capacity for Divine things (Allegories, xiii). In several passages Philo discusses prophecy and the prophetic office. One of the most interesting relates to the prophetic office of Moses (Life of Moses, iii ff). He also describes a false prophet who claims to be "inspired and possessed by the Holy Spirit" (On Those Who Offer Sacrifice, xi). In a very notable passage, Philo describes in detail his own subjective experiences under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and his language is that of the intellectual mystic. He says that at times he found himself devoid of impulse or capacity for mental activity, when suddenly by the coming of the Spirit of God, his intellect was rendered very fruitful: "and sometimes when I have come to my work empty I have suddenly become full, ideas being, in an invisible manner, showered upon me and implanted in me from on high; so that through the influence of Divine inspiration I have become greatly knit together, not in the same place in which I was, nor those who were present, nor myself, nor what I was saying, nor what I was writing," etc (Migrations of Abraham, vii).

In Philo, as in the non-canonical literature generally, there is a metaphysical teaching as to the Spirit and His relations to the Godhead. On this point there is no material advance over the OT teaching. The agency of the Holy Spirit in shaping and maintaining the physical universe and as the source of the spiritual capacities in man is recognized in Philo. In Philo, as in Jos, the conception of inspiration as the complete occupation and domination of the prophet's mind by the Spirit of God, even to the extent of suspending the operation of the natural powers, comes clearly into view. This is rather in contrast with, than in conformity to, the OT and NT conception of inspiration, in which the personality of the prophet remains intensely active while under the influence of the Holy Spirit, except possibly in cases of vision and trance.

III. The Holy Spirit in the NT.—In the NT there is unusual symmetry and completeness of teaching as to the work of the Spirit of God in relation to the Messiah and to the Messianic kingdom. The simplest mode of presentation will be to trace the course of the progressive activities of the Spirit, or teachings regarding these activities, as these are presented to us in the NT literature as we now have it, so far as the nature of the subject will permit. This will, of course, disturb to some extent the chronological order in which the NT books were written, since in some cases, as in John's Gospel, a very late book contains early teaching as to the Spirit.

1. The Spirit in Relation to the Person of Christ (I 20), all of which is declared to be in the person of Christ. (A) The fulfillment of the prophecy that a virgin shall bring forth a son whose name shall be called Immanuel (Isa 7 14). In Mt 1 35 the Spirit (pneuma hagion) shall come upon her, and the power of the Most High (μονιματις Υπερσιους) shall overshadow her. Here "Holy Spirit" and "power of the Most High" are expressions meaning the same thing; in the one case emphasizing the Divine source and in the other the holiness of "the holy thing which is begotten" (I 35). In connection with the presentation of the babe in the temple, Simeon is described as one upon whom the Holy Spirit rested, to whom revelation was made through the Spirit (Lk 2 25-28). So also Anna the prophetess speaks concerning the babe, evidently in Luke's thought, under the influence of the Holy Spirit (Lk 2 36 ff).

It is clear from the foregoing that the passages in Mt and Lk need to be set forth, first, the supernatural origin, and secondly, the sinlessness of the babe born of Mary. The act of the Holy Spirit is regarded as creative, although the words employed signify "begotten" or "born" (γενναθης, γενναθηναι, Mt 1 20; and γενναθης, γενναθηναι, Lk 1 35). There is no hint in the stories of the nativity concerning the pretemporal existence of Christ. This doctrine was developed later. Nor is there any suggestion of the immaculate conception or sinlessness of Mary, the mother of Our Lord. Dr. C. A. Briggs has set forth a theory of the sinlessness of Mary somewhat different from the Roman Catholic view, to the effect that the OT prophecies foretell the purification of the Davidic line, and that Mary was begotten in the womb of her father, who thereby became sinless (Incarnation of the Lord, 230-34). This, however, is speculative and without substantial Bib. warrant. The sinlessness of Jesus was not due to the sinlessness of His mother, but to the Divine origin of His human nature, the Spirit of God.

In He 10 5 ff the writer makes reference to the sinless body of Christ as affording a perfect offering for sins. No direct reference is made to the birth of Jesus, but the very nature of God is clearly set forth (He 10 5), though not specifically to the Holy Spirit.

2. The baptism of Jesus.—The NT records give us very little information regarding the growth of Jesus to manhood. In Lk 2 40 ff a picture is given of the boyhood, exceedingly brief, but full of significance. The "child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom [in "becoming full of wisdom"]: and the grace of God was upon him." Then follows the account of the visit to the temple and the circumcision, and all these experiences, the boy is under the influence and guidance of the Spirit. This alone would supply an adequate explanation, although Luke does not expressly name the Spirit as the source of these experiences. The Spirit's action is rather assumed.

Great emphasis, however, is given to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His baptism. Mt 3 16 declares that after His baptism "the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him." Mk 1 10 repeats the statement in substantially equivalent terms. Lk 3 22 declares that the Spirit descended in "bodily form, as a dove" (τροφος εις ους πνενθης, σωματικοι ελικοι ην περιεχομενοι). In Jn 3 32-33 the Baptist testifies that he saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus as a dove out of heaven, and that it abide upon Him, and, further, that this descent of the Spirit was the mark by which he was to recognize Jesus as "he that baptizedeth in the Holy Spirit."

We gather from these passages that at the baptism there was a new communication of the Spirit to Jesus in great fullness, as a special anointing for His public ministry. Lk 4:14-16 declares that the dovelike appearance was seen by Jesus as by John, which is scarcely compatible with a subjective experience merely. Of course, the dove here is to be taken as a symbol, and not as an assertion that God's Spirit assumed the form of a dove actually.
Various meanings have been assigned to the symbol. One connects it with the creative power, according to a gentle usage; others with the speculative philosophy of Alexandrian Judaism, according to which the dove symbolized the Divine wisdom or reason. But the most natural explanation connects it with the brooding or hovering of the Spirit in Gen 1:3. In this new spiritual creation of humanity, as in the first physical creation, the Spirit of God is the energy through which the work is carried on. Possibly the dove, as a symbol of peace, complete in itself, may suggest the totality and fulness of the gift of the Spirit to Jesus. At Pentecost, on the contrary, the Spirit is bestowed distributively and partially to at least individuals as such, as suggested by the seven tongues as of fire which "sat upon each one of them" (Acts 2:3). Jn 3:34 emphasizes the fulness of the bestowal upon Jesus: "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for he giveth not the Spirit by measure." In the witness of the Baptist the permanence of the anointing of Jesus is declared: "Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding" (1:33).

It is probable that the connection of the bestowal of the Spirit with water baptism, as seen later in the Book of Acts, is traceable to the reception of the Spirit at Jesus' own baptism. Baptism in the Spirit did not supersede water baptism.

The gift of the Spirit in fulness to Jesus at His baptism was no doubt His formal and public anointing for His Messianic work (Acts 10:38). The baptism of Jesus could not have the same significance with that of sinful men. For the symbolic cleansing from sin had no meaning for the sinless one. Yet as an act of formal public consecration it was appropriate to the Messiah. It brought to a close His human life and introduced Him to His public Messianic career. The conception of an anointing for public service was a familiar one in the OT writings and applied to the priest (Ex 28:41; 40:13; Lev 4:5.16; 26:22); to kings (1 Kgs 9:18; 10:1; 15:1; 16:33); sometimes to prophets (1 Kgs 19:16; of Isa 61:1; Psa 2:2; 20:6). These anointings were with oil, and the oil came to be regarded as a symbol of the Spirit of God.

The anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit qualified Him in two particulars for His Messianic office: (a) it signified the source of His own endowments of power for the endurance of temptation, for teaching, for casting out demons, and healing the sick, for His sufferings and death, for His resurrection and ascension. The question is often raised, why Jesus, the Divine one, should have needed the Holy Spirit for His Messianic vocation. The reply is that His human nature, which was real, required the Spirit's presence. Man, made in God's image, is constituted in dependence upon the Spirit of God. Apart from God's Spirit man fails of his true destiny, simply because our nature is constituted as dependent upon the indwelling Spirit of God for the performance of our true functions. Jesus as human, therefore, required the presence of God's Spirit, for understanding His Divine-human consciousness. (b) The Holy Spirit's coming upon Jesus in fulness also qualified Him to bestow the Holy Spirit upon His disciples. John the Baptist esp. predicts that it is He who shall baptize in the Holy Spirit (Mt 3:11; Mk 1:8; Lk 3:16; see also Jn 1:7). It was esp. true of the king that He was anointed for His office, and the term Messiah (מֶשֶׁךְ, mashšēh), equivalent to the Gr Ἐρυρχός, ho Christēs), meaning the Anointed One, points to this fact.

(3) The temptation of Jesus.—The facts as to the temptations are as follows: In Mt 4:1 we are told that Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. Mk 1:12 declares in his graphic way that after the baptism "straightway the Spirit driveth [ἐκδηλωθή, ekdhlethē] him forth into the wilderness." Lk 4:1 more fully declares that Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit," and that He was "led in the Spirit in the wilderness during 40 days." The impression which the narratives of the temptation give is of energetic spiritual conflict. As the Messiah confronted His life task He was subject to the ordinary conditions of other men in an evil world. Not by sheer divinity and acting from without as God, but as human also and a part of the world, He must overcome, so that while He was sinless, it was nevertheless true that the righteousness of Jesus was also an achieved righteousness. The temptations were no doubt such as were peculiar to His Messianic vocation, the misuse of power, the presumption of faith and the appeal of temporal splendor. To these He opposed the restraint of power, the poise of faith and the conception of a kingdom wholly spiritual in its origin, means and ends. Jesus is hurled, as it were, by the Spirit into this terrific conflict with the powers of evil, and His conquest, like the temptations themselves, was not final, but typical and representative; it is true that the temptations of Jesus ended at the close of the forty days. Later in His ministry, He refers to the disciples as those who had been with Him in His temptations (Lk 22:28). The temptations continued throughout His life, and course, the wilderness temptations were the severest test of all, and the victory there contained in principle and by anticipation later victories. Comment has been made upon the absence of reference to the Holy Spirit's influence upon Jesus in the separate experiences, which in the case of others would ordinarily have been traced directly to the Spirit, as in Lk 1:14 ff, etc (cf. art. by James Denney in DCG, I, 732, 734). Is it not true, however, that the point of view of the writers of the Gospels is that Jesus is always under the power of the Spirit? At His baptism, in the temptation, and at the beginning of His public ministry (Lk 4:14) very special stress is placed upon the fact. Hence-forward the Spirit's presence and special acts are accentuated. From time to time, reference is made to the Spirit for special reasons, but the action of the Spirit in and through Jesus is always assumed.

(4) The public ministry of Jesus.—Here we can select only a few points to illustrate a much larger truth. The writers of the Gospels, and esp. Luke, conceived of the entire ministry of Jesus as under the power of the Holy Spirit. After declaring that Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit" and that He was led by the Spirit in the wilderness forty days in 4:1, He declares, in 4:14, that Jesus "returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee." This is followed in the next verse by a general summary of His activities: "And he taught in their synagogues, and was glorified of all." Then, as if to complete his teaching as to the relation of the Spirit to Jesus, He narrates the visit to Nazareth and the citation by Jesus in the synagogue there of Isaiah's words beginning, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," with the detailed description of His Messianic activity, viz., preaching to the poor, announcement of release to the captives, recovering of sight to the blind, and to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord (Isa 61:1). Jesus proclaims the fulfilment of this prophecy in Himself (Lk 4:18 ff). Is 42:1-3 is given in connection with the miraculous healing work of Jesus. It is a passage of exquisite beauty and describes the Messiah as a quiet and unobtrusive and tender minister to human needs, possessed of
irresistible power and infinite patience. Thus the highest OT ideals as to the operations of the Spirit of God come to realization, esp. in the public ministry of Jesus. The comprehensive terms of the description make it incontestably clear that the New light of the eternal life of Jesus is as directed by the Spirit of God. We need only to read the evangelic records in order to fill in the details.

The miracles of Jesus were wrought through the power of the Holy Spirit. Occasionally He is seized as it were, by a sense of the urgency of work in some such way as to impress beholders with the presence of a strange power working in Him. In one case men think He is beside Himself (Mk 3:21); in another they are impressed with the supernatural goodness of His teaching (Mk 1:22); in another His intense devotion to His task makes Him forget bodily needs (Jn 4:31); again men think He has a demon (Jn 8:48); at one time He is seized with a rapturous joy when the 70 return from their mission (Lk 10:17), and Luke declares that at that hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit (Lk 10:21; cf Mt 11:25). This whole passage is a remarkable one, containing elements which point to the Johannine conception of which according to the Spirit is dispensed to discredit it at certain points (Sayings of Jesus, 302). One of the most impressive aspects of this activity of Jesus in the Spirit is its suppressed intensity. Nowhere is there lack of self-control. Nowhere is there evidence of a coldly didactic attitude, on the one hand, or of a loose rein upon the will, on the other. Jesus is always an intensely human Master wrapped in Divine power. The miracles contrast strikingly with the miracles of the apocryphal gospels. In the latter all sorts of capricious deeds of power are ascribed to Jesus as a boy. In our Gospels, on the contrary, no miracle is wrought until after His anointing with the Spirit at Baptism.

A topic of especial interest is that of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Jesus cast out demons by the power of God's Spirit. In Mt 12:31; Mk 3:28; Lk 12:10, we have the declaration that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is unpardonable sin. Mark particularizes the offence of the accusers of Jesus by saying that they said of Jesus, "He hath an unclean spirit." The blasphemy against the Spirit seems to have been not merely rebuffing Him and His work, but doing Him and His work black injury due to various causes. It was rather the sin of ascribing works of Divine mercy and power—works which had all the marks of their origin in the goodness of God—to a diabolic source. The charge was that He cast out devils by reason of the prince of devils. We are not to suppose that the unpardonable nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit was due to anything arbitrary in God's arrangements regarding sin. The moral and spiritual attitude involved in the charge against Jesus was simply a hopeless one. It presupposed a warping or wrenching of the moral nature from the truth in such degree, a deep-seated malignity and insusceptibility to Divine influences so complete, that no moral nucleus remained on which the forgiving love of God might work. See Blasphemy.

(5) Death, resurrection and Pentecostal gift.—It is not possible to give here a complete outline of the activities of Jesus in the Holy Spirit. We shall only give an account of the relations of the Holy Spirit to Him. In He 9:14 it is declared that Christ "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God," and in Rom 1:4, Paul says He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (cf also Rom 8:11).

As already noted, John the Baptist gave as a particular designation of Jesus that it was He who should baptize with the Holy Spirit, in contrast with His own baptism in water. In Acts 1:5 it is declared that He gave commandment through the Holy Spirit, and in 1:5 it is predicted by Him that the disciples should "be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence"; and in 1:8 it is declared, "Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you."

It is clear from the preceding that in the thought of the NT writers Jesus is completely endowed with the power of the Holy Spirit. It is in large measure the OT view of the Spirit that is here, the operation of the Spirit in and through Jesus is chiefly with a view to His official Messianic work, the charismatic Spirit imparting power rather than the Spirit for holy living. Yet there is a difference between this and the NT representation here. In the OT the agency of the Spirit is made very prominent when mighty works are performed by His power. In the Gospels the view is concentrated less upon the Spirit than upon Jesus Himself, though it is always assumed that He is acting in the power of the Spirit. In the case of Jesus also, the moral quality of His words and deeds is always assumed.

Our next topic in setting forth the NT teaching is the Holy Spirit in relation to the kingdom of God.

2. The endowment of Jesus, the founder of the kingdom. Spirit, with the power of the Holy Spirit, is the communication of the kingdom of God to the agents employed by Providence in the conduct of the affairs of the kingdom. We need, at all points, in considering the subject in the NT to keep in view the OT background and the relations between God and Israel were the presupposition of all the blessings of the OT. In the NT there is not an identical but an analogous point of view. God is continuing His work among men. Indeed in a sense a new work is the fulfillment of the old. The new differs from the old in some very important respects, chiefly indeed in this, that now the national and theocratic life is wholly out of sight. Prophecy no longer deals with political questions. The power of the Spirit no longer anoints kings and judges for their duties. The action of the Spirit upon the cosmos now ceases to receive attention. In short, the kingdom of God is intensely spiritualized, and the relation of the Spirit to the individual or the church is nearly always that which is dealt with.

(1) Synoptic teachings.—We consider briefly the synoptic teachings as to the Holy Spirit in relation to the kingdom of God. The forerunner of Jesus goes before His face in the Spirit and power of Elijah (Lk 1:17). Of Him it had been predicted that He should be filled with the Holy Spirit from His mother's womb (Lk 1:15). The Master expressly predicts that the Holy Spirit will give the needed wisdom when the disciples are delivered up to the people (cf. Mt 10:19; Mk 13:11). In Lk 12:12 it is also declared that "The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say." Likewise in Mt 10:20, "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." In Lk 11:13 is
a beautiful saying: If we who are evil give good gifts to our children, how much more shall the "heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." This is a variation from the | passage in Mt (7:11), and illustrates Luke's marked emphasis on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In Mt 28:19, the disciples are commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This passage has been called in question, but there is not sufficient ground for its rejection. Hitherto there has been almost no hint directly of the personality of the Spirit or the Trinitarian implications in the teaching as to the Spirit. Here, however, we have a very suggestive hint toward a doctrine of the Spirit which attains more complete development later.

(2) In the Gospel of John there is a more elaborate presentation of the office and work of the Holy Spirit, particularly in chs 14-17. Several earlier passages, however, must be noticed. The passage on the new birth in Jn 3:5ff we notice first. The expression, "except one be born of water and the Spirit," seems to contain a reference to baptism along with the action of the Spirit of God directly on the soul. In the light of other NT teachings, however, we are not warranted in ascribing saving effect to baptism alone here. So far as it relates to baptism, is symbolic simply, not actual. The outward act is the fitting symbolic accomplishment of the spiritual regeneration by the Spirit. Symbolism and spiritual fact move on | lines in the Johannine Gospel, and the kingdom is symbolically effected by means of baptism, just as the "new birth" takes place symbolically by the same means.

In Jn 6:51ff we have the very difficult words attributed to Jesus concerning the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood. These were greatly distanced by these words, and in 6:63 Jesus insists that "it is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing." One's view of the meaning of this much-discussed passage will turn largely on his point of view in interpreting it. If he adopts the view that John is reading back into the record much that came later in the history, the inference will probably follow that Jesus is here referring to the Lord's Supper. If on the other hand it is held that John has reported substantially what was said, and to convey an impression of the actual situation, the reference to the Supper will not be inferred. Certainly the language fits the later teaching in the establish-ment-making, although in so far as it accounts for the actual account of the Supper. But Jesus was meeting a very real situation in the carnal spirit of the multitude which followed Him for the loaves and fishes. His deeply mystical words seem to have been intended to accomplish the result which followed, viz., the separation of the true from the false disciples. There is no necessary reference to the Lord's Supper specifically, therefore, in His words. Spiritual meat and drink, not carnal, are the true food and drink. Himself with that food, but only the spiritually susceptible would grasp His meaning. It is difficult to assign any sufficient reason why Jesus should have here referred to the Supper, or why John should have desired to introduce such reference into the story at this stage.

In Jn 7:37ff we have a saying of Jesus and its interpretation by John which accords with the synoptic reference to a future baptism in the Holy Spirit to be bestowed by Jesus: "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," John adds: "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." No doubt John's Gospel is largely a reproduction of the facts and teachings of Jesus in the evangelist's own words. This passage indicates, however, that John discriminated between his own constructions of Christ's teachings and the teachings themselves, and warns us against the custom of many exegeses of the NT. In 16:14ff John employed his material with slight regard for careful and correct statement, passing it through his own consciousness in such manner as to leave us his own subjective Gospel, rather than a truly historical record. The ethical implications of such a process on John's part would scarcely harmonize with his general tone and esp. the teachings of his Epp. No doubt John's Gospel contains much meaning which he could not have put into it prior to the coming of the Spirit. But what John seeks to give is the teaching of Jesus and not his own theory of Jesus.

We give next an outline of the teachings in the great chapters from 14 to 17, the farewell discourse of Jesus. In 14:10 Jesus says, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter (παρακλητός, paraclētēs; see PARACLETES). Next Jesus describes this Comforter as one whom the world cannot receive. Disciples know Him because He abides in them. The truth of Christianity is symbolically here, for it is spiritually displayed in so far as it relates to baptism, is symbolic simply, not actual. The outward act is the fitting symbolic accomplishment of the spiritual regeneration by the Spirit. Symbolism and spiritual fact move on | lines in the Johannine Gospel, and the kingdom is symbolically effected by means of baptism, just as the "new birth" takes place symbolically by the same means.

In 15:26 the function of the Spirit is indicated. He is to bring to "remembrance all that I said unto you." In 16:14 this is made even more comprehensive: "He shall bear witness of me," and yet more emphatically in 16:14, "He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." The sphere of the Spirit's activity is the heart of the individual believer and of the church. His chief function is to illumine the teaching and glorify the person of Jesus. In 16:26 is the passage which has been used in support of the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit. Jesus says, "I will send (αποστέλλω, apostellō) future tense, referring to the "Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, whom the Father hath appointed to | bear testimony." The present tense here suggests timeless action and has been taken to indicate an essential relation of the Spirit to God the Father (of Godet, Comment. on John, in loc.). The hazard of such an interpretation lies chiefly in the absence of other
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confirmatory Scriptures and in the possibility of another and simpler meaning of the word. However, the language is unusual, and the change of tense in the course of the sentence is suggestive. Perhaps it is one of the many instances where we must be content to know the precise import of the language of Scripture.

In 16:7-15 we have a very important passage. Jesus declares to the anxious disciples that it is expedient for Him to go away, because otherwise the Spirit will not come. “He, when he is come, will convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment” (16:8). The term τριάν “convict” (θέτον, ἐλέγηκεν) involves a cognitive link along with a moral process. The Spirit who deals in truth, and makes His appeal through the truth, shall convict, shall bring the mind on which He is working into a sense of self-condemnation on account of sin. The word means more than reprove, or refute, or convince. It signifies up to a certain point a moral conquest of the mind: “of sin, because they believe not on me” (16:9). Unbelief is the root sin. The revelation of God in Christ is, broadly speaking, His condemnation of all sin. The Spirit may convict of particular sins, but that will all be shown to consist essentially in the rejection of all that He is and all that He does. i.e. in unbelief. “Of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more” (16:10). What does this mean? Does Jesus mean that His going to the Father will be the proof of His righteousness? Or does He mean that those who put Him to death, or that going to the Father will be the consummating or crowning act of His righteousness which the Spirit is to carry home to the hearts of men? Or does He mean that these two go hand in hand? His place in convicting men of righteousness? The latter meaning seems implied in the words, “and ye behold me no more.” Probably, however, the meanings are not mutually exclusive. “Of judgment because the Prince of this world hath been judged” (16:11). In His incarnation and death the prince of this world, the usurper, is conquered and cast out. We may sum up the teachings as to the Spirit in these four chapters as follows: He is the Spirit of truth; He guides into all truth; He brings to those who put Him to death, or that going to the Father will be the consummating or crowning act of His righteousness which the Spirit is to carry home to the hearts of men; He glorifies Christ; He speaks not of Himself but of Christ; He, like believers, bears witness to Christ; He enables Christians to do greater works than those of Christ; He convicts the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; He comes because Christ goes away; He is “another Comforter”; He is to abide with disciples forever.

These teachings cover a very wide range of needs. The Holy Spirit is the subject of the entire discourse. In a sense it is the counterpart of the Sermon on the Mount. There the laws of the kingdom are expounded. Here the means of realization of all the ends of that kingdom are presented. The kingdom now becomes the kingdom of the Spirit. The historical revelation of truth in the Old Testament, the Law, is now followed up by the personal, direct, and power of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of truth comes in fulness. The gospel as history is now to become the gospel as experience. The Messiah as a fact is now to become the Messiah as a life through the Spirit’s action. All the elements of the Spirit’s action are embraced: the charismatic for mighty works; the intellectual for guidance into truth; the moral and spiritual for producing holy lives. This discourse transfers the kingdom in a special, in a real way, to those of the disciples, but the latter are empowered for their tasks by the might of the indwelling and abiding Spirit. The method of the kingdom’s growth and advance is clearly indicated as spiritual, conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment, and obedient and holy lives of Christ’s disciples.

Before passing to the next topic, one remark should be made as to the Trinitarian suggestions of these chapters in Jn. The personality of the Spirit is clearly implied in the passage here. It is true we have no formal teaching on the metaphorical side, no ontology in the strict sense of the word. This fact is made much of by writers who are slow to recognize the personality of the Holy Spirit in the light of the teachings of John and Paul. The NT writers have no difficulty, however, in asserting that the NT writers hold that God is a personal being (see I. F. Woods, The Spirit of God in Bib. Literature, 206, 208). It must be insisted, however, that in the NT, as in the OT, there is little metaphysics, little ontological teaching as to God. His personality is deduced from the same kind of sayings as those relating to the Spirit. From the ontological point of view, therefore, we should also have to reject the personality of God on the basis of the Bib. teachings. The Trinitarian formulations may not be correct at all points, but the NT warrants the Trinitarian doctrine, just as it warrants belief in the personality of God. We are not insisting on the Trinitarian formulations of the OT, but we do insist upon consistency in construing the popular and practical language of Scripture as to the second and third as well as the first Person of the Trinity.

We add a few lines as to John’s teachings in the Epp. and Revelation. In general they are in close harmony with the teachings in his Gospel, and need not require extended treatment. The Spirit imparts another spirit (Jn 26:14), and the same to the confession of Christ (4:2), bears witness to Christ (6:6). It is “in the Spirit” (4:2). The Spirit joins the church in the invitation of the gospel (21 17). (3) The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts.—The Book of Acts contains the record of the beginning of the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit. There is at the outset the closest connection with the recorded teachings of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel. Particularly does Luke make clear the continuity of his own thought regarding the Spirit in his earlier and later writing. Jesus in the first chapter of Acts gives commandment through the Holy Spirit and presents the conception of power as the result of the baptism in the Holy Spirit which the disciples are soon to receive.

The form of the Spirit’s activities in Acts is chiefly charismatic, that is, the miraculous endowment of disciples with power or wisdom for their work in extending the Messianic kingdom. As yet the work of the Spirit within disciples as the chief sanctifying agency is not fully developed, and is later described with great fulness in Paul’s writings. Some recent writers have overemphasized the contrast between the earlier and the more developed view of the Spirit with regard to the moral life. In Acts the ethical import of the Spirit’s action appears at several points (see Acts 5:9; 7:51; 8:15; 13:9; 15:28). The chief interest in Acts is naturally the Spirit’s agency in foundings the Messianic kingdom, since here is recorded the early history of the expansion of that kingdom. The phenomenon rather than the inner moral aspects of that great movement come chiefly into view. But everywhere the ethical implications are present. Gunkel is no doubt correct in the statement that Paul’s conception of the Spirit as inward and moral and acting in the daily life of the Christian opens the way for the activity of the Spirit as
One or two points require notice before passing from Acts. The impression we get of the Spirit's action here very strongly suggests a Divine purpose moving on the stage of history in a large and comprehensive way. It is evident that the individuals of the Spirit's activity were everywhere conscious of a vast historic movement of which they as individuals were a part. In some passages the existence of purpose in the Spirit's action is clearly recognized, as in the account of Saul at certain points and in the appointment of Saul and Barnabas as missionaries. Divine purpose is indeed implied at all points, and while the particular end in view was not always clear in a given instance, the subjects of Saul's and Barnabas' success were such as to make the apprehension of the matter as to think of their experiences merely as so many extraordinary phenomena caused in a particular way.

We note next the glossolalia, or speaking with tongues, referred to in Acts 2, as represented by the laying on of hands. These instances in which the order of baptism, the laying on of hands, and the gift of the Spirit seem to be a matter of indifference, and a striking indication of the non-sacramenterian character of the teaching of the Book of Acts, and indeed in the NT generally. Certainly no particular efficacy seems to be attached to the laying on of hands or baptism excepting as an indication of spiritual facts. Gunkel, in his excellent work on the Holy Spirit, claims Acts 2 38 as an instance when the Spirit is bestowed during baptism (Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc. 7). The words of Peter, however, may refer to a reception of the Spirit subsequent to baptism, although evidently in immediate connection with it. The baptism of the Holy Spirit clearly then was not meant to supplant water baptism. Moreover, in the strict sense the baptism of the Holy Spirit was a historical event or event, completed at the outset when the extension of the kingdom of God, beginning at Pentecost, began to reach out to the gentle world. See Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

In Acts the entire historical movement is represented by Luke as being under the direction of the Spirit. He guides Philip to the Ethiopian and then “catches away” Philip (8 29, 39). He guides Peter at Joppa through the vision and then leads him to Cornelius at Caesarea (10 19 ff; 11 12 f). The Spirit came down to the church at Antioch to separate Saul and Barnabas for missionary work (13 2 ff). He guides the church at Jersu (16 28). He forbids the apostle to go to Asia (16 6 ff). The Spirit enables Agabus to prophesy that Paul will be bound by the Jews at Jersu (21 11; cf also 20 25). The Spirit appointed the elders at Ephesus (20 28).
Spirit constitutes and maintains it (Wood, The Spirit of God in Bib. Literature, 268). In fact a careful study of Paul’s teachings discloses three | living activities of the Holy Spirit, namely, to the first and the third to the Holy Spirit. That is to say, his teachings coalesce, as it were, point by point, in reference to these three subjects. Faith is the human side of the Divine activity carried on by the Holy Spirit. Faith is therefore implied in the Spirit’s action and is the primary response to it in its various forms. But faith is primarily and essentially faith in Jesus Christ. Hence we find in Paul that Christ is represented as doing substantially everything that the Spirit does. Now we are not to see in this any conflicting conceptions as to Christ and the Spirit, but rather Paul’s intense feeling of the unity of the work of Christ and the Spirit. The “law” of the Spirit’s action is the revelation and glorification of Christ. In his Gospel which he comments upon, the Spirit’s function is precisely in these terms. Whether or not John was influenced by Paul in the matter we need not here consider.

(a) We begin with a brief reference to the connection in Paul’s thought also between the Spirit and Jesus. The Holy Spirit is described as the Spirit of God’s Son (Rom 8 14 ff; Gal 4 6), as the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8 9). He who confesses Jesus does so by the Holy Spirit, and “since” must mean that Jesus is the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12 1) is called a life-giving spirit (15 45); and in 2 Cor 3 17 the statement appears, “Now the Lord is the Spirit.” All of this shows how completely one Paul regarded the work of Christ and the Spirit, not because they were identical in the sense in which Bueschlag has contended, but because their task and aim being identical, there was no sense of discord in Paul’s mind in explaining the “similar.”

(b) The Spirit appears in Paul as in Acts imparting all kinds of charismatic gifts for the ends of the Messianic kingdom. He enumerates a long list of spiritual gifts which cannot receive separate treatment, such as prophecy (1 Thess 5 19 ff); tongues (1 Cor 12 14); wisdom (2 6 ff); knowledge (12 8); power to work miracles (12 9 f); discerning of spirits (12 10); interpretation of tongues (12 10); faith (12 9); boldness in Christ (Eph 3 15); the gifts of the Holy Spirit generally (1 Thess 1 5; 4 8, etc). See SPIRITUAL GIFTS. In addition to the above list, Paul esp. emphasizes the Spirit’s action in revealing to himself and to Christians the mind of God (1 Cor 2 10 12; Eph 3 15). He speaks in words taught by the Spirit (1 Cor 2 13). He preaches in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (1 Cor 2 4; 1 Thess 1 5).

In the above manifestations of the Spirit, as explained Paul’s writings we have presented in very large measure what we have already seen in Acts, but with some additions. In 1 Cor 14 and elsewhere Paul gives a new view as to the charismatic gifts which was greatly needed in view of the tendency to extravagant and intemperate indulgence in emotional excitement, due to the mighty action of God’s Spirit in the Christian church. He insists that all things be done unto edification, that spiritual growth is the true aim of all spiritual endowments. This may be regarded as the connecting link between the earlier and latter NT teaching as to the Holy Spirit, between the charismatic and moral-religious significance of the Spirit. To the latter we now direct attention.

(c) We note the Spirit in the beginnings of the Christian life is represented by Paul as under the power of the Holy Spirit, in its inner moral and religious aspects as well as in its charismatic forms. It is a singular fact that Paul does not anywhere expressly declare that the Holy Spirit originates the Christian life. G. A. Gunkel points out, "Spirit and freedom are always joined in Paul’s writings concerning the Holy Spirit and life. Freedom must needs come of the Spirit's presence because He is superior to all other
authorities and powers (Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc., 98). See also an excellent passage on the spirit in the church by Dr. James Denney, I, 739.

c) The Holy Spirit in the church. Toward the end of his ministry and in his later group of essays, Paul devoted much thought to the subject of the church, and one of his favorite topics was the church as the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit is represented as animating this body, as communicating to it life, and directing all its affairs. As in the case of the individual believer, so also in the body of believers the Spirit is sovereign in all rules and regulations. By one Spirit all are baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). All the gifts of the church, charismatic and other, are from the Spirit (12:4–11). All spiritual gifts in the church are for edification (14:12). Prayer is to be in the Spirit (14:15). The church is to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph 4:3). Love (Col 1:8); fellowship (Phil 2:1); worship (3:3) are in the Spirit. The church is the habitation of the Spirit (Eph 2:22). The church is an epistle of Christ written by the Spirit (2 Cor 3:3). Thus the whole life of the church falls under the operation of the Holy Spirit.

f) The Spirit also carries on His work in believers in a very personal way. In Rom 8:11 Paul asserts that the present indwelling of believers of the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead is the guarantee of the quickening of their mortal bodies by the power of the same Spirit. See also 1 Cor 6:19.

We have thus exhibited Paul’s teachings as to the Holy Spirit in some detail in order to make clear their scope and comprehensiveness. And we have not exhausted the material supplied by his writings. It will be observed that Paul nowhere elaborates a doctrine of the Spirit, as he does in a number of instances his doctrine of the person of Christ. The references to the Spirit are in connection with other subjects usually. This, however, only serves to indicate how very fundamental the work of the Spirit was in Paul’s assumptions as to the Christian life. The Spirit is the Christian life, just as Christ is that life.

The personality of the Spirit appears in Paul as in John. The indwelling Spirit is distinguished from the Son, Father, and Spirit (cf. also Eph 4:4). In many connections the Spirit is distinguished from the Son and Father, and the work of the Spirit is set forth in personal terms. It is true, references are often made to the Holy Spirit by Paul as if the Spirit were an impersonal influence, or at least without clearly personal attributes. This distinguishes his usage as to the Spirit from that as to Christ and God, who are always personal. It is a natural explanation of this fact if we hold that in the case of the impersonal references we have a survival of the current OT conception of the Spirit, while in those which are personal we have the developed conception as found in both Paul and John. Personal attributes are ascribed to the Spirit in so many instances, it would seem unwarranted in us to make the earlier and lower conception determinant of the later and higher.

In Paul’s writings we have the crowning factor in the Bib. doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He gathers under one head all of the OT elements, and adds to them his own distinctive teaching or emphasis. Some of the earlier OT elements are lacking, but all those which came earlier in the NT are found in Paul. The three points which Paul esp. brought into full expression were the nature of edification by means of spiritual gifts, second, the Holy Spirit in the moral life of the believer, and third, the Holy Spirit in the church. Thus Paul enables us to make an important distinction as to the work of the Spirit in the kingdom of God. There the distinction between means and ends, Charismatic gifts of the Spirit were, after all, means to ethical ends. God’s kingdom is moral in its purpose, “righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.” Christianity is, according to Paul, inherently and essentially supernatural, permanent and abiding significance is to be found, not in extraordinary phenomena in the form of “mighty works,” “wonders,” “tongues” and other miracles in the ordinary sense, but in the creation of a new moral order in which rules can be fulfilled completely. By one Spirit all are baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). All the gifts of the church, charismatic and other, are from the Spirit (12:4–11). All spiritual gifts in the church are for edification (14:12). Prayer is to be in the Spirit (14:15). The church is to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph 4:3). Love (Col 1:8); fellowship (Phil 2:1); worship (3:3) are in the Spirit. The church is the habitation of the Spirit (Eph 2:22). The church is an epistle of Christ written by the Spirit (2 Cor 3:3). Thus the whole life of the church falls under the operation of the Holy Spirit.

f) The Spirit also carries on His work in believers in a very personal way. In Rom 8:11 Paul asserts that the present indwelling of believers of the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead is the guarantee of the quickening of their mortal bodies by the power of the same Spirit. See also 1 Cor 6:19.

We have thus exhibited Paul’s teachings as to the Holy Spirit in some detail in order to make clear their scope and comprehensiveness. And we have not exhausted the material supplied by his writings. It will be observed that Paul nowhere elaborates a doctrine of the Spirit, as he does in a number of instances his doctrine of the person of Christ. The references to the Spirit are in connection with other subjects usually. This, however, only serves to indicate how very fundamental the work of the Spirit was in Paul’s assumptions as to the Christian life. The Spirit is the Christian life, just as Christ is that life.

The personality of the Spirit appears in Paul as in John. The indwelling Spirit is distinguished from the Son, Father, and Spirit (cf. also Eph 4:4). In many connections the Spirit is distinguished from the Son and Father, and the work of the Spirit is set forth in personal terms. It is true, references are often made to the Holy Spirit by Paul as if the Spirit were an impersonal influence, or at least without clearly personal attributes. This distinguishes his usage as to the Spirit from that as to Christ and God, who are always personal. It is a natural explanation of this fact if we hold that in the case of the impersonal references we have a survival of the current OT conception of the Spirit, while in those which are personal we have the developed conception as found in both Paul and John. Personal attributes are ascribed to the Spirit in so many instances, it would seem unwarranted in us to make the earlier and lower conception determinant of the later and higher.

In Paul’s writings we have the crowning factor in the Bib. doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He gathers under one head all of the OT elements, and adds to them his own distinctive teaching or emphasis. Some of the earlier OT elements are lacking, but all those which came earlier in the NT are found in Paul. The three points which Paul esp. brought into full expression were the nature of edification by means of spiritual gifts, second, the Holy Spirit in the moral life of the believer, and third, the Holy Spirit in the church. Thus Paul enables us to make an important distinction as to the work of the Spirit in the kingdom of God. There the distinction between means and ends, Charismatic gifts of the Spirit were, after all, means to ethical ends. God’s kingdom is moral in its purpose, "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Christianity is, according to Paul, inherently and essentially supernatural, permanent and abiding significance is to be found, not in extraordinary phenomena in the form of "mighty works," "wonders," "tongues" and other miracles in the ordinary sense, but in the creation of a new moral order in which rules can be fulfilled completely. By one Spirit all are baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). All the gifts of the church, charismatic and other, are from the Spirit (12:4–11). All spiritual gifts in the church are for edification (14:12). Prayer is to be in the Spirit (14:15). The church is to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph 4:3). Love (Col 1:8); fellowship (Phil 2:1); worship (3:3) are in the Spirit. The church is the habitation of the Spirit (Eph 2:22). The church is an epistle of Christ written by the Spirit (2 Cor 3:3). Thus the whole life of the church falls under the operation of the Holy Spirit.

f) The Spirit also carries on His work in believers in a very personal way. In Rom 8:11 Paul asserts that the present indwelling of believers of the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead is the guarantee of the quickening of their mortal bodies by the power of the same Spirit. See also 1 Cor 6:19.

We have thus exhibited Paul’s teachings as to the Holy Spirit in some detail in order to make clear their scope and comprehensiveness. And we have not exhausted the material supplied by his writings. It will be observed that Paul nowhere elaborates a doctrine of the Spirit, as he does in a number of instances his doctrine of the person of Christ. The references to the Spirit are in connection with other subjects usually. This, however, only serves to indicate how very fundamental the work of the Spirit was in Paul’s assumptions as to the Christian life. The Spirit is the Christian life, just as Christ is that life.
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In Paul’s writings we have the crowning factor in the Bib. doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He gathers under one head all of the OT elements, and adds to them his own distinctive teaching or emphasis. Some of the earlier OT elements are lacking, but all those which came earlier in the NT are found in Paul. The three points which Paul esp. brought into full expression were the nature of edification by means of spiritual gifts, second, the Holy Spirit in the moral life of the believer, and third, the
"home again" means "to their place." In Eccl 12:5, "long home." RV "everlasting home," means "eternal home," and in Jos 19:27 "unto his home" means "unto his own things" (so Jos 1:11). In 2 Cor 5:6 (and RV vs 8), "be at home" is a tr of endēmē, "to be among one's own people," as opposed to ekdēmē, "to be or live abroad.

HOMEBORN, hō'me-bərn (תֶּהֹמֶ֑ר, הָֽאָמֶֽרֶנָּ֑י): A native-born Heb, as contrasted with a foreigner of different blood. The same Heb word is found in Lev 16:29; 18:26 and elsewhere, but is tr differently. Home-born in Jer 2:14 is a tr of the phrase עַמֹּר תַּלְדֵ֛ית, yirḥō bayīth, which means he was a person free-born as contrasted with a slave.

HOMER, hō'mer (תֹּם, hōmer): A dry measure containing about 11 bushels. It was equal to 10 ephah. See Weights and Measures.

HOMICIDE, hom'i-sid (תֹּם, אֹמֵר): Heb has no word for killing or murder; rōphēk is the word for "suffering." The Gr for murder is φόνος, phōnos. Homicide was every conscious violent action against a human being with the immediate result of death. It was always to be punished by death, before considered a crime against the image of God. Killing was definitely forbidden in the 10 commandments (Gen 9:5; Ex 20:13; 21:12; Lev 24:17, 21; Nu 35:16–21;Dt 19:11–13). The penalty of death was not inflicted when the killing was unintentional or unpremeditated (Ex 21:13; Nu 35:25–29; Josh 20:3–6; cf Mish, Makkēth, xi. 5). Cities of Refuge were founded to which the man-slayer could escape from the "avenger of blood." There he had to abide till after the death of the officiating high priest. If he left the city before that event, the avenger who should kill him was free from punishment (Ex 21:13; Nu 35:10–15; 25–28, 32; Dt 19:1–13; Josh 20:2 ff). See Cities of Refuge. Killing a thief who broke in during the night was not accounted murder (Ex 22:2). Unintentional killing of the pregnant woman in a fray was punished according to the lex talionis, i.e., the husband of the woman killed could kill the wife of the man who committed the offence without being punished (Ex 21:21 f). This was not usually carried to its extreme, but gave the husband the right which to fines the offender. If a man failed to build a battlement to his house, and anyone fell over and was killed, blood-guiltiness came upon that man's house (Dt 22:8). He who killed a thief in the daytime was guilty in the same measure (Ex 22:3, 31 of AV). Where a body was found, but the murderer was unknown, the elders of the city nearest to the place where it was found were ordered by a pre-scribed ceremony to declare that they were not guilty of neglecting their duties, and were therefore innocent of the man's blood (Dt 21:1–9). Two witnesses were necessary for a conviction of murder (Nu 35:30). If a slave died under chastisement, the master was to be punished according to the principle that "he that smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death" (Ex 21:20; cf Ex 21:12). According to the rabbis the master was to be killed by the sword. Since in this passage the phrase "he shall die" is not used, some have supposed that punishment by death is not indicated. If the slave punished by the master died after one or two days, the master was not liable to punishment (Ex 21:21). Because of the words, "for he is his money," the rabbis held that not lawful for slaves to be murdered since times the avenger of blood was himself to be the executioner of the murderer (Nu 35:19,21). According to Sanhedrin 9 1 the murderer was to be beheaded. Nothing is said in the law about suicide.

PAUL LEVERTOFF

HONEST, on'est, HONESTY, on'es-ty: The word "honest" in the NT in AV generally represents the adj. καθαρός, kalōs, "good," "excellent," "honorable," and, with the exception of 1K 8:6, "honest" and "good" are changed in RV to the more correct "honorable" (Rom 12:17; 2 Cor 8:21; 13:7; Phil 4:8); in 1 Pet 2:12, into "seemly." In AV "honesty" in He 13:15 is rendered "honorably," and in 1 Thess 4:12 (here euachōmēnōs) is rendered "becoming." In AV "honesty" occurs but once in AV as the tr of σωτήρ, sēmeite (1 Tim 2:2), and in RV is more appropriately rendered "gravity." JAMES ORR

HONEY, hun'i (דבָּחָשׁ, dēḇaḥash; μέλι, méli): One familiar with life in Pal will recognize in dēḇaḥash the Arabic. dībās, which is the usual term for a sweet syrup made by boiling down the juice of grapes, raisins, earob beans, or dates. Dībās is seldom, if ever, used as a name for honey (cf Arab. ʿasād), whereas in the OT dēḇaḥash probably had only that meaning. The honey referred to was in most cases wild honey (Dt 32:13; Jgs 14:8,9; 1S 14:25. 26,29,43). Although the offering of honey with the first- fruits would seem to indicate that the bees were wild, there is reason to think that the honey was of cultivated stock (2Ch 31:5). They were constructed their honeycomb and deposited their honey in holes in the ground (1S 14:25); under rocks or in crevices between the rocks (Dt 32:13; Ps 81:16). They do the same today. When domesticated they are kept in cylindrical beehives which are plastered on the outside with mud. The Syrian bee is an esp. hardy type and a good honey producer. It is carried to Europe and America for breeding purposes.

In OT times, as at present, honey was rare enough to be considered a luxury (Gen 43:11; 1K 14:18). Honey was used in baking sweets (Ex 16:31). It was forbidden to be offered with the meal offering (Lev 2:11), perhaps because it was fermentable, but was presented with the fruit offering (2Ch 21:5). Honey was offered to David’s army (2S 17:29). It was sometimes stored in the fields (Jer 41:8). It was also exchanged as merchandise (Ezk 27:17). In NT times wild honey was an article of food among the lowly (Mt 4:1). It typified sumptuous fare (Cant 5:1; Isa 7:15,22; Ezk 16:13,19). The ordinances of Jeh were “sweeter than honey and the droppings of the honeycomb” (Ps 19:10; 119:103). “Thou didst eat . . . honey” (Ezk 16:13) expressed Jeh’s goodness to Jerusalem. JAMES A. PATCH

HONORABLE, on'er-a-ə'bəl (תָּפָּן, āḇēḇ; ὑπακούον, euachōmēnōs): In the OT “honorable” is for the most part the tr of kāḇēd, properly, “to be heavy,” “weight” (Gen 34:19, RV “honored,” Nu 22:15; 1S 9:6; Isa 3:5, etc); kāḇēd, “weight,” “heaviness,” etc. occurs in Isa 5:15; hāḇēd, “beauty,” “majesty,” “honor” (Ps 111:3, RV “honor”); ἀδῆρ, “to make honorable,” “illus-trious” (Isa 42:21, “magnify the law, and make it honorable”). RV: “honorable” (the teaching great and glorious); ὕδηκτρ, “precious” (Ps 46:4); ἐπάνω ἐπάνω, “lifted up of face” (2K 5:1; Isa 3:3; 9:15); νεανίς ἐπάνω (Job 22:8, RV: “he whose
person is accepted”); eušēmōn, lit. “well fashioned,” is tr2 Mk 16 48, AV “honorable,” RV of hold. (note: endozaus in glory, occurs 1 Cor 1 10, RV “glory”; tīmios, “weighty” (He 13 4, RV “hail in honor”); dītīmos, “without weight or honor” (1 Cor 12 23, “less honorable”); entīmos, “in honor” (Lk 14 8), “more honorable.”) RV gives for “honorable” (1 9 6), “held in honor”; for “Ye shall I be glorious” (Isa 49 5), “I am honorable”: “honorable for honesty” (Rom 12 17; 2 Cor 13 13). For “honestly” (He 13 18) AV has “honorably.”

In Apoc we have endozaus trc “honorable” (Tob 12 7; RV “ful: glory”); tīmios (Job 19 21); tīmios (Wisd 8). For “honor,” RV “glorified,” “honor” (39 27, RV “honor”), etc.

W L Walker

HOOD, hōd (יוּדָד), z’niphkuth: The ladies’ “hoods” of Isa 3 23 AV appear as “turbans” RV; and “mitre” of Zec 3 5 is “turban, or diadem” ERV. The word is from the vb. zānaph, “to wrap round.” It connotes a head-covering, not a permanent article of dress. See Dress, 5; HAT.

HOOF, hōf. See CHEW; CLOVEN.

HOOK, hōk: (1) רבע, hakkāh, is rendered “fishhook” in Job 41 1 RV (AV “hook”). RV is correct here and should have used the same tr for the same word in Isa 19 8; Hab 1 15, instead of retaining AV’s “angle.” Similarly in Am 4 2, רבע, ginad, and ב(In, ginad, appear to be synonyms for “fishhook,” although the former may mean the barb of a fisher’s spear. In the NT “fishhook” occurs in Mt 17 27 (ἐκχυστρόν, ἀκήστρον).

(2) The “flesh-hook” (ץניפ], mazlēph, צניפ; milākhāh) of Ex 27 3, etc, was probably a small pitchfork, with two or three tines. (3) The “pruning-hook” (ץניפ), “taxmērōn), used in the culture of the vine (Isa 18 5), was a sickle-shaped knife, small enough to be made from the metal of a spear-point (Isa 2 4; Joel 3 10; Mic 4 3). (4) גו, wāt, is the name given the supports of certain hangings of the tabernacle (Ex 26 26, etc). Their form is entirely obscure. (5) תער, ḫabb, is rendered “hook” in 2 K 19 28 = Isa 37 29; Ezk 29 4; 38 4, and Ezk 19 4-9 RV (AV “chain”). A ḥagg (e.g. 38 22), put in the nose of a tame beast and through which a rope is passed to lead him, is probably meant. (6) ליפש, ṣ’ghmōn, is rendered “hook” in Job 41 2 AV, but should be “a rope of rushes or rush-fiber” in RV, or, simply, “a rush” (on which small fish are strung). (7) ליפש, ṣ’ghā, is “hook” in Job 42 2 RV (“thorn,” perhaps right) and 2 Ch 33 11 RVm (text “chain”), RV “thorns”. On both vs see the comms. (8) יפפ, ṣ’kʾḥal, is “hook” in Ezk 40 43 (RVm “ledges”), but the meaning of this word is completely unknown, and “hook” is a mere guess.

Burton Scott Easton

HOOPoe, hōpēs; -pō (יוּפָה), dākhōphath; ṣ’kʾhp, ṣ’kʾhōpate; Lat Upupa epops: One of the peculiar and famous birds of Pal, having a curved bill and beautiful plumage. It is about the size of a thrush. Its back is rich cinnamon color, its head golden buff with a crest of feathers of gold, banded with white and tipped with black, that gradually lengthen as they cover the head until, when folded, they lie in lines of black and white, and, when erect, each feather shows its exquisite marking. Its wings and tail are black banded with white and buff. It nests in holes and hollow trees. At all ages the hoopoe is a “nasty, filthy bird” in its feeding and breeding habits. The nest, being paid no attention by the elders, soon becomes soiled and evil smelling. The bird is mentioned only in the lists of abomination (Lev 11 19; andDt 14 19). The hoopoe is not fit for food even on account of its habits. Quite as strong a one lay in the fact that it was one of the sacred birds of Egypt. There the belief was prevalent that it could detect water and indicate where to dig a well; that it could heal scrofula and cure diseases. Its head was a part of the charms used by witches. The hoopoe was believed to have wonderful medicinal powers and was called the “Doctor Bird” by the Arabs. Because it is almost the size of a hoopoe and somewhat suggestive of it in its golden plumage, the lapwing was used in the early translations of the Bible instead of hoopoe. But when it was remembered that the lapwing is a plow, its flesh and eggs esp. dainty food, that it was eaten everywhere it was known, modern commentators rightly decided that the hoopoe was the bird intended by the Mosaic law. It must be put on record, however, that where no superstition attaches to the hoopoe and where its nestling habits are unknown and its feeding propensities little understood, as it passes in migration it is killed, eaten and considered delicious, esp. by residents of Southern Europe.

Gene Stratton-Porter
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7, etc). The varieties of this hope are countless (see Israel, Religion of; Salvation, etc), but the form most perfect and with fundamental significance for the NT itself and the expectation of the faith and the coming appointed God, in person or through His representative (see Messiah), will establish a kingdom of righteousness.

1. The proclamation of this coming kingdom of God was the unifying element in the teaching of Jesus, and the message of His near advent (Mk 1:15, etc), with the certainty of a testimony to it for those who accepted His teaching (Lk 12:32, etc.), is the substance of what is often the strict hope of the NT teaching, though, is delivered in the language of One to whom the realities of the next world and of the future are perfectly familiar; the tone is not that of prediction so much as it is that of the statement of obvious facts. In other words, "hope" to Christ is "certainty," and the word "hope" is never on His lips (Lk 6:34 and Jn 5:45 are naturally not exceptions). For the details see Kingdom of God; Faith; Forgiveness, etc. And however far He may have taught that the kingdom was present in His lifetime, none the less the full consummation of that kingdom, with Himself as Messiah, was fashioned by Him a matter of the future (see Eschatology of the NT; Parousia).

The catalogue of the promises of heaven in the early church was left with an eschatological expectation that was primarily and almost technically the "hope" of the NT—looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (Tit 3:6-7); (Jude 3), living hope (1 Pet 1:3-5); and an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, . . . reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Pet 1:3-5; cf Rom 8:2; 8:20-24; 2 Cor 3:12; Eph 1:18-21; Col 1:5.23.27; Tit 1:2; 3:7; 1 Jn 3:2.3). The foundations of this hope were many: (a) Primarily, of course, the promises of the OT, which were the basis of Christ's teaching. Such are often quoted at length (Acts 2:16, etc), while they underlie countless other passages. These promises are the "anchor of hope" that holds the soul fast (He 6:18-20). In part, then, the earliest Christian expectations coincided with the Jewish, and the deuteronomic Israel" (Jude 3, esp. Eph 2:12, esp and esp. Rom 11:1-25) was a common ground on which Jew and Christian might meet. Still, through the confidence of forgiveness and purification given in the atonement (He 9:14, etc), the Christian felt himself to have an inheritance in Christ (He 7:19), which the Jew could not know. (b) Specifically Christian, however, was the pledge given in the resurrection of Christ. This sealed His Messiahship and proved His lordship (Rom 1:4; 15:18-20; 1 Pet 3:21, etc), so sending forth His followers with the certainty of victory. In addition, Christ's resurrection was felt to be the first step in the general resurrection, and hence a proof that the consummation of all things had begun (1 Cor 15:22; cf Acts 23:6; 24:15; 26:6.7; 1 Thess 4:13-14, etc). (c) But more than all, devotion to Christ produced a religious experience that gave certainty to hope. "Hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us" (Rom 5:5; cf 8:16.17; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14, etc, and see Holy Spirit). Even visible miracles were wrought by the Spirit that were signs of the end (Acts 2:17) as well of the individual's certainty of partaking in the first resurrection (1 Thess 4:17; Eph 5:5).

3. Yet, certain though the hope might be, it was not yet attained, and the interim was an opportunity to develop faith, "the substance of the things hoped for" (He 11:1). Indeed, hope is simply faith directed toward the future, and no such thing as hope is attainable. It is easy enough to see how the AV felt "confession of our faith" clearer than "confession of our hope" in He 10:23, although the rendition of elpis by "faith" was arbitrary. So in Rom 8:20-24, "hope" is scarcely more than "faith" in this specialized aspect. In particular, in ver 24 we have as the most natural tr (cf Eph 2:5.8). "By hope we were saved" (so AV, ERV, ARV, etc), and only a pedantic insistence on words can find in this any departure from theology (cf the essential outlook on the future of the classic example of "saving faith" in Rom 4:18-22, esp ver 18). Still, the combination is unusual, and the Gr may be rendered equally well "For hope we were saved" ("the hope of the ARV is not so good); i.e. our salvation, in so far as it is past, is but to prepare us for what is to come (cf Eph 4:4; 1 Pet 1:3). But this postponement of the full attainment, through developing faith, gives stedfastness (Rom 8:25; 1 Thes 1:5; 5:8; Acts 6:11), which could be gained in no other way. On the other hand this stedfastness, produced by hope, reacts again on hope and increases it (Rom 4:4; 16:4). And so on. But no attempt is made in the NT to give a catalogue of hope, and, indeed, such lists are inevitably artificial.

4. One passage that deserves special attention is 1 Cor 13:13, "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest is love." "Abideth" is in contrast to "shall be done away" in v 11, and the "hope" of 9:1-5 is born of the dying Christ is not a part of the Christian's character that the existence of the individual without them was unthinkable, without trying to define what the object of faith and hope would be in the glorified state. If any answer is to be given, it must be found in the doctrine that even in heaven life will not be static but will be unlimited. "The new life in Christ will give the finite soul be able to dispense entirely with faith, while at each stage the growth into the next can be anticipated through hope.

Only Adventist bodies can use all the NT promises literally, and it is the peculiar advantage of the NT to hold the language into modern practical terms is not basically easy. The simplest method is that already well developed in the Fourth Gospel, where the phrase "kingdom of God" is usually replaced by the words "eternal life," i.e. for a temporal relation between this world and the next is substituted a local, so that the accent is laid on the hope that awaits the individual beyond the grave. On the other hand, the cataclysmic imagery of the NT may be interpreted in evolutionary form. God, by sending into the world the supernatural power seen in the Christian church, is working for the race as well as for the individual, and has for His whole creation, as well as for individual souls, a goal in store. The individual has for his support the motives of the early church and, in particular, learns through the cross that even his own sins shall not disappoint him of his hope. But both of the above interpretations are needed if religion is to be the religion that is properly represented by the NT. For a pure individualism that looks beyond the grave for its hope empties the phrase "kingdom of God" of its meaning and tends inevitably to associ-
ciem. And, in contrast, the religion of Jesus cannot be reduced to a mere hope of ethical advancement for the present world. A Christianity that loses a transcendent, eschatological hope ceases to be Christianity.

Burton Scott Easton

HOPHNI, hof’ni, and PHINEHAS, fin’ë- as (יוֹפֶה, hophnâh, “pugilist” [?]; פִּינְחָשׁ, pin’châsh, prob. “face of brass”): Sons of Eli, priests of the sanctuary at Shiloh. Their character was wicked enough to merit the double designation “sons of Eli” and (AV) “sons of Belial” (RVm “base men,” 1 S 2 12). Their evil practices are described (vs 12–17). Twice is Eli warned concerning them, once by an unknown prophet (1 S 2 27 ff) and again by the lips of the young Samuel (1 S 2 11–18). The curse fell at the consecration of Abiathar (1 S 4 1–18) at which the brothers were slain, the ark was taken and the disaster occurred which caused Eli’s death. Phinehas was father of the posthumous Ichabod, whose name marks the calamity (see Ichabod).

A remnant to the prophecy of warning is seen in the deposition at Aiahath, of the house of Eli, from the priestly office (1 K 2 26–27,35).

Henry Wallace

HOPHRA, ho’f’ra. See Pharao-hophra.

HOR, hör, MOUNT (הָרָה, hör há-hár; lit. “Hor, the mountain”):

(1) A tradition identifying this mountain with Jebel Nebi Harân may be traced from the time of Jos. Ant., IV, iv, 7 downward. Omom (s.v. Ḫor, Hör) favors this identification. Jebel Nebi Harun, which has been accepted by many travelers and scholars. In HDN, while noting the fact that it has been questioned, Professor H. A. Elwell devotes all the space at his disposal to a description of Jebel Nebi Harûn. It is now recognized, however, that this identification is impossible. Niebuhr (Reise nach Arab., 238), Poocke (Description of the East, 1, 157), Robinson (BR, 1, 188), W. E. Ward (Hist. of Israel, II, 201, n.), and others had pointed out difficulties in the way, but the careful discussion of Dr. H. Clay Trumbull (Kadesh Barnea, 127 ff) finally disposed of the claims of Jebel Nebi Harûn.

From Nubia to Sinai (32 37) we may perhaps infer that Mt. Hor, “in the edge of the land of Edom,” was about a day’s journey from Kadesh. The name “Hor the mountain” suggests a prominent feature of the landscape. Aaron was buried there (Nu 20 28; Dt 32 50). It was therefore not in Mt. Seir (Dt 2 5), of which not even a foot-breath was given to Israel. Jebel Nebi Harûn is certainly a prominent feature of the landscape, towering over the tumbled hills that form the western edges of the Edomite plateau to a height of 4,800 ft. But it is much more than a day’s journey from Kadesh, while it is well within the boundary of Mt. Seir. The king of Arad was alarmed at the march to Mt. Hor. Had Israel marched toward Jebel Nebî Harûn, away to the S.E., it could have caused him no anxiety, as he dwelt in the north. This points to some eminence to the N. or N.E. of Kadesh. A hill meeting sufficiently all these conditions is Jebel Maderah (see Hakal, Mounir), which rises to the N.E. of ‘Ain kadas (Kadesh-barnea).

3. Jebel Maderah

N.W. boundary of the land of Edom, yet not within that boundary. Above the barrenness of the surrounding plain this “large, sickly, isolated, black hill” rises “like a lofty citadel,” “steep-sided” and “quite naked.” Here the solemn transactions described in Nu 20 22 ff could have been carried out lit. “in the sight of all the congregation.” While certainly is impossible, no more likely suggestion has been made.

(2) A mountain named only in Nu 34 7 f as on the N. boundary of the land of Israel. No success has attended the various attempts made to identify this particular height. Some have made it Mt. Hermon (Hull, HDB, s.v.); others Jebel ‘Akkâr, an outstrider on the N.E. of Lebanon (Furzer, ZDPV, VIII, 27), and others the mountain at the “knee of” Nahar el-Kassinâvê (van Kasteren, Rev. Bib., 1885, 30 f). In Ezk 17 14 נֵירָת, na-derekh, of course certainly be amended to נֵירָת, hadhârakh, a proper name, instead of “the way.” Possibly then Mt. Hor should disappear from Nu 34 7 f, and we should read, with slight emendation, “From the great sea ye shall draw a line for you as far as Hadrach, and from Hadrach . . . ” W. Ewing

Horam, ho’ram (הָרַם, hörám, “height”): A king of Gezer defeated by Joshua when he came to the help of Lachish, which Joshua was besieging (Josh 10 33).

Horeb, ho’reb. See Sinai.

Horem, ho’rem (הֵרֶם, hōrēm, “consecrated”): One of the fenced cities in the territory of Naphtali (Josh 19 38), named with Iron and Migdal-e. It may possibly be identified with the modern Hârâkh, which lies on a mound at the S. end of Wâdy el-Aîn, to the W. of Kedes.

Horehsh, ho’resh (הֹרֶשׁ, hōrēsh, 1 S 23 15,18, m only; LXX τὸ τὸ ἡμέραν, en τῇ Καίνα, “in the New”; EV “in the wood” [יוֹרֶשׁ, ba-hōrēshâh], the particle “in” being combined with the article): Hôresh in other passages is tr “forest” (cf 2 Ch 7 4; Isa 17 9; Ezk 31 3) and it is most probably that it should be tr here.

Hor-Haggidgad, hōr-ha-gîd’gâd (הֶרֶה-גִּדְגָד, hōr ha-gîd’ghâd): A desert camp of the Israelites between Beeroth Bene-jakan and Jobthahtah (Nu 33 92 f). In Dt 10 7 it is called Gudgoth. See WANDERING OF ISRAEL.

Horî, ho’î (וֹרִי, hōrî, hōrî, “covey-dweller”):

(1) A Horite descendant of Esaau (Gen 36 22; 1 Ch 1 39).

(2) A Simeonite, father of Shaphat, one of the twelve spies (Nu 13 5).

Horîte, ho’ît, HORîM, ho’îrîm (וֹרֵי, hōrî, לֵי, hōrîm; Χαραάτ, Charratai): Denoted the inhabitants of Mt. Seir before its occupation by the Edomites (Dt 2 12). Seir is accordingly called Horite in Gen 36 20,30, where a list of his descendants is given, who afterward mixed with the invading Edomites. Esau himself married the daughter of the Horite chieftain Anah (Gen 36 25; see ver 2, where “Horite” must be corrected into “Horite”). The “Horites” in their “Mt. Seir” were among the nations defeated by the army of Chedorlaomer in the age of Abraham (Gen 14 6). The Heb Horite, however, is the Khar of the Egypt inscriptions, a name given to the whole of Southern Palestine and Edom as well as to the adjacent sea. In accordance with this we find in the OT also traces of the existence of the Horites in other parts of the country besides Mt. Seir. In Gen 34 2; Josh 9 7, the LXX (Cod. A) more correctly reads “Horite” instead of “Hivite” for the inhabitants of Shechem and Gideon, and Caleb is said to be “the son of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah” or Bethelhem (1 Ch 2 50; 4 4). Hor or Horite has sometimes been explained to mean “covey-dweller”; it more probably,
Horned, Red
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Hormah

however, denotes the “white” race. The Horites were Semites, and consequently are distinguished in Dt 2:12 from the tall race of Reiphaim.

A. H. SAYCE

HORMAH, hörɔma (אֹרְמָה, hormah): A city first mentioned in connection with the defeat of the Israelites by the Amalekites and the Canaanites, when, after the ten spies who brought an evil report of the land had died of plague, the people persisted, against the will of Moses, in going “up into the place which Jehovah hath promised” (Nu 14:45; Dt 1:44). After the injury done them by the king of Arad, Israel took the city, utterly destroyed it, and called it Hormah, i.e. “accursed” (Nu 21:3). To this event probably the reference is in Jgs 1:17, where Judah and Simeon are credited with the work. In Josh 12:14 it is named between Geder and Arad; in Josh 15:30 between Chesil and Ziklag, among the uttermost cities toward the border of Edom in the S.; and in Josh 19:4 between Bethul and Ziklag (cf 1 Ch 4:30). To it David sent a share of the spoil taken from the Amalekites who had RAIDed Ziklag (1 S 30:30). The Ark was taken far from Kadesh, probably to the N.E. No name resembling Hormah has been recovered in that district. The ancient name was Zephath (Jgs 1:17). It is not unlikely that in popular use this name outlived Hormah; and in some form it may survive to this day. In that case it may be represented by the modern es-Sabaita between el-Khalasa in the N. and ‘An’a Kadi in the S., about 23 miles from the latter (cf ‘Asluj, about 14 miles N. of es-Sabaita), the probability is heightened. Robinson (BR, III, 150) compares the name Zephath with that of Nakk es-Safa, to the N. of Wady el-Fikrah; but that appears to be too far—about 40 miles—from Kadesh. W. Ewing

HORN, hörn (Heb and Aram. תַּחַר, kōras; kēras; for the “ram’s horn” [בַּחַר, yābbēl] of Josh 6 see MUSIC, and for the “inkhorn” of Ezk 9 [זִכְרַנ, ḫeṣēth see separate art.])

1. Kēren and keras represent the Eng. “horn” exactly, whether on the animal (Gen 22:13), or used in metaphorical purposes (Josh 6:5; 1 Ch 28:5); or for containing a liquid (1 S 16:1.3; 1 K 1:39), but in Ezk 27:15 the “horns of ivory” are of course tusk and the “horns” of ebony are small (pointed?) logs. Consequently most of the Usages require no explanation.

2. Both the altar of burnt offering (Ex 27:2; 38:2; cf Ezk 43:15) and the incense altar (Ex 30:2; 37:25.26; cf Rev 9:13) had “horns,” which are explained to be projections “of one piece with” the wooden framework and covered with the brass (or gold) that covered the altar. They formed the most sacred part of the altar and were anointed with the blood of the most solemn sacrifices (only) (Ex 30:10; Lev 4:7.18.25.30.34; 16:18; cf Ezk 43:20), and according to Lev 8:15; 9:9, the first official sacrifices began by anointing them. Consequently cutting off the horns effectually desecrated the altar (Am 3:14), while “sin graven on them” (Jer 17:1) took all efficacy from the sacrifice. On the other hand they offered the highest sanctuary (1 K 1:50.51; 2:28). Of their symbolism nothing whatever is said, and the eventual origin is quite obscure. “Remnants of a bull-cult” and “miniature sacred towers” have been suggested, but are wholly uncertain. A more likely origin is from the custom of dressing in the skins of sacrificed animals (Rs 436). That, however, the “horns” were mere conveniences for binding the sacrificial animals (Ps 118:27, a custom referred to nowhere else in the OT), is most unlikely. See Altar.

(3) The common figurative use of “horn” is taken from the image of battling animals (literal use in Dn 8:7, etc) to denote aggressive strength. So Zeolekiah ben Chenaanah illustrates the predicted defeat of the enemies by pushing with iron horns (1 K 22:11; 2 Ch 18:10), while “horns of the wild- ox” (Dt 33:15; Ps 22:21; 32:10) AV “unicorn” represent the magnitude of power, and in Zec 1:18-21 “horns” stand for power in general. In Hab 3 4 the “horns coming out of his hand” denote the potency of Jeh’s gesture (RV “rays” may be stronger, but is weak). So to “exalt the horn” (1 S 2:1.10; Ps 75:4, etc) is to clothe with strength, and to “cut off the horn” (not to be explained by Am 3 14) is to rob of power (Ps 75:10; Jer 48:25). Hence the “horn of salvation” in 2 S 22:3, Ps 18:2; Lk 1:60 is a means of active defence and not a place of sanctuary as in 1 K 1:50. When, in Dn 7:7-24; 8:3.8.9.20.21; Rev 13:1; 17:3.7.12; 16, many horns are given to the same animal, they figure successive nations or rulers. But the seven horns in Rev 6:6; 12:3 denote the completeness of the malefactors of power. In Rev 13:11, however, the two horns point only to the external imitation of the harmless lamb, the “horns” being mere stubs.

BURLINGTON EASTON

HORNS OF THE ALTAR תַּחַריִנוּת, kār-nāḥ ha-mizbəḥ+h): These projections at the four corners of the altar of burnt offering were of one piece with the altar, and were made of acacia wood overlaid with brass (Ex 27:2, “bronzes”). In Ezekiel’s altar-specifications their position is described as being on a level with the altar hearth (43:15). Fugitives seeking asylum might cling to the horns of the altar, as did Adonijah (1 K 1:50), which is one proof among many that worshippers had at all times access to the neighborhood of the altar. On certain occasions, as at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:12), and a sin offering for one of the people of the land (Lev 4:30), the horns were touched with sacrificial blood.

The altar of incense, standing in the outer chamber of the sanctuary, had also four horns, which were covered with gold (Ex 38:23). These were touched with blood in the case of a sin offering for a high priest, or for the whole congregation, if they had sinned unwittingly (Lev 4:7.18). See Altar; Horn.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

HORNS, RAMS’. See MUSIC.

HORNET, hör’nēt (נְחָלָה, cir’ah; of נְחָלֶת, zorah), “Zorah” [Jgs 13:2, etc]; also of נְחָלֶת, cara’ath, “leprosy” [Lev 13:2, etc]; from root נָחַל, cara’ “to smile”; LXX σφήκα, spēkētā, lit. “weas’y’s nest”). Hornets are mentioned only in Ex 23:32;Dt 7:20;Josh 24:12. All three references are to the miraculous interposition of God in driving out before the IsraeliteS the original inhabitants of the promised land. There has been much speculation as to whether hornets are literally meant. The following seems to throw some light on this question (Ex 23:32;27:28): “Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared... I will send the hornet before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee,” The “terror” of ver 27 may well be considered to be
tyrified by the “hornet” of ver 28, the care for the Israelites (ver 20) being thrown into marked contrast with the confusion of their enemies. Cf Isa 7 18, where the fly and the bee symbolize the military forces of Egypt and Assyria: “And it shall come to pass in that day, that Jeh 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.”

Hornets and wasps belong to the family Vespidae of the order Hymenoptera. Both belong to the genus Vespa, the hornets being distinguished by their large size. Both hornets and wasps are abundant in Pal (cf Zarah, which may mean “town of hornets”). A large kind is called in Arab. debbâr, which recalls the Heb dêbôrah, “bee.” They sting fiercely, but not unless molested.

**HORONAIM**, horônâ-im (ךרוֹנָאֵים), hor-ônaya’in; *Apôc*, Arônêâm; in Jer *Orônapa*, Orônâ-tam, “the two hollows”: An unidentified place in the S. of Moab. It is named in Jer 48 5.

Isaiah (15 5) and Jeremiah (41 3) speak of the “way to Horonaim,” and Jeremiah (48 5) of the “decent,” or “going down” of Horonaim. Masha (MS) says he was hidden by Chemosh to go “down” and fight against Horonâm. Probably, therefore, it lay on one of the roads leading down from the Moabite plateau, to Arâbâh.

It is mentioned by Jerome as being taken by Alexander Janneaus (Ant. XIII, xv, 4). Hyrumus promised to restore it and the rest to Aretas (XIV, 4). There is no indication that in early times it was ever possessed by Israel.

Buhl (G.A.P. 272 I) thinks it may be represented by a significant ruin near Wady ed-Derâ’a (Wady Kerak).

W. Ewing

**HORONITE**, horônît, horôt-nît (ךרוֹנִית), ha-hôrôni; An appellation of Sanballat (Neh 2 10; 13 28), an inhabitant of Beth-horon (q.v.).

**HORRIBLE**, hori-lồ (ךרוֹרִיל, sha’dârrâ, *sha’dărâ, sha’dârâ;*): In Jer 5 30 sha’dârrâ, “vile,” “horrible,” is tr. “horrible,” “a wonderful and horrible thing,” RV “astonishing and horror”; also 23 14; in 16 18; Hos 6 10 it is sha’dârrâ; in Ps 11 6 we have sha’dârrâ “heat,” RV “heating wind.” Ps 40 2 sha’dâ, “noise,” “tumult,” “He brought me up . . . out of a horrible pit,” RV “a pit of tumult” (or destruction). Horribili is the tr. of sdâr, “to shudder,” “to be whirled away,” “in Jer 2 12 of the storm, RV “wind.” It is mentioned by Ezech 32 10; in Ezech 27 35 RV “has horribly afraid” (sa’ar) for “sore afraid.” “Horrible” occurs frequently in Apoc (2 Esd 11 45; 16 28.34; Wisd 3 10; “For horrible [charapela] is the end of the unrighteous generation, RV “grievous,” etc.)

W. L. Walker

**HORROR**, horô (ךרוֹרֹר), *émah, há-brâqáh, pâllâqâh*: In Gen 15 12 *émah* (often rendered “terror”) is trd “terror,” “a horror of great darkness”; pâllâqâh, “trembling,” “horror” (Ps 55 5; Ezek 7 18); zal’âphâh, “glow,” “heat” (Ps 119 53; RV “hot indignation,” “anger,” “horror”); cf Ps 11 6; Lam 6 10. For “trembling” (Job 21 6) and for “fearfulness” (Isa 21 4) RV has “horror.” “Horror” does not occur in the NT, but in 2 Mac 3 17 we have “The man was so compassed with horror” (periklasmoda), RV “shuddering.”

**HORSE** (אַיִן, *šâdôb*), *éphes, hippôs*; Symbolic of war.

1. Names in several cases is trd “horse” or “war-horse” (Isa 28 28; Ezek 27 14; Joel 2 4 RVm); also in 2 S 1 6, where “the horsemen” of EV is יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאַלְפֵי אַלְפֵי, ba’âle ha-pâ’arshîm, “owners of horses”; cf Arab. qâ’ar, fâris, “horseman,” and َرَكْس, faras, “horse.” (4) The fem. form, *gâdâh,* occurs in Cant 1 9, and is rendered as follows: LXX הַפְּרָשָׁא, hâ鄱pâs; Vulg., equat. AV “company of horses,” RV “steed.” It is not clear why EV does not have “mare.” (5) The word בְּשֵׂדֶר, abbritim, “strong ones,” is used for horses in Jgs 5 22; Jer 8 16; 47 3; 50 11 (AV “bulls”). In Ps 22 12 the same word is trd “strong bulls” (of Bashan). (6) For רִכְשָׁה (cf Arab. رَكْس, rakad, “to run”), in I K 4 28; Est 8 10.14; Mic 1 13, RV “has swift steeds,” while AV gives “dromedaries” in II K and “mules” in Est. (7) For רִכְשָׁה, kirkôrâth (Isa 66 20), AV and RV have “swift beasts.” ERVm and ARV “dromedaries.”

2. Origin (see also under Horses, Horse). The Heb and Egyptian names for the horse are alike akin to the Assyrians. The Jews may have obtained horses from Egypt (Dt 17 16), but the Canaanites before them had horses (Josh 17 16), and in looking toward the N. E. for the origin of the horse, the philologists are in agreement with zoologists who consider that the plains of Central Asia, and also of Europe, were the original home of the horse. At least the species of wild horse is still found in Central Asia.

3. Uses. The horses of the Bible are almost exclusively war-horses, or at least the property of kings and not of the common people. A double reference to the use of horses in threshing grain is found in Isa 28 28.

Horses are among the properties which the Egyptians gave to Joseph in exchange for grain (Gen 47 17). In Dt 17 16 it is enjoined that the king shall not multiply horses, and in Dt 17 18 that he shall not multiply “heats.” This and other injunctions failed to prevent the Jews from borrowing from the neighboring civilizations their customs, idolatries, and even their horses. So in Ezekiel, Ezech is expressly forbidden to have horses (Ezech 27 35; Est 8 10); for “mules” and “young dromedaries” (Est 7 10). See Camel.

The horse is referred to figuratively chiefly in Zec and Rev. A chariot and horses of fire take Elijah up to heaven (2 K 2 11). In Ps 21 7; 33 17; and 76 6, the great strength of the horse is recalled as a Descriptive reminder of the greater strength of God. In Jas 3 3, the small bridle by which the horse can be managed is compared to the tongue (cf Ps 32 9). In Job 19 25-26, we have a magnificent description of a spirited war-horse.


**HORSE GATE.** See Jerusalem.

**HORSE, RED** (ךִמוֹרֵה, *chîmôrêh, hîpîpîs pûrûs): Symbolic of war, bloodshed ("slay one another,"

HORSELEACH, ἱρσ'?lēch (אַלָּכָה, 'alakah; cf Arab. ʿalākah, 'alakah, "ghoul," and ʿalakā, ʿalakah, "leech," from root ʿalak, ʿalik, "to cling"); LXX βραξίλα,  βαξίλα, ("leech"): The word occurs only once, in Prov 30 15, RVm "vampire." In Arab. 'alakah is a leech of any kind, not only a horse-leech. The Arab. 'alakah, which, if it may be noted, is almost identical with the Heb form, is a ghoul (Arab. ghādī), an evil spirit which seeks to injure men and which preys upon the dead. The mythical vampire is similar to the ghoul. In zoology the name "vampire" is applied to a family of bats inhabiting tropical America, some, but not all, of which suck blood. In the passage cited the Arab. Bible has 'alakah, "ghoul." If "leech" is meant, there can be no good reason for specifying "horse-leech." At least six species of leeches are known in Pal and Syria, and doubtless others exist. They are common in streams, pools, and fountains where animals drink. They enter the mouth, attach themselves to the interior of the mouth or pharynx, and are removed only with difficulty. ALFRED ELY DAY

HORSEMAN, ἱρσ'man. See Army.

HORSES OF THE SUN (2 K 23 11): In connection with the sun-worship practised by idolatrous kings in the temple at Jerus (2 K 23 5; cf Ezek 8 16), horses dedicated to the sun, with chariots, had been placed at the entrance of the sacred edifice. These Jeishah, in his great excitement, "took away," and burned the chariots with fire. Horses sacred to the sun were common among oriental peoples (Bochart, Heivroz., 1, 2, 10).

HOSAH, ḫs'as (חָשָׁה, hōshāh): A city on the border of Asher, in the neighborhood of Tyre (Josh 19 29). LXX reads Isaieph, which might suggest identification with Kefr Yassif to the N.E. of Acre. Possibly, however, as Sayce (HCM, 429) and Malone, 2nd ed., 51), suggest, Hosah may represent the Assyrian Usu. Some scholars think that Usu was the Assyrian name for Palaetyrus. If "the fenced city of Tyre" were that on the island, while the city on the mainland lay at Ras el'-Ain, 30 stadia to the S. (Strabo xvi.758), this identification is not improbable.

HOSANNA, ḫô-san'nâ (سيدא, hōsannd): This Gr transliteration of a Heb word occurs 6 t in the Gospels as the cry of the people when Our Lord entered Jerus as the Messiah was represented by Zeo (9 9), and of the "children" when He cleansed the temple (Mt 21 9 bds.15; Mk 11 9 f; Jn 12 13). In Mt 21 9 it is "Hosanna to the son of David!" followed by "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest!" In ver 15 it is also "Hosanna to the Son of David!"; in Mk 11 9 f it is "Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Blessèd is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." In Jn 12 13 it is "Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel." Thus in all the evangelists it is an acclamation or ascription of praise. This has raised the question whether the supposed derivation from Ps 118 25, beginning with ἀνανά ΥΔΗΣ ἀνσ' δν μν, “Save now, pray" (which is followed [ver 26] by ἀναφεροντίς ον πρεσ" in the name of Jeh) is correct. (See Thayer, HDB; Cheyne, EB; Dalman, Words of Jesus.) Various other explanations have been suggested. Thayer remarks, "It is most natural to regard the word Hosanna, as respects its form, as neither syncopated nor contracted, but the shorter Hiphil imperative with the appended enclitic' (hōshānū; cf Ps 85 2; Jer 31 7), for which there is Talmudic warrant. "As respects its force, we must for . . . contextual reasons, assume that it had already lost its primary supplicatory sense and become an ejaculation of joy or shout of welcome. It is said to have been so used in this sense at the joyous Feast of Tabernacles, the 7th day of which came to be called "the Great Hosanna," or "Hosanna Day." But, while the word is certainly an ejaculation of praise and not one of supplication, the idea of salvation need not be excluded. As in Rev 7 10 (of 19 1), we have the acclamation, "Salvation unto God . . . and unto the Lamb," so we might have the cry, "Salvation to the son of David!" and "Hosanna in the Highest," might be the equivalent of "Salvation unto our God!" He who was 'coming in the name of the Lord' was the king who was bringing salvation from God to the people. W. L. WALKER

HOSEA, ἱοσ'ēa: I. The Prophet. 1. Name. 2. Native Place. 3. Date. 4. Personal History (Marriage) (1) Allegorical View (2) Literal View II. The Book. 1. Style and Scope. 2. Historical Background. 3. Contents and Divisions (1) Chs 1-3 (2) Chs 4-14. 4. Testimony to Earlier History. 5. Testimony to Law. 6. Affinity with Deuteronomy LITERATURE I. The Prophet.—The name (עֵוָטִית, ḫāshāh; LXX Ὁσῆ, Ὁσῖς; for other forms vide note in DB), probably meaning "help," seems to have been not uncommon, being derived from the suspicious vb. from which we have the frequently recurring word "salvation." It may be a contraction of a larger form of which the Divine name or its abbreviation formed a part, so as to signify "God is help," or "Help, God." According to Nu 13 8.16 that is the original name of Joshua son of Nun, till Moses gave him the longer name (compounded with the name of Jeh) which he continued to bear (עֵוָטִית, Ὁσῖς), "Jeh is salvation." The last king of the Northern Kingdom was also named Hosea (2 K 15 30), and we find the same name borne by a chief of the tribe of Ephraim under David (1 Ch 27 20) and by a chief under Nehemiah (Neh 10 23). Although it is not directly stated in the book, there can be little doubt that he exercised his ministry in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. Whereas his references to the Place Judah are of a general kind, Ephraim or Samaria being sometimes mentioned in the same connection or more frequently alone, the situation implied throughout and the whole tone of the addresses agree with what we know of the Northern Kingdom at the time, and his references to places and events in that kingdom are so numerous and minute as to lead to the conclusion that he not only prophesied there, but that he was a native of that part of the country. Gilead, e.g. a district little named in the prophets, is twice men-
tioned (6, 8; 12, 11) and in such a manner as to suggest that he knew it by personal observation; and that Mirzah accompanied the mission of Hosea to the court of Jeroboam in Gilead (Jgs 17, 10). Then we find Tabor (6, 1), Shechem (6, 9 RV), Gilgal and Bethel (4 15; 9 15; 10 5, 8, 15; 12, 11). Even Lebanon in the distant N., is spoken of with a minuteness of detail, as if it were only familiar to one versed in the topography of the Syrian Anti-Lebanon, familiar with Northern Pal. (14 5–8). In a stricter sense, therefore, than Amos who, though a native of Tekoa, had a prophetic mission to the N., Hosea may be called the prophet of Northern Israel, and his book may be regarded as an early stage in the development of the Gileadite prophetic voice, in the absence of the book of Amos.

0. PLACE.

All that we are told directly as to the time when Hosea prophesied is the statement in the first verse that the word of the Lord came to him "in the days of Uzziah, Jothan, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel."

It is quite evident that his ministry did not extend over the combined reigns of all these kings; for, if the beginning of the reign of Uzziah is put in direct connection with the beginning of that of Hezekiah, according to the now usually accepted chronology (Kautzsch, Literature of the OT, ET), there is a period of 52 years, and Jeroboam came to his throne a few years before the accession of Uzziah.

To fix the book itself for more precise indications of date, we find that the prophet threatens in God's name that in "a little while" He will "aveng the blood of Jeroboam upon the house of Jehu." Now Jeroboam was the great-grandson of Jehu, and his son Zechariah, who succeeded him, reigned six months, and was the last of the line of Jehu. We may, therefore, place the beginning of Hosea's ministry a short time before the death of Jeroboam which took place 745 BC. As to the other limit, it is to be observed that, though the whole reign of the kingdom of the house of Israel was threatened (1 4), the catastrophe had not occurred when the prophet ceased his ministry. The date of that event is fixed in the year 722 BC, and it is said to have happened in the 6th year of King Hezekiah. This does not give too long a time for Hosea's activity, and it leaves the accuracy of the superscription unchallenged, whoever may have written it. If it is the work of a later editor, it may be that Hosea's ministry ceased before the reign of Hezekiah, though he may have lived on into that king's reign. It should be added, however, that there seems to be no reference to another event which might have been expected to find an echo in the beginning of the kingdom in the reign of Ahaz (735 BC) by Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Damascus against the kingdom of Judah (2 K 16 5; Isa 7 1).

Briefly we may say that, though there is uncertainty as to the dates at the beginning and end of his activity, he began his work before the middle of the 8th cent., and that he saw the rise and fall of several kings. He would thus be a younger contemporary of Amos whose activity seems to have been confined to the reign of Jeroboam.

Hosea is described as the son of Beeri, who is otherwise unknown. Of his personal history we are told either absolutely nothing or else a very great deal, according as we read the first 1 and 3 of his book. In ancient and in modern times, opinions have been divided as to whether in these chapters we have a recital of actual facts, or the presentation of prophetic teaching in the form of a parable or allegory.

1. (1) Allegorical view.—The Jewish interpreters as a rule took the allegorical view, and Jerome, in the early Christian church, no doubt following Origen the great allegorizer, states it at length, and sets it down as the view in the closing words of Hosea's book: "Who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?" (14 9).

It is a mystery, he says: for it is a scandal to think of Hosea being commanded to take an unchaste wife and without any reluctance obeying the command. It is a figure, like that of Jeremiah going to the Euphrates (when Jerusalem was closely besiegéd), and seeing a girdle in the bed of the river (Jer 13). So Kaeckel is commanded to reproduce the life of Jeroboam, and to lie 360 days on his side to indicate the years of his iniquity (Ezk 4); and there are other symbolic acts. Jerome then proceeds to show that Hosea's marriage was not the first to Israel, which is the Gomer of ch 1, and then to Judah, the wife in ch 3, and finally to Christ and the church, the representations being types from beginning to end.

Calvin took the same view. Among modern commentators we find holding the allegorical view not only Hengstenberg, Hilvernick and Keil, but also Eichhorn and Kautzsch. Hengstenberg also (Das AT, II, 88 ff) protests against the literal interpretation as impossible, and that on no moral or reverential considerations, but entirely on exegetical grounds. He thinks it enough to say that, when the prophet calls his children "children of whoredom," he indicates quite clearly that he uses the words in a figurative sense; and he explains the allegory as follows: The prophet is the representative of Jehovah; Israel is the wife of Jehu, but faithless to her husband, going after other gods; the children are the Israelites, who are therefore called children of whoredoms because they practise the idolatry of the nation. So they receive names which denote the consequences of their sin. In accordance with the allegory, the children may not be of the prophet (for Israel is God's own) but this is not the main point; the essential thing is the naming of the children as they are named. In the third chapter, according to this interpretation, allegory again appears, to another purpose. Idolatrous Israel is again the unfaithful wife of the prophet as the representative of Jehu. This relation can again be understood only as figurative; for, if the prophet stands for Jehu, the marriage of Israel to the prophet cannot imply infidelity to Jeh. The sense is evident: the marriage still subsists; God does not give His people up, but they are for the present divorced "from bed and board"; it is a prophecy of the time when Jeh will leave the people to their fate, till the day of reconciliation comes.

2. Literal view.—The literal interpretation, adopted by Theodore of Mopsuestia in the ancient church, was followed, after the Reformation, by the chief theologians of the Lutheran church, and has been held, in modern times, by expositors, including Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith and others. In this view, as generally held, chs 1 and 3 go together and refer to the same person. The idea is that Hosea married a woman named Gomer, who had the three children here named. Whether it was that she was known to be a worthless woman before the marriage and that the prophet hoped to reclaim her, or that she proved faithless after the marriage, she finally left him and sank deeper and deeper into sin, until, at some future time, the prophet bought her from her paramour and brought her to his own house, keeping her secluded, however, and deprived of all the privileges of a wife. In support of this view it is urged that the details are related in so matter-of-fact a manner that they must be matters of fact. Though the children receive symbolic names (as Isaiah gave such names to his children), the meanings of these are clear and are explained, whereas the wife cannot thus be explained. Then there are details, such as the weaning of one child before the conception of another (1 8) and the precise price paid for the earring wife (3 2), which are not needed to keep up the allegory, and cannot be invested with symbolic meaning by the prophet. What is considered a still stronger argument is relied on by modern advocates of this view, the psychological
argument that there is always a proportion between a revelation vouchsafed and the mental state of the person receiving it. Hosea dates the beginning of his vision to the 13th year of the reign of Jere-miah, when he was 30 years old. This was the unfaithfulness of his wife that brought home to him the apostasy of Israel; and, as his heart went after his wayward wife, so the Divine love was stronger than Israel's sin; and thus through his own domestic experience he was prepared to be a prophet to his people.

The great difficulty in the way of accepting the literal interpretation lies, as Reuss has pointed out, in the statement at the beginning, that the prophet was commanded to take a wife of whoresoms and children of whoresoms. And the advocates of the view meet the difficulties in some way like this: The narrative as it stands is manifestly later than the events. On looking back, the prophet describes his wife as she turned out to be, not as she was at the beginning of the history. It is urged with some force that it was necessary to the analogy (even if the story is only a parable) that the wife should have been first of all chaste; for, in Hosea's representa-
tion, he stands at the time of his wife's departure. In the wilderness was faithful and fell away only afterward (2 15; 9 10; 11 1). The narrative does not require us to assume that Gomer was an immoral person or that she was the mother of children before her. The children bore the prophetic names, but these names do not reflect upon Gomer but upon Israel. Why, then, is she described as a woman of whoresoms? It is answered that the expression 'baheth z'nanim is a class-descriptive, and is different from 'baheth hammelekh, which is a woman of whom the marriage bond is broken.' (ishehah zonah.) A Jewish interpreter quoted by Aben Ezra says: "Hosea was commanded to take a wife of whoresoms because an honest woman was not to be had. The whole people had gone astray—a woman's path also. Considering her as one of them was a typical example, and the children involved in the common declension (see 4 1 f.)." The comment of Umbreit is worthy of notice: "As the covenant of monogamy with Israel is viewed as a marriage bond, so is the prophetic bond with Israel a marriage, for he is the messenger and mediator. Therefore, if he feels an irresistible impulse to enter into the marriage bond with Israel, he is bound to unite himself with a bride of an unfaithful character. Hosea's whoresom wife Gomer is involved in the universal guilt." (Prak. Comm. über die Propheten, Hamburg, 1844.) It is considered, then, that this view, that Gomer, after her marriage, being in heart addicted to the prevailing idolatry, when we know was often associated with gross immoralitiness (see 4 13), felt the irksomeness of restrained in the prophet's house, left him and sank into open profli-
gency, from which (ch 3) the prophet reclaims her so far as to bring her back and keep her secluded in his own house.

Quite recently this view has been advocated by Riedel (Alltscl. Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1902), who endeavors to enforce it by giving a symbolic meaning to Gomer's name, "baheth-Diolah." The word is the dual (or might be pointed as a pl.) of a word, abbihah, meaning a fruit-
cake, i.e. raisins or figs pressed together. It is the word used in the story of Hezekiah's illness (2 K 20, 7), and is found in the list of things furnished by Abijah to David (1 K 2, 18). See also S 30 12; 1 Ch 12 40. Another name for the same thing, abbiyah, occurs in the rendering of AY, "a branch of wine," but in RV "cakes of raisins." It seems clear that this word, at least here, denotes fruit-cakes offered to the heathen deities in Jerahmiah's time (Jer 7, 18; 44 17). So Riedel argues that Gomer may have been domesticated from a fruit-cake, according to the Hebrew idiom in such expressions as "daughters of song," etc (Ecc 12 4; Prov 31 2; 2 S 7 10; Gen 37 3, 5). It will be perceived that the literal interpretation as thus stated does not involve the supposition that Hosea became aware of his wife's infidelity before the birth of the second child, as Robertson Smith and G. A. Smith suppose. The names given to the children all refer to the infidelity of the people; and of his remarriage it is the unfaithfulness of his wife that brought home to him the apostasy of Israel; and, as his heart went after his wayward wife, so the Divine love was stronger than Israel's sin; and thus through his own domestic experience he was prepared to be a prophet to his people.

II. The Book—Scarcely any book in the OT is more difficult of exposition than the Book of Hos. This does not seem to be owing to any exceptional defect in the transmitted text, but rather to the peculiarity of the style; and partly also, no doubt, to the fact that the historical situation of the prophet was one of bewildering and sudden change of a violent kind, which seems to reflect itself in the book. The style here is predominantly the man. Whatever view we may take of his personal history, it is evident that at the time of his apostasy he was in a situation in which he is placed. He is controlled by his subject, instead of controlling it. It is his heart that speaks; he is not careful to concentrate his thoughts or to mark his transitions; the sentences fall from him in an uncontrolled flow.

Mournful as Jeremiah, he does not indulge in the pleasure of melancholy as that prophet seems to do. Jeremiah broods over his sorrow, nurses it, and tells us he is weeping. Hosea does not say he is weeping, but we know in his case. Instead of laying out his plaint in measured form, he ejaculates it in short, sharp sentences, as the stabs of his people's sin pierce his heart.

The result is the absence of that rhythmic flow and studied parallelism which are such common features of Heb oratory, and are often so helpful to the expounder. His imagery, while highly poetical, is not elaborated; his figures are not so much carried out as thrown out; nor does he dwell long on the same figure. His sentences are like utterances of an oracle, and he forgets himself in identifying himself with the God in whose name he speaks—a feature which is not without significance in the bearing on the question of his personal history. This standing expression "Thus saith the Lord" ("It is the utterance of Jehovah," RV), so characteristic of the Book of Hosea, is very rarely occurs (only in 2 13 13 21; 11 11) whereas the words that he speaks are the very words of the Lord; and without any formal introduction. Sometimes he passes from speaking in his own name to speaking in the name of Jehovah (see, e.g., 6 4; 13 14; 14 17, etc.). Never was speaker so absorbed in his theme, or more identified with him for whom he speaks. He seems to be only an instrument given to him to repeat, as the scriptor or summary of spoken addresses. They certainly want to a great extent the directness and point which are so marked a feature of prophetic diction, so much so that some (e.g. Reuss and Marti) suppose they are the production of one who had readers and not hearers in view.

But, though the style appears in this abrupt form, there is one clear note on diverse strings sounding through the whole. The theme is twofold: the love of Jehovah, and the indifference of Israel to that love; and it would be hard to say which of the two is more vividly conceived and more forcibly expressed. Among the figures of the tenderest affection, sometimes that of the pitying, solicitous care of the parent (11 1 3 5; 14 3), but more promi-
nently as the affection of the husband (chs 1 3), the Divine love is brought in by the simple expression of all indifference and opposition; and, on the other hand, the waywardness, unblushing faithlessness of the loved one is painted in colors so repulsive as almost to shock the moral sense, but giving thereby evidence of the terrible painfulness of the situation on the prophet's mind. Thus early does he take the sacred bond of husband and wife as the type of the Divine eating love—a similitude found else-
where in prophetic literature, and most fully elaborated by Ezekiel (Ezk 16; cf Jer 3). Hosea is the prophet of love, and not without propriety has been called the St. John of the OT.

For the reasons just stated, it is very difficult to give a systematic analysis of the Book of Hos. It may, however, be helpful to that end to recall the situation of the time as Background furnishing a historical setting for the several sections of the book.

At the commencement of the prophet's ministry, the Northern Kingdom was enjoying the prosperity and running into the excesses consequent on the victories of Jeroboam II. The glaring social corruptions of the times are exhibited and castigated by Amos, as they would most impress a stranger from the S.; but Hosea, a native, as we are led to suppose, of the Northern Kingdom, saw more deeply into the malady, and traced all the crime and vice of the nation to the fundamental evil of idolatry and apostasy from the true God. What he describes under the repulsive figure of whoredom was the rampant worship of the ba'alim, which had practically obscured the recognition of the sole claims to worship of the national Jeh. This worship of the ba'alim is to be distinguished from that of which we treat earlier. Ahah's Tyrian wife Jezebel had introduced the worship of her native country, that of the Sidonian Baal, which amounted to the setting up of a foreign deity; and Elijah's contention that it must be a choice between Jeh and Baal appealed to the sense of patriotism and the sentiment of national existence.

The worship of the ba'alim, however, was an older and more insidious form of idolatry. The worship of the Canaanites, among whom the Israelites found themselves on the occupation of Pal, was a reverence of the gods of Baal generally known by the names of the places where each had his shrine or influence. The generic name of ba'al or "lord" was applied naturally as a common word to each of these, with the addition of the name of place or potency to distinguish them. Thus we have Baal-hamon, Baal-gad, Baal-berith, etc. The insidiousness of this kind of worship is proved by its wide prevalence, esp. among people at a low stage of intelligence, when the untutored mind is brought face to face with the forces of Nature. And the tenacity of the feeling is proved by the prevalence of such worship, even among people whose professed religion condemns idolatry of every kind. The veneration of local shrines among Christians of the East is well known; and Mohammedans make pilgrimages to the tombs of saints who, though not formally worshipped as deities, are believed to have the power to confer such benefits as the Canaanites expected from the ba'alim. The very name ba'al, originally meaning simply lord and master, as in such expressions as "master of a house," or "lord of a wife," or "owner of an ox," would be misleading; for the Israelites could quite innocently call Jeh their ba'al or Lord, as we can they did in the formation of proper names. We can, without much difficulty, conceive what would happen among a people like the Israelite tribes, of no high grade of religious intelligence, and with the prevailing superstitions in their blood, when they found themselves in Pal. From a nomad and pastoral people they became, and had to become, agriculturists; the natives of the land would be their instructors, in many or in most cases the actual labor would be done by them. The Book of Jgs tells us that originally all the tribes of Israelites "did not drive out" the native inhabitants; the northern tribes in particular, where the land was most fertile, tolerated a large native admixture. We are also told (Jgs 2 7) that the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and of those elders who outlived Joshua; and this hint of a gradual declension no doubt points to what actually took place. For a time they remembered and thought of Jeh as the God who had done for them great things in Egypt and in the wilderness; and then, as time went on, they had to think of Him as the giver of the land in which they found themselves, with all its varied produce. But this was the very thing the Canaanites ascribed to their ba'alim. And so, imperceptibly, by naming places as the natives named them, by observing the customs which the natives followed, and celebrating the festivals of the agricultural year, they were gliding into conformity with the religion of their neighbors; for, in such a state of society, custom is more or less based on religion and passes for religion. Almost before they were aware, they were doing homage to the various ba'alim in celebrating their festival days and offering to them the produce of the ground.

Such was the condition which Hosea describes as an absence of the knowledge of God (4 1) and the consequence cannot be better described than in the words of St. Paul: "As they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a corrupt mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (Rom 1 28). Hosea well tells us in no ambiguous terms how the devotees of the impure worship gave themselves up "to work all uncleanness with greediness" (Eph 4 19; cf Am 2 7 f; Hose 4 14); and how deeply the canker had worked into the body politic and produced the rapid collapse and irretrievable ruin which followed soon after the strong hand of Jeroboam was removed. The 21 years that followed his death in 743 BC saw no fewer than six successive occupants of the throne, and the final disappearance of the ten tribes. Zechariah, his son, had reigned only six months when "Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him . . . and slew him, and reigned in his stead" (2 K 15 10). Shallum himself reigned only a month when he was in the same bloody manner removed by Menahem. After a reign of 10 years, according to 2 K 15 17 (although the chronology here is uncertain), he was succeeded by his son Pekahiah (2 K 15 22), and after two years Pekah took him and reigned in his stead (2 K 15 25). This king also was assassinated, and was succeeded by Hoshea (2 K 15 30), the last king of the ten tribes, for the kingdom came to an end in 722 BC. Hosea must have lived during a most marked condition of the troublous times; and we may expect to hear echoes of the events in his book.

(1) Ota 1-3.—We should naturally expect that the order of the chapters would correspond in the main with the progress of events; and

2. Historical 3. Contents thereafter to an earlier period than those that follow. In favor of this is the reference in 1: 2 to the commencement of the prophet's ministry, as also the threatening of the impending extermination of the house of Jehu (1 4), implying that it was still in existence; and finally the hints of the abundance amounting to luxury which marked the prosperous time of Jeroboam's reign.

These three chapters are to be regarded as going together; and, however they may be viewed as reflecting the prophet's personal experience, they leave no room for doubt in regard to the national apostasy that, weighed so heavy on his heart. And this, in effect, is what he says: Just as the wife, espoused to a loving husband, enjoys the protection of home and owns all her provision to her husband, so Israel, chosen by Jeh and brought by Him into a fertile land, has received all she has from
Hosea

The giving of recognition to the b'\text{a}l\text{a}'s for material prosperity was tantamount to a wife's bestowing her affection on another; the accepting of these blessings as bestowed on condition of homage rendered to the b'\text{a}l\text{a}'s was tantamount to the receiving of hire by an abandoned woman.

This being so, the prophet, speaking in God's name, declares: He will do, in a series of a third repeated "therefore" (2:9,14), marking three stages of His discipline. First of all, changing the metaphor to that of a straying heifer, the prophet in God's name declares (vs 6 ff) that He will hedge up His ways with thorns, so as to make it impossible for her to reach her lovers—meaning, no doubt, that whether by drought or blight, or some national misfortune, there would be such a disturbance of the processes of Nature that the usual rites of homage would be suspended.

The people would fail to find the "law of the god of the land" (2 K 17:26). In their perplexity they would betheck themselves, begin to doubt the power of the b'\text{a}l\text{a}'s, and resolve to pay to Jeh the homage which has been given to the local gods. But this is still the same low conception of Jeh that had led them astray. To exchange one god for another simply in the hope of enjoying material prosperity is not the thing He requires.

And then the mastermost second "therefore" (vs 9 ff).

Instead of allowing them to enjoy their corn and wine and oil on the terms of a mere lip allegiance or ritual service, Jeh will take these away, will reduce Israel to her original poverty, causing all the milk of her bosom to cease, and giving garments of mourning for festal attire. Her lovers will no longer own her, her own husband's hand is heavy upon her, and what remains? The third "therefore" (vs 14 ff). Israel, now bereft of all, helpless, homeless, is at last convinced that, as her God could take away all, so it was from Him she had received all: she is shut up to His love and His mercy alone. And here the prophet's thoughts clothe themselves in language referring to the early betrothal period of national life. A new beginning will be made, she will again lead the wilderness life of daily dependence on God, cheerfully and joyfully she will begin a new journey, out of trouble will come, and the hope of another past will be a pain to her. As all the associations of the name b'\text{a}l\text{a}' have been degrading, she shall think of her Lord in a different relation, not as the mere giver of material blessing, but as the husband and deliverer, as the One who gave to each of her children a distinguished from one of many benefactors. In all this Hosea does not make it clear how he expected these changes to be brought about, nor do we detect any references to the political history of the time. He mentions no foreign enemy at this stage, or, at most, hints at war in a vague manner (1:4 ff).

In the second chapter the thing that is emphasized is the heavy hand of God laid on the things through which Israel had been led astray, the paralyzing of Nature's operations, so as to turn her to the God of Nature-worship; but the closing stage of the Divine discipline (ch 3), when Israel, like the wife kept in seclusion, neither enjoying the privileges of the lawful spouse nor able to follow after idols, seems to point to, and certainly was not reached till, the captivity when the people, on a foreign soil, could not exercise their ancestral worship, but yet were finally cured of idolatry.

The references to Judah in these chapters are not to be overlooked. Having said (1:6) that Israel would be utterly destroyed (which seems to point to exile), the prophet adds that Judah would be saved from that fate, though not by warfare means. Farther down (ver 11) he predicts the union of Israel and Judah under one head, and finally in ch 3 it is said that in the latter day the children of Israel would seek the Lord their God and David their king. Many critics suppose that 1 10 f are out of place (though they cannot find a better place for them); and not a few declare that all the references to Judah must be taken as from a later hand, the usual reason for this conclusion being that the words "disturb the connection." In the case of a writer like Hosea, however, whose transitions are so sharp and sudden, we are not safe in speaking of disturbing the connection: what may to us appear abrupt, because we are not expecting it, may have crossed the mind of the original writer; and Hosea, in forecasting the future of his people, can scarcely be debarred from having thought of the whole nation. It was Israel as a whole that was the original bride of Jeh, and surely therefore the united Israel would be the partaker of the final glory. As a matter of fact, Judah was at the time in better case than Israel, and the old promise to the Davidic house (2 S 7:16) was deeply cherished to the end.

(2) Chs 4-14.—If it is admissible to consider chs 1-3 as one related piece (though possibly the written deposits of several addresses) it is quite otherwise with chs 4-14. These are, in a manner, a counterpart of the first three; He requires, when the hand of Jerobeam was relaxed, the kingdom rapidly fell to pieces; a series of military usurpers follows with bewildering rapidity; but who can tell how much political disorder and social diestatement he be behind those brief and gnomic notices of events and So in his stead? So with these chapters. The will of grief, the echo of violence and excess, is heard through all, but it is very difficult to assign each lament, each reproach, each denunciation to the proper occasion that called it forth. The chapters seem like the recital of the confused, hideous dream through which the nation passed till it had awakened by the sharp shock of the Assyrian invasion and the exile that followed. The political condition of the time was one of party strife and national impotence. Sometimes Assyria or Egypt is mentioned alone (5:13; 8:9,13; 9:6; 10:6; 14:3), at other times Assyria and Egypt together (7:1; 13:5, 11; 14:5). The election of Israel is too plainly that the spirit of self-reliance—not to speak of reliance on Jeh—had departed from a race that was worn-eaten with civil wars and rendered selfish and callous by the indulgence of every vice. These foreign powers are also in the view of the prophet destined to be future scourges (see 6:13; 8:9 f; 7:11; 12:1) and we know, from the Book of K and also from the Assyrian monuments, how much the kings of Israel at this time were at the mercy of the great conquering empires of the East. Such passages as speak of Assyria and Egypt in the same breath may point to the rival policies which were in vogue in the Northern Kingdom (as they appeared also somewhat later in Judah) that the root of the Assyrian is to be sought even in the prophet's own times. When the prophet inclines in hope no more mixed with biting fear, he puts into the mouth of repentant Ephraim the words: "Assyria shall not save us; we will not ride upon horses" (14:3), thus alluding to the two foreign powers between which Israel had lost its independence.

It is not possible to give a satisfactory analysis of the chapters under consideration. They are not marked off, as certain sections of other prophetic books are, by headings or refrains, nor are the references to current events sufficiently clear to enable
us to assign different parts to different times, nor, in fine, is the matter so distinctly laid out that we can arrange the book under subjects treated. Most expositors accordingly content themselves with indicating the chief topics or lines of thought, and arranging the chapters according to the tone pervading them.

Kell, e.g., would divide all these chapters into three great sections, each forming a kind of prophetical cycle, in which the three great types of repentance, threatening, and promise, are heard in succession. His first section embraces chs 4 to 6, ending with the great

Its (p. 466) return unto Jehu, etc. The second section, 6 to 11, ends with the prophecies of return to the house of David. The third section, chs 11 to 14, ends with Solomon's passage, giving a fourth section, at ch 9, at the end of which there is a break in the MT, and a new subject begins. Accordingly, the section embraces 11 to 9, and Volck, agreeing with Hitzig, assigns it to the reign of Menahem, on the ground of 4:4: "They have set up kings, but not by me," referring to the support given to Menahem by the king of Assyria (2 K 16 10). (5) The fifth section extends from 9 to 11, and is marked by the peculiarity that the prophet's three times refers to the early history of Israel (9 10; 11 1). Identifying Shalman in 10 with Shalmaneser, Volck refers the section to the opening years of the reign of Hosea, against whom (as stated in 2 K 17 3) Shalmaneser came up and Hosea became his servant. (6) Lastly there is a sixth section, ending from 12 to 1, which looks to the future recovery of the people (13 14) and closes with words of gracious promise. This portion also Volck assigns to the reign of Hosea, just as the ruin of Samaria was forecasted in 1, as the despair of any earthly hope. In this way Volck thinks that the statement in the superscription of the Book of Hose is confirmed, and that we have before us, in chronological order if not in precisely their original form, the utterances of the prophet during his ministry. Ewald also was strongly of opinion that the book (in its second part at least) has come down to us substantially in the form in which the prophet himself left it.

The impression one receives from this whole section is one of sadness, for the prevailing tone is one of denunciation and doom. And yet Hosea is not a prophet of despair; and, in fact, he bursts forth into hope just at the point where, humanly speaking, there is no ground of hope. But this hope is produced, not by what he sees in the condition of the people: it is exulting and sustained by his confident faith in the unfailing love of Jeh. And so he ends on the theme on which he began, the love of God prevailing over many circumstances.

Some expositors, however (e.g. Maurer, Hitzig, Delitzsch and Volck), recognizing what they consider as direct references or brief allusions to events outside the history, perceive a chronological order in the chapters. Volck, who has attempted a full analysis on this line (PREP) thinks that chs 4 14 arrange themselves into 6 consecutively sections as follows: (1) ch 4 constitutes a section by itself, determined by the introductory words "Hear the word of Jeh" (4 1), and a similar call at the beginning of ch 5. He assigns this chapter to the reign of Zechahiah, as a description of the low condition to which the nation had fallen, the priests, the people, being involved in the guilt and repaying with interest (ver 6). (2) The second section extends from 5 to 6 8, and is addressed directly to the priests and the royal house, who ought to have been guides but were snares. The prophet in the spirit sees Divine justice breaking breads of sin. (3) The prophecy, which Hitzig referred to the time of Zechiah, and Maurer to the reign of Pekah, is assigned by Volck to one month's reign of Shalum, on the ground of 6 7: "Now shall Shalum and his sons, and the house of them, and the house of Yehu, and the house of Pekah"

trumpet to thy mouth." The passage which determines its date is 7:7: "All their kings are fallen," which, agreeing with Hitzig, he thinks could not have been said after the fall of one king, Zechahiah, and so he assigns it to the beginning of the reign of Menahem, who killed Shalum. The next sitting place, giving a fourth section, is at ch 9, at the end of which there is a break in the MT, and a new subject begins. Accordingly, the section embraces 8 1 to 9, and Volck, agreeing with Hitzig, assigns it to the reign of Menahem, on the ground of 4:4: "They have set up kings, but not by me," referring to the support given to Menahem by the king of Assyria (2 K 16 10). (5) The fifth section extends from 9 to 11, and is marked by the peculiarity that the prophet's three times refers to the early history of Israel (9 10; 11 1). Identifying Shalman in 10 with Shalmaneser, Volck refers the section to the opening years of the reign of Hosea, against whom (as stated in 2 K 17 3) Shalmaneser came up and Hosea became his servant. (6) Lastly there is a sixth section, ending from 12 to 1, which looks to the future recovery of the people (13 14) and closes with words of gracious promise. This portion also Volck assigns to the reign of Hosea, just as the ruin of Samaria was forecasted in 1, as the despair of any earthly hope. In this way Volck thinks that the statement in the superscription of the Book of Hose is confirmed, and that we have before us, in chronological order if not in precisely their original form, the utterances of the prophet during his ministry. Ewald also was strongly of opinion that the book (in its second part at least) has come down to us substantially in the form in which the prophet himself left it.

The impression one receives from this whole section is one of sadness, for the prevailing tone is one of denunciation and doom. And yet Hosea is not a prophet of despair; and, in fact, he bursts forth into hope just at the point where, humanly speaking, there is no ground of hope. But this hope is produced, not by what he sees in the condition of the people: it is exulting and sustained by his confident faith in the unfailing love of Jeh. And so he ends on the theme on which he began, the love of God prevailing over many circumstances.

Some expositors, however (e.g. Maurer, Hitzig, Delitzsch and Volck), recognizing what they consider as direct references or brief allusions to events outside the history, perceive a chronological order in the chapters. Volck, who has attempted a full analysis on this line (PREP) thinks that chs 4-14 arrange themselves into 6 consecutive sections as follows: (1) ch 4 constitutes a section by itself, determined by the introductory words "Hear the word of Jeh" (4:1), and a similar call at the beginning of ch 5. He assigns this chapter to the reign of Zechahiah, as a description of the low condition to which the nation had fallen, the priests, the people, being involved in the guilt and repaying with interest (ver 6). (2) The second section extends from ch 5 to ch 8, and is addressed directly to the priests and the royal house, who ought to have been guides but were snares. The prophet in the spirit sees Divine justice breaking breads of sin. (3) The prophecy, which Hitzig referred to the time of Zechahiah, and Maurer to the reign of Pekah, is assigned by Volck to one month's reign of Shalum, on the ground of 6:7: "Now shall Shalum and his sons, and the house of them, and the house of Yehu, and the house of Pekah" devour them. It is by inference from this that Volck puts ch 4 in the preceding reign of Zechahiah. (3) The third section, chs 4-7, is marked off by the new beginning made at ch 8:1: "Set the
This implies that the mass of the people, even in degenerate Israel, were well acquainted with such incidents or episodes as the prophet introduces into his discourses, as well as the links which were necessary to bind them into a connected whole. It is necessary to bear all this in mind in forming an estimate of the historical value of other books. It seems to be taken by many modern writers as certain that those parts of the Pent (JE) which deal with the earlier history were not written till a comparatively short time before Hosea. It is plain, however, that the accounts must be of much earlier date, before they could have become, in an age when books could not have been numerous, the general possession of the national consciousness. Further, the homiletic manner in which Hosea handles these ancient stories makes one suspicious of the modern theory that a number of popular stories were supplied with didactic "frameworks" by later Deuteronomic or other "redactors," and makes it more probable that these accounts were invented with a moral and religious meaning from the beginning. With these considerations in mind, and particularly in view of the use he makes of his references, it is interesting to note the wide range of the prophet's historical survey. If we read with RV or RVm "men" (M) an allusion to the Fall, implying in its connection the view which, as all admit, Hosea held of the religious history of his people as a declension and not an upward evolution. This view is more clearly brought out in the references to the wilderness period of the character of Jacob (12 3-12). Repeatedly he declares that Jeh is the God of Israel "from the land of Egypt" (12 9; 13 4), alludes to the sin of Achan and the valley of Achor (2 15), asserts that God had in time past "spoken unto the prophets" (12 10), "bewed" His people by prophets (6 5), and by a prophet brought His people out of Egypt (12 13). There are also references to incidents nearer to the prophet's time, some of them not very clear (4 4; 6 1; 9 5; 14 2; 13 11), as, for instance, "the Israel" (10 8) refers to the schism of the ten tribes, the prominence given to the Davidic kingship, which, along with the references to Judah, some critics reject on merely subjective grounds, is quite inexplicable (4 15). We do not expect to find in a prophetic writing the same frequency of reference to the law as to the history; for it is the essence of prophecy to appeal to history and to interpret it. Of course, the moral and social aspects of the law are as much the province of the prophet as of the priest; but the ceremonial part of the law, which was under the care of the priests, though it was designed to be the expression of the same ideas that lay at the foundation of prophecy, is mainly touched upon by the prophets when, as was too frequently the case, it ceased to express those ideas and became an offence. The words of the prophets on this subject, when fairly interpreted, are not opposed to law in any of its authorized forms, but only to its abuses; and there are expressions and allusions in Hosea, although he spoke to the Northern Kingdom, where from the time of the schism there had been a wide departure from the Mosaic law, which recognizes its ancient existence and its Divine sanction. The much-debated passage (8 12), "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts" (RV or RVm "I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law"), on any understanding of the words or with any reasonable emendation of the text (for which see the comm.), points to written law, and that of considerable compass, and seems hardly consistent with the supposition that in the prophet's time the whole of the written law was confined to a few chapters in Ex, the so-called "Book of the Covenant." And the very next verse (8 13), "As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it; but Jeh accepteth them not," is at once an acknowledgment of the Divine institution of sacrifice, and an illustration of the kind of opposition the prophets entertained to sacrificial service as it was practiced. So when it is said, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies" (2 11; cf 9 5), the reference, as the context shows, is to a deprivation of what were national distinctive privileges; and the allusions to transgressions and trespasses against the law (8 1; cf Dt 17 2) point in the same direction. We have a plain reference to the Feast of Tabernacles (12 9): "I will yet again make the tents of Israel to dwell in tents, as in the days of the solemn feast" (cf Lev 23 39-43); and there are phrases which are either in the express language of the law-books or evident allusions to them, as "They are as they that strive with God" (12 11); "As the children of Judah are like them that remove the landmark" (5 10; cf Dt 19 14); "Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners" (9 4; cf Dt 26 14); "[They] the priests] feed on the sin of my people." (8 4; cf Lev 6 9). In verse 4 the prophet combines the fundamental fact in the nation's history and the fundamental principle of the law: "I am Jeh thy God from the land of Egypt; and thou shalt know no god but me" (13 4; cf Ex 20 3). It is, however, with the Book of Dt more than with any other portion of the Pent that the Book of Hos shows affinity; and the resemblances here are so striking, that the critics who hold to the late date of Dt speak of the author of that book as "the spiritual heir of Hosea" (Driver, Comm. on Dt, Intro, xxvii), or of Hosea as "the great spiritual predecessor of the Deuteronomist." Chayye, Jeredel, "the sixth" or "seventh" prophet of Israel" (10 8) refers to the schism of the ten tribes, the prominence given to the Davidic kingship, which, along with the references to Judah, some critics reject on merely subjective grounds, is quite inexplicable (4 15). We do not expect to find in a prophetic writing the same frequency of reference to the law as to the history; for it is the essence of prophecy to appeal to history and to interpret it. Of course, the moral and social aspects of the law are as much the province of the prophet as of the priest; but the ceremonial part of the law, which was under the care of the priests, though it was designed to be the expression of the same ideas that lay at the foundation of prophecy, is mainly touched upon by the prophets when, as was too frequently the case, it ceased to express those ideas and became an offence. The words of the prophets on this subject, when fairly interpreted, are not opposed to law in any of its authorized forms, but only to its abuses; and there are expressions and allusions in Hosea, although he spoke to the Northern Kingdom, where from the time of the schism there had been a wide departure from the Mosaic law, which recognizes its ancient existence and its Divine sanction. The much-debated passage (8 12), "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts" (RV or RVm "I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law"), on any understanding of the
had experience of their apostasy under the very shadow of Sinai, and all his life long to bear with a stiff-necked and rebellious people. Then, again, if these “Deuteronemic” ideas are found so clearly expressed in Hosea, why should it be necessary to postulate a late Deuteronomist going back upon older books, and editing and supplementing them with Deuteronomic matter? If Moses sustained anything like the function which all tradition assigned to him, and, as all confess, he was the instrument of molding the tribes into one people, those addresses contained in the Book of Dt are precisely in the tone which would be adopted by a great leader in taking farewell of the people. And, if he did so, it is quite conceivable that his words would be treasured by the God-fearing men among his followers and successors, in that unbroken line of prophetic men to whose existence both Amos and Hosea appealed, and that they should be found coming to expression at the very dawn of written prophecy. 

Hosea was the son of Beeri, the son of Joash, the son of Seilim, the son of Beeri, the son of Assir. He was one of the Twelve, called a prophet in the Expositor’s Bible, and the “prophet of the Twelve” in Eichhorn’s Commentary. The lapidary first of those who were the prophets of the Twelve, and the last, “Ephraim shall say, What have I to do anymore with idols?” (14:8), showing that, in the prophet’s estimation, the idolatrous worship of Jeh, as associated with the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, lay at the root of the nation’s evil.

Over this shrunk and weakened kingdom—corresponding generally with the Samaritan district of the NT—Hosea was placed position was 729, though he may have been appointed a few months earlier.

Tiglath-pileser III died in 727, so that three years’ tribute was probably paid to Nineveh. There was, however, a political party in Samaria, which, ground down by cruel exactions, was for making an alliance with Egypt, hoping that, in the jealousy and antipathies of the two world-powers, it might find some relief or even a measure of independence. Hosea himself a prophet of the north, allows us to see beneath the surface of court life in Samaria, “They call unto Egypt, they go to Assyria” (7:11), and again, “They make a covenant with Assyria, and oil is carried into Egypt” (12:1). This political duplicity from which it was the only way to save his people, probably took its origin during the time of Tiglath-pileser’s death.

Tigril-pileser III died in 727, that event Action either caused or promoted the treasonable action, and the large quantities of oil on the southward road was an object-lesson to be read of all men. On the accession of Shalmanese IV—who is the Shalmaneser of the Bible (2 K 17:3; 18:9)—Hosea would seem to have carried, or sent, the annual tribute for 726 to the treasury at Nineveh (2 K 17:3). The text is not clear as to who was the bearer of this tribute, but from the statement that Shalmaneser came up against him, and Hosea became his servant, it may be presumed that the tribute for the first year after Tiglath-pileser’s death was at first refused, then, when a military demonstration took place, was paid, and obedience promised. In such a case Hosea would have been required to attend at his suzerain’s court and do homage to the sovereign.

This is what probably took place, not without inquiry into the past. Grave suspicions were thus aroused as to the loyalty of Hoseas, and on these being confirmed by the discovery of two pieces of ancient writing which afterwards passed to “So king of Egypt,” and the further withholding of the tribute (2 K 17:4), Hosea was arrested and shut up in prison. Here he disappears from history. Such was the ignominious end of a king of kings, not one of whom had, in all the vicissitudes of two and a
quarter centuries, been in harmony with the theocratic spirit, or realized that the true welfare and dignity of the state lay in the unalloyed worship of Jehovah. With Hoshea in his hands, Shalmaneser's troops marched, in the spring or summer of 725, to the completion of Assyria's work in Pal. 7. Battle of Beth-arbel 11th chs on the divinely sanctioned mission of "the Assyrian" and of the ultimate fate that should befall him for his pride and cruelty in carrying out his mission. The campaign was not a bloodless one. At Beth-arbel—at present unidentified—the hostile forces met, with the result that might have been expected. "Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle" (Hos 10:14). The defeated army took refuge behind the walls of Samaria, and the siege began. The city was well placed for purposes of defence, being built on the summit of a lonely hill, which was Omri's reason for moving the capital from Tirzah (1 K 16:24). It was probably during the continuance of the siege that Isaiah wrote his prophecy, "Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim," etc (Isa 28), in which the hill of Samaria with its coronet of walls is compared to a diadem of flowers worn in a scene of revolting, which should fade and die. Micah's degray on the fall of Samaria (ch 1) has the same topographical note. "I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will uncover the foundations thereof" (ver 6).

Shalmaneser's reign was of exactly five years, December, 727 to December, 722, and the city fell in the 1st month of his successor's reign. The history of its fall is summarized in Sargon's great Khorsabad inscription in these words, "Samaria I besieged, I captured, 27,290 of her inhabitants I carried away. 50 chariots I collected from their midst. The rest of their property I caused to be taken." Hoshea's character is summed up in the qualified phrase, "He did evil in the sight of the Lord, yet not as the kings of Israel that were before." Hoshea's fall was taken symbolically in the history of the kingdom of Israel, mainly by the idolatry of Bethel the official sanction and prominence which each of his 18 predecessors had done. According to Hos 10:6 the golden calf of Samaria was to be taken to Assyria, to the shame of its erstwhile worshippers.

W. Shaw Caldecott

HOSPITALITY, hos-pi-ta'li-ti, HOST, host (φαλαβία, φιλαξία, "love of strangers," φίλος, φίλος, "guest," φίλος, φίλος, "friend; πανδοχεία, "inkeeper"): When the Nomads civilization of a people has advanced so far that some traveling has become necessary, but not yet so far that traveling by individuals is a usual thing, then hospitality is a virtue indispensable to the life of the people. This stage of culture was that represented in ancient Pal and the stage whose customs are still preserved among the present-day Arabs of the desert. Hospitality is regarded as a right by the traveler, to whom it never occurs to thank his host as if for a favor. And hospitality is granted as a duty by the host, who himself may very soon be dependent on some one else's hospitality. But none the less, both in OT times and today, the granting of that right is surrounded by an etiquette that has made hospitality so highly esteemed. The traveler is made the literal master of the house during his stay; his host will perform for him the most servile offices, and will not even sit in his presence without express request. To the use of the guest is given over all that his host possesses, stopping not even short of the honor of wife or daughter. "'Be we not all,' say the poor nomads, 'guests of Ullah? Has God given unto them, God's guest shall partake with them thereof; if they will not for God render his own, it should not be well with their bondman' (Arabia Deserta, 1, 228). The host is in duty bound to defend his guest against all comers and to lay aside any personal hatred—the murderer of a father is safe as the guest of the son.

An exquisite example of the etiquette of hospitality is found in Gen 18:1-8. The very fact that the three strangers have passed by Abraham's door gives him the privilege of entertaining them. When he sees them approaching he runs to beg the honor of their turning in to him, with oriental courtesy depreciates the feast that he is about to lay before them as a 'morsel of bread,' and stands by them while they eat. Manoah (Jgs 13:16) is equally pressing although more matter-of-fact, while Jehoro (Ex 2:20) sends out that 'the stranger may be brought in. And Job (31:32) repels the very thought that he could let the sojourner be unprovided for. The one case where a breach of hospitality receives praise is that of Jael (Jgs 4:5), perhaps to degenerate hospitality in the conflicts with the Canaanites or (perhaps more plausibly) to literary-critical considerations, according to which in Jgs 6 Sisera is not represented as entering Jael's tent or possibly not as actually tasting the food, a state of things which Jgs 4, written under later circumstances of city life. For contrasting opinions see "Jael" in EB and HDB.

It is well to understand that to secure the right to hospitality it is not necessary, even in modern times, for the guest to eat with his host, still less to eat salt specifically.

Table-Bond Indeed, guests arriving after sunset and departing the next morning not, as a rule, eat all in the tent of the host. It is sufficient to enter the tent, to grasp a tent-pin, or even, under certain circumstances, to invoke the name of a man as host. On the other hand, the bond of hospitality is certainly strengthened by eating with one's host给别人 a hospitality bond created by eating food belonging to him, even by stealth or in an act of theft. Here a quite different set of motives is at work. The idea here is that of kinship arising from participation in a common repast and in the modern Arab, the animal killed for his guest the dhabhlah or "sacrifice" (of HDB, II, 428). This concept finds its rather materialistic expression in the theory that after the processes of digestion are completed (a time estimated as two nights and the included day), the bond lapses if it is not renewed. There seem to be various references in the Bible to some such idea of a "table-bond" (Ps 41:9, e.g.), but hardly in connection directly with hospitality. For a discussion of them see Baas, "Oracle: Sacrifice to the People." In the city, naturally, the exercise of hospitality was more restricted. Where travel was great, doubtless commercial provision for the traveler was made from a very early day (cf Lk 10:34 and see LXX), and at all events free hospitality to all comers would have been unacceptably abused. Lot in Sodom (Gen 19) is the nomad who has preserved his old ideas, although settled in the city, and who thinks nothing of the "milk of human kindness" (ver 8) for his tents. The same is true of the old man of Gibeah of Jgs 19:16 ff. And the sin of Sodom and of Gibeah is not that wanderers cannot find hospitality so much as it is that they are unsafe in the streets at night. Both Lot and "the old man,"
however, are firm in their duty and willing to sacrifice their daughters for the safety of their guests. (Later ideas as to the position of woman should not be read back into these narratives.) However, when the city-dweller Rahab refuses to surrender the spies (Josh 2), her reason is that the breach of hospitality involved but her fear of Jah (ver 9). When Abraham's slave is in Nahor, and begs a night's lodging for himself and his camels, he accompanies the request with a substantial present, evidently conceived of as pay for the same (Gen 24 22 f). Such also are the modern conditions; of Benzinger-Socin in Baeckere's *Palestine*, xxxv, observe that "inmates" of private houses "are aware that Franks always pay, and therefore receive them gladly." None the less, in NT times, if not earlier, and even at present, a room was set apart in each village for the use of strangers, whose expenses were borne by the entire community. Most interpreters consider that the *kateluma* of Lk 2 7 was a room of this sort, but this opinion cannot be regarded as quite certain. But many of the wealthier city-dwellers still strive to attain a reputation for hospitality, a zeal that naturally was found in the ancient world as well.

6. **Christ and Hospitality.** Indeed, it is assumed that they may even make their own choice of hosts (Mt 10 7). In this case, however, the claims of the travelers to hospitality are accentuated by the fact that they are bearers of good tidings for the people, and it is in view of this latter fact that hospitality to them becomes so great a virtue—the "cup of cold water" becomes so highly meritorious because it is given "in the name of a disciple" (Mt 10 42; cf ver 41, and Mk 9 41). Rejection of hospitality to one of Christ's "least brethren" (almost certainly to be understood as *disciples*) is equivalent to the rejection of Christ Himself (Mt 25 42; cf ver 35). It is not quite clear whether in Mt 10 14 and Lk, simple refusal of hospitality is the sin in point or refusal to lodge or board.

In the Dispersion, the Jew who was traveling seemed always to be sure of finding entertainment from the Jews resident in whatever city he might happen to be passing through. The fact for the spread of early Christianity is inestimable. To be sure, some of the first missionaries may have been men who were able to bear their own traveling expenses or who were merchants that taught the new religion when on business tours. In the case of soldiers or slaves their opportunity to carry the gospel into new fields came often through the movements of the army or of their masters. And it was by an "infiltration" of this sort, probably, rather than by any specific missionary effort that the church of Rome, at least, was founded. See Romans, Epistle to the. But the ordinary missionary, whether apostle (in any sense of the word) or evangelist, would have been helpless if it had not been that he could count so confidently on the hospitality everywhere. From this fact comes one reason why St. Paul, for instance, could plan tours of such magnitude with such assurance: he knew that he would not have to face any problem of sustenance in a strange city (Rom 16 23).

As the first Christian churches were founded, the exercise of hospitality took on a new aspect, esp. after the breach with the Jews had begun. Not only did the traveling Christian look naturally to his brethren for hospitality, but the individual churches looked to the traveler for fostering the sense of the unity of the church throughout the world. Hospitality became a virtue indispensable to the well-being of the church—one reason for the emphasis laid thereon (Rom 12 13). As the organization of the churches became more perfected, the exercise of hospitality grew to be an official duty of the ministry and a reputation for hospitality was a prerequisite in some cases (1 Tim 3 2; 5 10; Tit 2 3). The exercise of such hospitality must have become burdensome at times (1 Pet 4 9), and as false teachers began to appear in the church a new set of problems was created in discriminating among applicants for hospitality. 2 and 3 Ju reflect some of the difficulties. For the later history of hospitality in the church interesting matter will be found in the *Didache*, chs xi, xii, *Apologetic of Aristides*, ch xv, and *Lucian's Death of Peregrinus*, ch xvi. The church certainly preferred to err by excess of the virtue.

An evaluation of the Bib. directions regarding hospitality for modern times is extremely difficult on account of the utterly changed conditions. Be it said at once, esp., that certain well-meant criticism of modern missions and methods, of organized finance, etc., on the basis of Christ's directions to the Twelve, is a woeful misapplication of Bib. teaching. The hospitality that an apostle could count on in his own day is something that the modern missionary cannot expect and something that it would be arrant folly for him to expect (Weinle, *Die chrstliche und die heutige Mission*, should be read by everyone desiring to compare modern missions with the apostolic). In general, the basis for hospitality has become merged in the larger field of charitable enterprise of various sorts. The modern problem nearest related to the old virtue is the question of providing for the necessities of the indigent traveler, a distinctly minor problem, although a very real one, in the general field of social problems that the modern church has to study. In so far as the NT exhortations are based on missionary motives there has been again a merging into general appeals for missions. The special virtue has become merged in the larger field of charitable enterprise of various sorts. The "hospitality" of today, by which is meant the entertainment of friends or relatives, hardly comes within the Bib. use of the term as denoting a special virtue.


**HOSTAGE, hos'tāj.** See WAR.

**HOST OF HEAVEN (טומא נָאָּ֣ה, סבְּחאָה həsʃaŋayim): The expression is employed in the OT to denote (1) the stars, frequently as objects of idolatry (Dt 4 19; 17 3; Jer 2 16; 17 16; 23 4 f; Jer 8 2; 19 13; Zeph 1 5), but also as witnesses in their number, order and splendor, to the majesty and providential rule and care of Jah (Isa 34 4; 40 26, "calleth them all by name"; 48 12; Jer 33 22); and (2) the angels (1 K 22 19; 2 Ch 18 18; Neh 9 6; cf Ps 105 21).

1) Star-worship seems to have been an enticement to Israel from the first (Dt 4 19; 17 3; Am 5 26; cf Acts 7 42-43), but attained special prominence in the days of the later kings of Judah. The name of Manasseh is particularly connected with it. This king built altars for "all the host of heaven" in the courts of the temple (2 K 21 3.5). Josiah destroyed these altars, and cleansed the temple from the idolatry by putting down the priests and burning the vessels associated with it (2 K 23 4-5.7).

2) In the other meaning of the expression, the
angels are regarded as forming Jeh's "host" or army, and He himself is the leader of them—"Jeh of hosts" (Isa 31:4, etc.)—though this designation has a much wider reference. See ANGELS; ASTROLOGY; LORD OF HOSTS; of Oehlers, Theol of OT, II, 270 ff (ET).

JAMES OHM

HOSTS, hosts, LORD OF. See Lord of Hosts.

HOTHAM, hō'tham, HOTHAN, hō'than (ὁθήν, ὅθην, "sea"); (1) An Asherite, son of Heber, family of Beriah (1 Ch 7:32).

(2) An Arcorite, father of two of the mighty men of David (1 Ch 11:44). AV, following LXX Hothir, Chahdan, has, incorrectly, Hothan.

HOTHIR, hō'thir ("cean, "abundance"); Mentioned in 1 Ch 25:425 among the sons of Heman, and one of those set apart for David for the musical service of God (cf ver 6).

HOUGH, hok. See HOCK.

HOUR, our (יוֹם, sha'athâ'ah, יָמָּה, shar'â'; ὥρα, hòra); Hour as a division of the day does not occur in the OT; the term shar'â' (sha'athâ') found in Dn 3:15, 4:33 (Heb 30); 5:5. The Gr hòra is commonly used in the NT in the same way, as "that same hour," "from that hour," etc, but it also occurs as a division of the day as, "the third hour," "the ninth hour," etc. The Hebrews would seem to have become acquainted with this division of time through the Babylonians, but whether before the captivity we are not certain. The mention of the sun dial of Ahaz would seem to indicate some reckoning of time during the monarchy. See TIME.

H. PORTER

HOURS OF PRAYER: The Mosaic law did not regulate the offering of prayer, but fully recognized its spontaneous character. In what manner or how far back in Jewish history the sacrificial prayer, mentioned in Lk 1:10, originated no one knows. In the days of Christ it had evidently become an institution. But ages before that, stated hours of prayer were known and religiously observed by all devout Jews. It evidently belonged to the evolutionary process of Jewish worship, in connection with the temple-ritual. Devout Jews, living at Jerusalem, went to the temple to pray (Lk 18:10; Acts 3:1). The pious Jews of the Diaspora opened their windows "toward Jerusalem" and prayed "toward" the place of God's presence (1 K 8:48; Dn 6:10; Ps 5:7). The regular hours of prayer, as we may infer from Ps 55:17 and Dn 6:10, were three in number. The first coincided with the morning sacrifice, at the 3d hour, or around 9 AM therefore (Acts 2:15). The second was at the 6th hour, or at noon, and may have coincided with the thanksgiving for the chief meal of the day, a religious custom apparently universally observed (Mt 15:36; Acts 27:35). The 3d hour of prayer coincided with the evening sacrifice, at the ninth hour (Acts 3:1; 10:30). Thus every day, as belonging to God, was religiously subdivided, and regular seasons of prayer were assigned to the devout believer. Its influence on the development of the religious spirit must have been incalculable, and it undoubtedly is, at least in part, the solution of the riddle of the preservation of the Jewish faith in the cruel centuries of its bitter persecution. Mohammedianism borrowed this feature of worship from the Jews and early Christians, and made it one of the chief pillars of its faith.

HENRY E. DODGE

HOUSE, huis (יוֹם, bayith; qôkî, qôkî, in classical Gr generally "an estate," oikia, oikia, oikêma [lit. "habitation"], in Acts 12:1, "prison").

I. CAVE DWELLINGS

II. Stone- and Mud-Brick-built Houses

1. Details of Plan and Construction

(1) Corner-stone

(2) Floor

(3) Gutter

(4) Door

(5) Hinge

(6) Lock and Key

(7) Threshold

(8) Hearth

(9) Window

(10) Roof

2. Houses of More than One Story

(1) Upper Chambers and Stairs

(2) Palaces and Castles

3. Internal Appearance

(1) Plaster

(2) Paint

(3) Decoration

(4) Cupboards

III. Other Meanings

LITERATURE

I. Cave-Dwelling.—The earliest permanent habitations of the prehistoric inhabitants of Pal were the natural caves which abounded throughout the country. As the people increased and gathered into communities, these abodes were supplemented by systems of artificial caves which, in some cases, developed into extensive burrowings of many adjoining compartments, having in each system several entrances. These entrances were usually cut through the rock down a few steps, or simply dropped to the floor from the rock surface. The sinking was shallow and the headroom low but sufficient for the undersized troglodytes who were the occupiers. Fig. 1 is the plan of an elaborate system of cave dwellings from Gezer, all adjoining and approached by 9 separate entrances (PEFS, October, 1905).

II. Stone- and Mud-Brick-built Houses.—There are many references to the use of caves as dwellings in the OT. Lot dwelt with his two daughters in a cave (Gen 19:30). Elijah, fleeing from Jezebel, lodged in a cave (1 K 19:9). The natural successor to the cave was the stone-built hut, and just as the loose field-bowlers and the stones, quarried from the caves, served their first and most vital uses in the building of defence walls, so did they later become material for the first hut. Caves, during the rainy season, were faulty dwellings, as at the time when protection was most needed, they were left shut through the surface openings which formed their entrances. The rudest cell built of rough stones in mud and covered with a roof of brushwood and mud was at first sufficient. More elaborate plans of several apartments, entering from what may be called a living-room, followed as a matter of course, and these, huddled together, constituted the homes of the people. Mud-brick buildings (Job 4:19) of similar plan occur, and to protect this friable material from the weather, the walls were sometimes covered with a casing of stone slabs, as at Lachish. (See Blass, A Mound of Many Cities.) Generally speaking, this rude type of building prevailed, although, in some of the larger buildings, square dressed and jointed stones were used. There is little or no sign of improvement until the period of the Hellenistic influence, and even then the improvement was slight, so far as the homes of the common people were concerned. Figs. 2 and 3 are the isometric sketch and plan showing construction of a typical small house from Gezer. The house is protected and

1. Details approached from the street by an open Plan and court, on one side of which is a cov-

Con-

ed way. The doors enter into a living-room from which the two very small and primitive private rooms, bedcham-

bers, are reached. Builders varied the plan to suit
requirements, but in the main, this plan may be taken as typical. When members of a family married, extra accommodation was required. Additions were made as well as could be arranged on the cramped site, and in consequence, plans often became such a meaningless jumble that it is impossible to identify the respective limits of adjoining houses. The forecourt was absorbed and crushed out of existence, so that in many of the plans recovered the arrangement shown in Figs. 2 and 3 is lost. Fig. 4 shows the elevation of the house from the court.

(1) Corner-stone (ἐγγραφή, pinnāh, Isa 28 16; Jer 61 26; λίθος ἀκρογωνίας, lithos akrogonias, 1 Pet 2 6).—In the construction of rude bowlder walls, more esp. on a sloping site, as can be seen today in the highlands of Scotland and Wales, a large projecting bowlder was built into the lower angle-course.

(2) Floor (πάτωμα, kurba).—When houses were built on the rock outcrop, the floor was roughly leveled on the rock surface, but it is more common to find floors of beaten clay similar to the native floor of the present day. Stone slabs were sparingly used, and only appear in the houses of the great.

It is unlikely that wood was much used as a flooring to houses, although Solomon used it for his temple floor (1 K 6 15).

(3) Gutter (מָעוֹן, cinnōr).—The “gutter” in 2 S 5 8 AV is obviously difficult to associate with the gutter of a house, except in so far as it may have a similar meaning to the water duct or “water course” (RV) leading to the private cistern, which formed part of the plan. Remains of open channels for this purpose have been found of rough stones set in clay, sometimes leading through a silt pit into the cistern.

(4) Door (מִזְבָּב, dolath, מָעון, pathāh; טָנָה, thirā).—Doorways were simple, square, entering openings in the wall with a stone or wood lintel (masākhōph, Ex 12 22 23; ‘ayl, 1 K 6 31) and a stone threshold raised slightly above the floor. It is easy to imagine the earliest wooden door as a simple movable boarded cover with back bars, fixed vertically by a movable bar slipped into sockets in the stone jamb. Doorposts (saph, Ezek 41 16) appear to have been in use, but, until locks were introduced, it is difficult to imagine a reason for them. Posts, when introduced, were probably let into the stone

**Fig. 1.—Plan of the Cave Dwellings at Gezer.**

It tied together the return angles and was one of the few bond-stones used in the building. This most necessary support claimed chief importance and as such assumed a figurative meaning frequently used (Isa 28 16; 1 Pet 2 6; see Corner-stone). The importance given to the laying of a sure foundation is further emphasized by the dedication rites in common practice, evidence of which has been found on various sites in Pal (see Excavations of Gezer). The discovery of human remains placed diagonally below the foundations of the returning angle of the house gives proof of the exercise of dedication rites both before and after the conquest. Hiel sacrificed his firstborn to the foundations of Jericho and his youngest son to the gates thereof (1 K 16 34). But this was in a great cause compared with a similar sacrifice to a private dwelling. The latter manifests a respect scarcely borne out by the miserable nature of the houses so dedicated. At the same time, it gives proof of the frequent collapse of structures which the winter rains made inevitable and at which superstition trembled. The fear of pending disaster to the man who failed to make his sacrifice is recorded in Dt 20 5: “What man is there that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle.” See illustration, p. 500.

**Fig. 2.—Isometric Sketch of a House at Gezer.**

Remains of open channels for this purpose have been found of rough stones set in clay, sometimes leading through a silt pit into the cistern.
at top and bottom, and, unlike our present door frame, had no head-piece. When no wood was used, the stone jambs of the opening constituted the doorposts. To the present day the post retains its function as commanded in Dt 6:9; 11:20, and in it is fitted a small case containing a parchment on which is written the exhortation to obedience.

6. Hinge (חרב, 1 K 7:50; ציר, Prov 26:14).—Specimens of sill and head sockets of stone have been discovered which suggest the use of the pivot hinge, the elongated swinging stile of the door being let into the sockets at top and bottom. A more advanced form of construction was necessary to this type of door than in the previous instance, and some little skill was required to brace it so that it would hold together. The construction of doors and windows is an interesting question, as it is in these two details that the joinery craft first claimed development. There is no indication, however, of anything of the nature of advancement, and it seems probable that there was none.

6. Lock and key ("lock," man‘ul, Neh 3:3, Hb; Cant 6:8; "key," ma‘âth, Jgs 3:25; fig. Isa 22:22; כְּלֶשׁ, כְּלֶת, Mt 16:19, etc.).—In later Hellenic times a sort of primitive lock and key appeared, similar to the Arab type. See Excavations of Gezer, 1, 197, and illustration in art. Key.

7. Threshold (ףד, saph, 1 K 14:17; Ezek 40:6f; מַפִּילָן, miphlan, 1 S 5:45; Ezek 9:3, etc.).—Next to the corner-stone, the threshold was specially sacred, and in many instances foundation-sacrifices have been found buried under the threshold. In later times, when the Hebrews became weaned of this unholy practice, the rite remained with the substitution of a lamp inclosed between two bowls as a symbol of the life. See Gezer.

8. Hearth (קיר, 1b, Jer 36:22,23, RV “braizer”; קִיר, kiyvr).—The references in the OT and the frequent discovery of hearths make it clear that so much provision for heating had been made. It is unlikely, however, that chimneys were provided. The smoke from the wood or charcoal fuel was allowed to find its way through the door and windows and the many interstices occurring in workmanship of the worst possible description. The “chimney” referred to (Hos 13:3) is a doubtful tr. The “fire in the braizer” (Jer 36:22 RV) which burned before the king of Judah in his “winter house” was probably of charcoal. The modern natives, during the cold season, huddle around and warm their hands at a tiny glow in much the same way as their ancient predecessors. The use of cow and camel dung for baking-oven (larnur) fires appears to have continued from the earliest time to the present day (Ezk 4:15). See also Hearth.

9. Window (חָלָה, thuris, Acts 20:9; 2 Cor 11:33).—It would appear that windows were often simple openings in the wall which were furnished with some method of closing, such as is suggested.
in Fig. 5, which, it may be conjectured, was somewhat the same as the primitive door previously mentioned. The window of the ark (hallôn, Gen 8 6), the references in Gen 26 8; Josh 2 15, and the window from which Jezebel looked (2 K 9 30), were presumably of the casement class. Ahaziah fell through a lattice (ebrakkāh) in the same palace, and the same word is used for the “networks” (1 K 7 41) “covering the bowls of the capitals,” and in Cant. 2 9, “through the lattice” (hārakkīm). It would appear, therefore, that some variety of treatment existed, and that the simple window opening with casement and the opening filled in with a lattice or grill were distinct. Windows were small, and, according to the Mish, were kept not less than 

6 ft. from floor to sill. The lattice was open, without glass filling, and in this connection there is the interesting figurative reference in Isa 54 12 AV, “windows of agates,” trd in RV “windows of rubies.” Heaven is spoken of as having “windows” (drubbāh) for rain (Gen 7 11; 8 2; 2 K 7 2, etc).

(10) Roofs (gāgh; śtyyn; šileq)—These were flat, and their construction is illustrated in Figs. 2 and 6. Cf. “The beams of our house are cedars, and our rafters are fire” (Cant. 1 17). To get over the difficulty of the larger spans, a common practice was to introduce a main beam (kūrah) carried on the walls and strengthened by one or more intermediate posts let into stone sockets laid on the floor. Smaller timbers as joists (“rafters,” rāḥāt) were spaced out and covered in turn with brushwood; the final covering, being of mud mixed with chopped straw, was beaten and rolled. A tiny stone roller is used here, as modern natively roof, and is used to roll the mud into greater solidity every year on the advent of the first rains. Similar rollers have been found among the ancient remains throughout the country; see Excavations of Gezer, I, 100;
P.E.P.S., Warren’s letters, 46. “They let him down through the tiles [κιπάςos, kàrâmos] with his cloak into the midst before Jesus” (Lk 5 19) refers to the breaking through of a roof similar to this. The roof (“housetop,” gāgh; śāma, ḏōma) was an important part of every house and was subjected to many uses. It was used for worship (2 K 23 12; Jer 19 13; 32 29; Zeph 1 5; Acts 10 9). Absalom spread his tent on the “top of the house” (2 S 16 22). In the Feast of the Tabernacles temporary booths (gukōh) were erected on the house tops. The people, as is their habit today, gathered together on the roof as a common meeting-place on high days and holidays (Jgs 16 27). The

Modern Arab Village.
existed, and the lack of the remains of stone steps suggests that they were wood steps, probably in the form of ladders.

(2) Palaces and castles (עֶרֶם, בֵּית, הָעֵקֶד; see also הַעֲרָב).—These were the public centers of the city and occupied the
part of every city and were more elaborately in plan, raised in all probability to some considerable height.

The Canaanite palace discovered by Macalister at Gezer shows a building of enormously thick walls and small rooms. Restored is the so-called Solomon’s palace at Samaria, revealing a plan of considerable area.

Solomon’s palace is detailed in 1 K 7 (see Temple).

In this class may also be included the megalithic fortresses with the beeve guard towers of an earlier date, described by Dr. Mackenzie (PEF, 1).

Walls were plastered (Lev 14:48), and small fragments of painted (Jer 22:14) plaster discovered from time to time show that some attempt at mural decoration was made, usually in the form of crudely painted line ornament. Walls were recessed here and there into various forms of cupboards (q.v.) at various levels. The smaller cuttings in the wall were probably for lamps, and in the larger and deeper recesses beds may have been kept and cuttings stored. (See also Architecture II, 2.)

III. Other Meanings.—The word has often the sense of "household," and this term is frequently substituted in RV for "house" of AV (e.g. Ex 12:3; 2 K 7:11; 10:5; 16:5; Isa 36:3; 1 Cor 1:11; 1 Tim 5:14); in certain cases for phrases with "house" RV has "at home" (Acts 2:46; 5:42). See also House of God.

IV. Literature.—Macalister, Excavations of Gezer; PEFS; Sellin, Excavations at Tell Taanach; Schumacher, Excavations at Tel Moversilim; Bliss, Mound of Many Cities; arts. In Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

ARCH. C. DICKIE

HOUSE, FATHER’S. See Father’s House.

HOUSE, GARDEN. See Garden House.

HOUSE OF GOD: In Gen 28:17-22 is Bethel (q.v.). In Jgs 1 and 2 Ch, Ezr, Neh, Ps, etc. (hāh hā-ḥōlām), a designation of the sanctuary = "house of Jeh" (of the tabernacle, Jgs 18:31; 20:18; AV of the temple, 1 Ch 19:11; 24:2; AV 5:2; Ch 2:14; Ps 42:4; Isa 2:3, etc.) of the 23 temple, Ezr 5:8-10, 19:12; 6:16; Neh 1:11; 11:1; Ch 7:51); spiritual, the NT, the "house of God" (ὁικία Θεοῦ) is the church or community of believers (1 Tim 3:15; Heb 10:21; 1 Pet 4:17; cf 1 Cor 3:9-16; 17:1; 1 Pet 2:5).

HOUSEHOLD, house-hold: Three words are usually found in the Bible where the family is indicated. These three are the Heb word bāyith and the Gr words oikia and oikos. The unit of the national life, from the very beginning, was found in the family. In the old patriarchal days each family was complete within itself, the oldest living sire being the unquestioned head of the whole, possessed of almost arbitrary powers. The house and the household are practically synonymous. God had called Abraham "that he might command his children and household after him" (Gen 18:19). The Passover-lamb was to be eaten by the "household" (Ex 12:3). The "households" of the rebels in the eighth-century Israelian kings (Nu 16:31-33; Dt 11:6). David’s household shares his humiliation (2 S 15:16); the children everywhere in the OT are the bearers of the sins of the fathers. Human life is not a conglomerate of individuals; the family is its center and unit, not different in the NT. The curse and the blessing of the apostles are to abide on a house, according to its attitude (Mt 10:13). A divided house falls ( Mk 3:25). The household believes with the head thereof (Jn 4:53; Acts 16:15-16). Thus the households became the nuclei for the early life of the church (Acts 2:42; 4:32). Of Pisac and Aqula at Rome (Rom 16:5), of Stephanas (1 Cor 16:15), of Onesiphorus (2 Tim 1:16), etc. No wonder that the early church made such an abundance of the family life.

And in the midst of all our modern, rampant individualism, the household is the throbbing heart of the church as well as of the nation.

HENRY E. DOSKER

HOUSEHOLDER, house-hold-der (οἰκοδομήτης, oikodespótēs): The word occurs in Mt 13:27,52; 20:1; 21:33, for the master or owner of a "household," i.e. of servants (doulos). The Gr word emphasizes the authority of the master.

HOUSETOP, house-top. See House.

HOW: Represents various Heb and Gr words, interrogative, interjectional and relative. Different uses refer to: (1) the unlimited, e.g. Gen 44:34, "How shall I go up to my father?" (חָא): Mt 6:28, "how they grow" (πάσα); 1 Cor 10:35, "how are the dead raised?" (2) degree, extent, frequency, "how grias" (Διώκειν, 2 Th 3:13, "how great"); "how much" (οὐκ εἰμὶ, Mt 27:13, "how much"); "how many" (Acts 9:13, hosos); "how much more" (Mt 7:11, πολλοὶ; 1 S 14:30, "aph kî"); "how oft" (Ps 78:40, kammah; Mt 18:21, poioth); "how long" (Job 7:19, kammān, Mt 17:16, ἠγέτου); the reason, wherefore, etc (Mt 18:12, ἱκά 2:49, τί; 4) means—by what means? (Jn 4:3, Vp); (5) cause (Jn 12:34; Acts 2:8; 21:21, πόδῃς); (6) condition, in state, etc (Lk 23:55, ἀπὸ; Acts 15:36, ἐπὶ ἑαυτῷ, τί); "how" is sometimes used to emphasize a statement or explanation (2 S 19:25, "How are the mighty fallen!"); "how" is also used for "that" (Gen 30:20, "eth ἀσθείρ, frequently "how that"), Ex 9:29, "率达到, etc mostly in the NT, ὅταν, Mt 12:3; 15:12; 20:21; Acts 7:25; Rom 7:1, etc., in AV).

RV has "wherefore" for "how" (Gen 38:29, m "how"); has "what" (Jgs 13:12; 1 K 16:6; Job 22:13; 1 Cor 14:20, omits 1 Cor 13:5); has "how" that (1 S 2:4; Gr kai thou).— (1) Rs: Jas 2:24; Rev 2:2; has "that even" for "how that" (He 12:17).—"What is this?" (Lk 19:2): omits "How is it?" (Mt 2:16, different text); "Do ye not yet, for how is it that? (Mk 8:21): have ye not yet (Ps 4:7, μόνον, Gr kai thou) for "how much" (Lk 19:15, different text); omits "how much" (Lk 7:22); "Then how" (Jas 2:24), has "cannot" for "How can he" (1 Jn 4:20); omits "How hast thou" (Jas 2:6, "how is" (Jn 31:41); has "how for the fashion which" (Gen 6:15, for "and" (Ex 18:1), for "what" (Jgs 18:24; 1 S 4:16; 1 Cor 7:16), for "why" (Job 18:28; 31:1; Jer 22:3; Gal 3:14) for "whom" (Jas 2:17), for "for" (Ps 42:4), for "God" (Prov 21:1) for "whereunto" (Mt 14:5); for "by what means" (Lk 5:36; Jn 9:21), for "how greatly" (Phil 1:8), "how that" for "because" (Ex 9:9; 1 Thes 1:3), for "how and how know you to" for "can" (Mt 16:8), "how for by whom" (Am 7:2-5).

"How" in compounds gives us Howbeit (how be it), it is the tr. of ἡδομ, "but," "truly," "yet" (Jgs 18:29); of ἀκάκ, "certainly," etc (Pr 3:8); of ἀφήνες, "moreover," etc (2 S 12:14); of κενά, "so," "thus" (2 Ch 32:31); of ὅμως, "only," "surely," "nevertheless" (1 K 11:13; of ἀλλὰ, "but," etc (Jn 7:27; Acts 485; 1 Cor 8:7), etc.; of ὧδε, "but," etc (Jn 6:23); of mentoi (Jn 7:13 AV); many other instances.

For "howbeit," RV has frequently "but" (2 K 19:13, etc.); "and" (2 Ch 21:20; Mt 5:15), "surely" (ERV) (Joh 30:24), "now" (Jn 11:18), "yet" (2 Cor 11:21), "nay, did" (He 3:16); omits (Mt 17:21, different
HUMANE SACRIFICE. See SACRIFICE, HUMAN.

HUMILATION, hūmil-i-tā'ahun, OF CHRIST (Acts 8 33; Phil 2 8). See KENOSIS; PERSON OF CHRIST.

HUMILITY, hūmil-i-tā (Ὑμητία, ἀνήσθαι; ταπεινοφροσύνη): (1) The noun occurs in the OT only in Prov 15 33; 18 12; 22 4; but the adj. "humble" appears frequently as the tr of 'āšî, 'āḏâw, 'āḏâh, in Prov 1 9; 9 8; 15 15 (cf. Neh 9 4); "afflicted"; the vb. as the tr of 'āḏâh, "to afflict," "to humble," and of kāḏâw, "to be or become humbled": e.g. (Pro 6 12; Mic 6 8). RV "humble" (Ps 14 7; 12 10) has RV "poor"; Ps 10 17; 34 20; 60 35; 66 5. (2) The adj. "humbleless" (Isa 11; 10 35) "brought low": for "He humblyth himself" (Jer 6 9). "It brought low. m. humbled himself": Ps 10 10. "Boweth down" (tapeinophrosūnēs) is τρείρε, "humbleness" (Col 2 18; 23; 1 Pet 5 6); (3) "humble" (Acts 8 33); for "man of humble body" (Phil 2 21) RV gives "body of our humiliation.

Humility is an essential characteristic of true piety, or of the man who is right with God. Humble men humed in order to bring them to Himself (Mt 8 23, etc.), and it is when men humble themselves before Him that they are accepted (1 K 21 29; 2 Ch 7 14, etc.).

The prayer of Manasseh, mentioned in 13 12 f. 18 f and included in this history, suggests the apocryphal book, "The Prayer of Manasseh," written, probably, in the 1st cent. BC. See Apoc.

J. Gray McAllister

HUCKSTER, huk'ster: A retailer of small wares, provisions, or the like; a peddler. "A huckster shall not be acquitted of sin" (Sir 26 29). Neither a merchant nor a huckster is without sin.

HUKKOK, huk'ok (חִוק, חַוק): A town on the border of Naphtali named with Aznoth-tabor (Josh 19 34). It is usually identified with the modern site of the W. of Wady el-'Ammi, to the W. of the N.G. of Sarepta, about 4 miles from the sea. This would fall on the boundary of Zebulun and Naphtali, between Tabor and Hanathoh (Josh 19 14). The identification may be correct; but it seems too far from Tabor.

HUKOK, huk'ok. See HELLKATH.

HUL, hul (וּל, הול): The name of one of the "sons of Aram" in the list of nations descended from Noah, but a people of uncertain identity and location (Gen 10 23; 1 Ch 1 17).

HULDAH, hul'dah ( חוֹלָד, חוֹלָד, "weepful"; Ὅλδα, Ὅλδα): A prophetess who lived in Jerus during the reign of Josiah. She was the wife of Shallum, keeper of the wardrobe, and resided in the "Mishnah" or second part or quarter of Jerus (location unknown). Cheyne says it should read, "She was sitting in the upper part of the gate of the Old City," i.e. in a public central place ready to receive any who wished to inquire of Jeh. He gives no reason for such a change of text. The standing and reputation of Huldah in the city are attested by the fact that she was consulted when the Book of the Law was discovered. The king, high priest, counsellors, etc., appealed to her rather than to Jeremiah, and her word was accepted by all as the word of Jeh (2 K 22 14-20; 2 Ch 34 22-20).

J. J. Reive

HUMAN SACRIFICE. See SACRIFICE, HUMAN.

HUMILITAS, hūmil-ī-ā'un, OF CHRIST (Acts 8 33; Phil 2 8). See KENOSIS; PERSON OF CHRIST.

HUMILITY, hūmil-ī-ā (Ὑμητία, ἀνήσθαι; ταπεινοφροσύνη): (1) The noun occurs in the OT only in Prov 15 33; 18 12; 22 4, but the adj. "humble" appears frequently as the tr of 'āšî, 'āḏâw, 'āḏâh, in Prov 1 9; 9 8; 15 15 (cf. Neh 9 4); "afflicted"; the vb. as the tr of 'āḏâh, "to afflict," "to humble," and of kāḏâw, "to be or become humbled": e.g. (Pro 6 12; Mic 6 8). RV "humble" (Ps 14 7; 12 10) has RV "poor"; Ps 10 17; 34 20; 60 35; 66 5. (2) The adj. "humbleless" (Isa 11; 10 35) "brought low": for "He humblyth himself" (Jer 6 9). "It brought low. m. humbled himself": Ps 10 10. "Boweth down" (tapeinophrosūnēs) is τρείρε, "humbleness" (Col 2 18; 23; 1 Pet 5 6); (3) "humble" (Acts 8 33); for "man of humble body" (Phil 2 21) RV gives "body of our humiliation.

Humility is an essential characteristic of true piety, or of the man who is right with God. Humble men humed in order to bring them to Himself (Mt 8 23, etc.), and it is when men humble themselves before Him that they are accepted (1 K 21 29; 2 Ch 7 14, etc.). To "walk humbly with thy God" completes the Divine requirements (Mic 6 8). In Ps 18 35 (2 S 22 30) the quality is ascribed to God Himself, "Thy gentleness for conscience sake" is great. Of "him that hath his seat on high" it is said, "[He] humblyth [shālpēl] himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in the earth" (Ps 113 6). It is in the humble heart that "the high and lofty One" (Isa 57 15; of 66 2). (b) The word tapeinophrosūnēs is not found in classical Gr (Lightfoot); in the NT (with the exception of 1 Pet 5 6) it is Pauline. In so far as Christian writers tapeinos is, with a few exceptions in Plato and Platonic writers, used in a bad or inferior sense—as denoting something evil or unworthy. The prominence it gained in Christian thought indicates the new concept of humility in relation to God, to himself, and to his fellow men, which is due to Christianity. It by no means implies slavishness or servility; nor is it inconsistent with a right estimate of oneself, one's gifts and calling of God, or with proper self-assertion when called for. But the habitual frame of mind or child of God is that of one who feels not only that he owes all his natural gifts, etc, to God, but that he has been the object of undeserved redeeming love, and who regards himself as being not his own, but God's in Christ. He cannot exalt himself, for he knows that he has nothing of himself. The humble mind is thus at the root of all other graces and virtues. Self-exaltation spoils everything. There can be no real love without humility. "Love," said Paul, "vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up" (1 Cor 13 4). As Augustine said, humility is first, second and third in Christianity.

(c) Jesus not only strongly impressed His disciples with the need of humility, but was in Himself its supreme example. He knew Himself as "meek and lowly [tapeinos] in heart" (Mt 11 29). The first of the Beatitudes was to "be poor in spirit" (Mt 5 3), and it was "the meek who should inherit the earth." Humility is the way to true greatness: he who is "humble himself as this little child" should be "the greatest in the kingdom of heaven": "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Mt 18 4; 23 12; Lk
11:18–14:1)

To the humble mind truth is revealed (Mt 11:25; Lk 10:21). Jesus set a touching example of humility in His washing His disciples' feet (Jn 13:1-17).

(d) St. Paul, therefore, makes an earnest appeal to Christians (Phil 2:1-11) that they should cherish and manifest the Spirit of their Lord's humility—"in nothing thinketh any of himself above that which he ought to think: but rather thinketh of himself according to the excellency wherewith God hath endowed him," and addsuce the supreme example of the self-emptying (kénòsis) of Christ: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, etc." The rendering of ἐγκάτιστος ἐγκατέστησαν (Phil 2:7 AV) by "the humbled himself" has given rise to the designation of the Incarnation as the "Humiliation of Christ."

(c) There is a false humility which Paul warns against, a self-sought, "voluntary humility" (Col 2:18). This is a physiological sensation associated with emptiness of the stomach, and dependent on some state of the mucous membrane; (2) starvation as the effect of want of food, as Ex 16:18; Isa 49:10; (3) to feed the craving for food as Dt 8:3; when under the impression of general scarcity of food as Jer 38:9; Ezk 34:29 it is replaced in RV by "famine." The word is used to express the poverty which follows idleness and sloth (Prov 19:15). The absence of this condition is given as one of the characteristics of the holy of holies (Ezek 40:11-17; 41:1, 3).

HUNGA, húr-gár (םְגַה), rá'ábbak; λυπος, λύμος (sucks.), πνεῦμον, πνεύμα (vb.) (1) the desire for food, hunger (Ps 14:5, 18); (2) a physical sensation, associated with emptiness of the stomach, and dependent on some state of the mucous membrane; (3) starvation as the effect of want of food, as Ex 16:18; Isa 49:10; (3) to feed the craving for food as Dt 8:3; when under the impression of general scarcity of food as Jer 38:9; Ezk 34:29 it is replaced in RV by "famine." The word is used to express the poverty which follows idleness and sloth (Prov 19:15). The absence of this condition is given as one of the characteristics of the holy of holies (Ezek 40:11-17; 41:1, 3).

HUNTAH, húm’tá (םְגַה, humath): An unidentified place mentioned between Apekah and Hebron in the mountain of Judah (Josh 15:54).

HUNDRED, hun’dred (םְגַה, me’ah; ἑκατόν, hecaton). See NUMBER.

HUNTING, hun’ting (כְּנַק, qayyāḏ): The hunting of wild animals for sport, or for the defence of men and flocks, or for food, was common in Western Asia and Egypt, esp. in early times. Some of the Egyptian and Assyrian kings were great hunters in the first sense, for example Amenhotep III (1411-1375 BC), "a lion-hunting and bull-baiting Pharaoh," who boasted of having slain 76 bulls in the course of one expedition, and of having killed in one day or other 102 lions; and the Assyrian conqueror, Tiglath-pileser I (c 1100 BC), who claimed 4 wild bulls, 14 elephants and 920 lions as the trophies of his skill and courage.

The Bib. prototype of these heroes of war and the chase is Nimrod (see 1. Nimrod and His Like or mythico-historical character in the Assyro-Babylonian monuments; but possibly the Gilgamesh of the great epic, who may be the hero represented on seals and reliefs as victorious over the lion (Skinner, "Gen," ICC, 208). We are reminded also of Samson's exploit at Timnah (Jgs 14:5-6), but this, like David's encounter with the lion and the bear (1 S 37:34 f) and Benaiah's struggle with a lion in a pit on a snowy day (2 S 23:20), was an occasional incident and scarcely comes under the category of hunting. There is no evidence that hunting was pursued by the kings of Judah and Israel. Not until the time of Herod the Great, who had a hunting establishment and was a great hunter of boars, stags, and wild asses (Jos, BJ, I, xx, 18), mastering as many as 40 beasts in one day, do we find a ruler of Pal indulging in this pastime.

Hunting, for the other two purposes mentioned above was probably as frequent among the Israelites, even after they had ceased to be nomads, as among their neighbors. We know indeed of only two personal examples, both in the patriarchal period and both outside the direct line of Israelite kings: Isaac (Gen 27:27 f) and Ishmael (Gen 21:20); but there are several references and many figurative allusions to the pursuit and its methods and instruments. Hunting (inclus. of bowing) is mentioned in the Pent in the regulation about personal service of the levites and covering it with dust (Lev 17:13); and there is a typical allusion in the proverb (Prov 12:27): "The slothful man restriseth not that which he took in hunting." The hunting of the lion is assumed in Ezekiel's allegory of the lion that is to devour the shepherds (Ezk 21:9-19; cf Job 10:16; of the antelope or the gazelle (Ezk 14:5; Isa 51:20); of the roe (Prov 6:5); of the partridge in the mountains (1 S 26:20), and of birds in general in many passages. Hunting is probably implied in the statement about the provision of harts, gazelles and roebucks for Solomon's kitchen (I K 4:23), and to some extent in the reference to the den of lions in Babylon (Dn 6:7 ff).

The weapons most frequently employed by hunters seem to have been bows and arrows. Isaac (Gen 27:3) commands Esau to take 3. Methods his bow and quiver and procure him of Hunters venison or game (cf also Isa 7:24; Job 41:28). This method is amply illustrated by the monuments. Ashur-nasir-pal III (885-860 BC) and Darius (c 500 BC), for example, are depicted shooting at lions from the chariot. Use was also made of the sword, the spear, the dart or javelin, the club and the cub (Job 41:26), the application of these weapons to hunting is implied. The larger animals were wounded in a pit. The classical reference is in Ezekiel's allegory, "He was taken in their pit" (shahoth, Ezk 19:48; c Also Is 34:17; Jer 48:45; Ps 35:7, etc.). The details of this mode of capture as practised

ALEX. MACALISTER
at the present day, and probably in ancient times, are described by Tristram in his Natural History of the Bible (118 f.). A more elaborate method is described by Maspero in Lectures historiques (285).

To make the pit-capture more effective, nets were also employed: "They spread their net over him" (Ezk 19:8; cf Ps 35:7). When caught, the lion was sometimes placed in a large wooden cage (Ezk 19:9, sughar, the Assyry shigaru; for the word and the thing of SBOT, "Ezk," Eng., 132; Heb, 71). The lion (or any other large animal) was led about by a ring or hook (hah) inserted in the jaws or nose (2 K 19:28=Isa 37:20; Ezk 19:4; 39:4; 38:4). From wild animals the brutal Assyrians transferred the custom to their human captives, as the Israelites were well aware (2 Ch 33:11 RVm, Heb hoph; for monumental illustrations cf SBOT, "Ezk," Eng., 132 f.). Nets were also used for other animals such as the oryx or antelope (Isa 51:20).

The hunting of birds or fowling is so often referred to that it must have been very widely practised (cf Ps 91:3; 124:7; Prov 17:6; 6:5; Ecc 8:12; Am 3:5, etc). The only bird specifically mentioned is the partridge said to be hunted on the mountains (1 S 16:20). The method of hunting is supposed by Tristram (NHB, 225) to be that still prevalent—continual pursuit until the creature is struck down by sticks thrown along the ground—but the interpretation is uncertain. Birds were generally caught by snares or traps. Two passages are peculiarly instructive on this point: Job 18:8–10, where six words are used for such contrivances, represented respectively by "net," "toils," "gin," "snare," "noose," "trap"; and Am 3:5, which is important enough to be cited in full: "Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no snare is set for him? shall a snare spring up from the ground, and have taken nothing at all?"

The word for "snare" (moketh) probably describes a net laid on the ground, perhaps a circular net like the Egypt bird-trap, represented in the Canaanite R). "Assyry shigaru," shows the method, "usually tsi in RV "snare" (moketh, lit. "fowling instrument") is supposed to refer either to the bait (th, 188) or to the catch connected with it which causes the net to collapse (Siegfried). For a full account of Egypt modes of fowling which probably illustrate animal hunting (chiefly of Wilkinson, Popular Account, 11, 178–83. The two words (moketh and sughar) mentioned above are used figuratively in many OT passages, the former repeatedly of the deadly influence of Canaanite idolatry on Israel, as in Ex 33:23. For if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee" (cf Ex 34:12; Dt 7:16; Josh 23:15). The use of the hawk in trapping, which was tested for Northern Syria by a bas-relief found in 1908 at Salke-Genizi, is not mentioned in the OT, but there may perhaps be an allusion in Am 3:8, "the birds that had their pastime with the fowls of the air". A reference to the use of decoys is found in Is 37:27, "a cage . . . full of birds," but that is a doubtful interpretation, and in the Gr of Sir 11:30, "As a decoy partridge in a cage, so is the heathen who believes, but the Heb text of the latter is less explicit. See FOWLER.

The NT has a few figurative allusions to hunting. The words for "catch" in Mk 12:13 and Lk 11:54 (agreō and theōreō) mean lit. "hunt." 5. Allusions. The vb. "ensnar[e]d" (papigeō) occurs in the NT once in the Gospels (Mt 23:15), and the noun "snare" (paga) is met with in 5 passages (Lk 21:34; Rom 11:19; 1 Tim 3:7; 6:9; 2 Tim 2:26). Another word for "snare" (trichōs), which means lit. "noose" (RVm), is used in 1 Cor 7:35. The word for "things that cause stumbling" and "stumble" (skandalon and skandala) may possibly conceal in some passages an allusion to a hunter's trap or snare, Skandalon is closely allied to skandaliōthron, "the stick in a trap on which the bait is placed," and is used in LXX for mokēth. The abundant use of imagery taken from hunting in the Bible is remarkable, in view of the comparative rarity of literal references.

LITERATURE.—In addition to the works cited in the course of the art., the art. "Hunting" in Smith's Bible Dictionary, is large and small, BB, Jew Enc., and Jacob in German Bible Dictionary. Of the Hebrew names, and Wiener, and in JPS W., William Taylor Smith, is probably the best handbook. HUPHAM, hup'a (הֵפַח, huphām, "coast-inhabitant"): One of Benjamin's sons and head of the Huphamite family (Nu 26:9). See HUPPHIM.

HUPPHIM, hup'ā (הֵפָיו, hupphāh, "protection"): The priest in charge of the 13th course as prescribed under David (1 Ch 24:13).

HUPPHIM, hup'ā (הֵפָיו, hupphām, "coastpeople"): Probably a variant form of Hupham in v. 8. From the only Hebrew mention made of them in Jgs 5:6 (cf Josh 14:6), 1 Ch 7:12), his direct descent is difficult to establish.

HUR, hur (הֵר, hur):

(1) A prominent official in Israel. With Aaron he held up Moses' hands during the battle against the Amalekites (Ex 17:10.12) and assisted him as judicial head of the people during Moses' stay in the mount (Ex 24:14).

(2) Grandfather of Bezaleel, the head artificer in the construction of the Tabernacle (Ex 31:2; 35:30; 36:22; 2 Ch 1:5). He is here assigned to the tribe of Judah, and in 1 Ch is connected with the same by descent through Caleb (2:19.20.50; 4:4). Jos (Ant, IV, ii, 4; v, 1) makes him identical with (1) and the husband of Miriam.

(3) One of the five kings of Midian slaid along with Balaam when Israel avenged the "matter of Peor" upon this people (Nu 31:8; cf vs 12.16). In Josh 13:21 these kings were spoken of as "chiefs [r'm] of Midian" and "princes [pēzār] of Sihon," king of the Amorites.

According to 1 K 4:8 AV, the father of one of Solomon's twelve officers who provided food for the king's household, and whose district was the hill country of Ephraim and used to take the Heb ben, "son of," as part of the proper name; and the same is true in reference to the...
names of four others of these officers (cf vs 9.10. 11.13).

(5) Father of Rephaiah, who was one of the builders of the wall under Nehemiah, and ruler of half the district of Jerus (Neh 3 9).

BENJAMIN RENO DOWNER

HURAI, húr'á (הָעָרָי, hû'ráy, "linen-weaver"): One of David’s "mighty men" mentioned in 1 Ch 11 32 as of the brooks of Gaash, i.e. of the land of Jeshua. In the 2 S 23 30, the orthography is Hiddai.

HURAM, húr'ám (הָעָרָם, hû'ram, "noble-born"): (1) Grandson of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 5). (2) King of Tyre in alliance with David and Solomon. So named in 2 Ch 2 3 3112; 8 2; 9 1021, but elsewhere written Hiram (q.v.). (3) The Tyrian artisan who is so named in 2 Ch 2 13; 4 116, but elsewhere called "Hiram."

HURI, húr'í (הָעַרְי, hû'ri, "linen weaver"): One of the immediate descendants of Gad, and father of Abihail, a man of his family (1 Ch 5 14).

HURT, húrt: The term (noun and vb.) represents a large number of Heb words, of which the chief are רע, ra' (vb. רעע, ra'a'), "evil" (Gen 26 29; I S 24 9; Ps 35 4, etc), and רעע or רעע, shebher or shebher (from רעע, shebhar, "a fracture" or "breaking") (Jer 6 14; 8 1121; 10 19; cf Ex 22 10.14). In Gr a principal vb. is ἄπτω, adptō, "to do injustice" (Lk 10 19; Rev 2 11; 63, etc); once the word "hurt" is used in AV (Acts 27 10, story of Paul's shipwreck) for ἡμέρω, hémra, "injury" (thus RV). In RV "hurt" sometimes takes the place of other words in AV, as "sick" (Prov 23 35), "breach" (Isa 30 26), "bruise" (Jer 30 12; Nah 3 19); sometimes, on the other hand, the word in AV is exchanged in RV for "evil" (Josh 24 20), "harm" (Acts 18 10), or, as above, "injury" (Acts 27 10). These references sufficiently show the meaning of the word—harm, bruise, breaking, etc. In Jer (ut supra) the word is used figuratively for moral disease or corruption. JAMES ORR

HUSBAND, huz'band (הusband, ʿāshāh, ārāh, anār): In the Heb household the husband and father was the head and institution of an estate which was regarded as more than a social organism, inasmuch as the family in primitive Sem society had a distinctively religious character and significance. It was through it that the cult of the household and tribal deities was practised and perpetuated. The house-father, by virtue of being the family head, was priest of the household, and as such, responsible for the religious life of the family and the maintenance of the family altar. As priest he offered sacrifices to the family gods, as at first, before the centralisation of worship, he did to Jeh as the tribal or national Deity. We see this reflected in the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and in the Book of Job. This goes far to explain such ritual acts as we have in Gen 31 53; 22 9, and the exceptional reverence that was paid the patriarchal sepulchers (I S 20 6). Abraham was regarded as being the father of a nation. It was customary, it would seem, to assign a "father" to every known tribe and nation (Gen 10). So the family came to play an important and constructive part in Heb thought and life, forming the base upon which the social structure was built, merging gradually into the wider organism of the clan or tribe, and vitally affecting at last the political and religious life of the nation itself.

The husband from the first had supreme authority over his wife, or wives, and children. In his own domain his rule was well-nigh absolute. The wife, or wives, looked up to him as their lord (Gen 18 12). He was chief (cf Arab. šēkē), and to dishonor him was a crime to be punished by death (Ex 21 15.17). He was permitted to divorce his wife with little reason, and divorces were all too common (Dt 22 13.19.28.29; Isa 50 1; Jer 3 8; 5 8; Mal 2 16, etc). The wife seems to have had no redress if wronged by him. Absolute faithfulness, though required of the wife was apparently not expected or exacted of the husband, so long as he did not violate the rights of another husband.

In general among Eastern people women were lightly esteemed, as in the Japhetic nations they came to be. Plato counted a state "disorganised, "where slaves are disobedient to their masters, and wives are on equality with their husbands."

"Is there a human being," asks Socrates, "with whom you talk less than with your wife?" But from the first, among the Hebrews, the ideal husband trained his household in the way they should go religiously, as well as instructed them in the traditions of the family, the tribe, and the nation (Gen 18 19; Ex 12 26; 13 8; Dt 6 7, etc). It was due to him in part at least, that, in spite of the worst acts and evils incident to polygamy, the Heb household was a nursery of virtue and piety to an unusual degree, and became a genuine anticipation of the ideal realised later in the Christian home (1 Cor 7 2 f; Eph 5 25; 1 Pet 3 7).

Used figuratively of the relation (1) between Jeh and His people (Isa 54 5; Jer 3 14; Hos 2 19 f); (2) between Christ and His church (Mt 9 15; 2 Cor 11 2; Eph 5 25; Rev 19 7; 21 2)

GEO. B. EAGER

HUSBANDMAN, huz'band-man, HUSBANDRY, huz'band-ri: Husbandman, originally a "householder" or "master of the house," is now limited in its meaning to "farmer" or "tiller of the soil." In this sense it is the correct tr. of the various Heb. words: רועyah רועיה, "hubbah, lit. "man of the soil" (Gen 9 20); רוד, ikkar, lit. "gigger," "a farmer" (2 Ch 26 10; Jer 31 24; 51 23; Am 5 16; Joel 1 11); בִּשְׂדֶה, gbeh, "to dig" (2 K 25 12); בַּשְׂדֶה, yaghabh, "to dig" (Jer 52 16); יָגוּפָר, gippar, "cultivator" (Mt 21 33 f; Jn 16 1; Jas 5 7). See Agriculture.

It is a common practice in Pal and Syria today for a rich man to own lands in many different parts of the country. He sets farmers over these different tracts who, with the helpers, do the plowing, planting, reaping, etc; or he lets out his lands to farmers who pay a yearly rental or a part of the produce to him. The name of the owner of the land is kept by 19th century writers. Many difficulties of the owner with his husbandmen described by Jesus are often repeated today.

Figurative: Jesus said "I am the true vine, and my father is the husbandman" (Jn 15 1). He sows, cultivates, prunes and expects fruits from His church. In the parable of the Householder (Mt 21 33 ff), the abundant harvest will not be forgotten. All the difficulties of the owner with his husbandmen described by Jesus are often repeated today.

JAMES A. PATCH

HUSBAND'S BROTHER (בָּן הָעָרָי, yābbām, "brother-in-law"; תָּנִום בָּרֵא, epigambrō; Latin levir): He was required (Dt 25 5-10; Mt 22
24) "to perform the duty of a husband's brother" (hubb'mah); that is, if his brother, living with him on the paternal estate, died without male issue, he should take the widow to wife, and "raise up seed unto his brother," the firstborn of the new marriage inheriting the deceased brother's estate. Refusal of the duty was possible, but entailed public ceremonial disgrace and lasting reproach. This provision for a specific case modified the general law which forbade the marriage of a sister-in-law (Lev 18 16. 18). It was a patriarchal custom (Gen 29, Judah and Tamar), and is alluded to in Ruth 1 11-13. A related custom is found in Ruth 4 1, Boaz playing, however, the part, not of levir ("brother-in-law"); but of gô'ël ("redeemer"). It was at least theoretically in force in Our Lord's time (Mt 22 25-26; the question of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection). For the origin and object of this custom see FAMILY, MARRIAGE.

PHILIP WENDELL CRANNEIL

HUSHAI, hû'sha (יוֹשָׁה, ֹוֹשָׁה, "haste"): Mentioned in 1 Ch 4 4 as probably an individual, a Judahite, or a family name; but may possibly be a place.

HUSHAI, hû'shah, hû'shāt (יוֹשָׁח, ֹוֹשֶׁח, יוֹשַׁח, חָוֵש, חַוֵּשׁ, חוֹשָׁח, חוֹשָׁא: An Architect, native of Archi or Erech(?), W. of Bethol on the northern border of Benjamin and southern border of Joseph (Josh 16 2). Hushai was one of David's most faithful and wise counsellors. When David was fleeing from Jerus and Absalom, Hushai met him, having his coat rent and earth on his head. The king persuaded him to return to Jerus, feign submission to Absalom, and try to defeat the counsel of Ahithophel (2 S 16 32). Whatever Absalom decided on, Hushai was to send word to David through two young men, sons of the priests Zakon and Abiathar (15 24-36). Hushai obeyed, and succeeded in persuading Absalom to adopt his counsel rather than that of Ahithophel (2 S 16 16-17 14). He sent word to David of the nature of Ahithophel's counsel, and the king made good his escape that night across the Jordan. The result was the suicide of Ahithophel and the ultimate defeat and death of Absalom.

J. J. REEVE

HUSHAM, hû'sham (ほう, ほう, hû'sham; Gen 36 34; 1 Ch 1 46-46, "alert"): According to the former reference, Husham was one of the kings of Edom, and according to the latter he was "of the land of the Temanites" and (1 Ch 1 35) descended from Esau.

HUSHATHIHE, hû'shath-it (יוֹשֶׁת, ֹוֹשֶׁת, "a dweller in Hushah"): The patronymic given in two forms, but probably of the same man, Sibbecai, one of David's thirty heroes (2 S 21 15; 1 Ch 11 29; 20 4; 27 11), or Mebunnai as named in the passage (2 S 23 27).

HUSHIM, hû'sh'm (ほう, ほう, ほう, ほう, ほう, hû'shim, "hearts"): (1) Family name of the children of Dan (Gen 46 29), but of form "Shuham" in Nu 26 42. (2) The sons of Aher, of the lineage of Benjamin (1 Ch 7 12). (3) One of the wives of Shaharaim, of the family of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 11).

HUSHSHATHIHE, hûsh'shath-it (יוֹשֶׁת, ֹוֹשֶׁת, "a dweller of Hushah"): Same as Hushathite (q.v.), except in recoplicated form (1 Ch 27 11; cf 11 29, Heb pronunciation).

HUSKS, husks (סֶקֶרַת, kerätz, i.e. "little horns," Lk 15 10): These are the pods of the carob tree (RVM), also called the locust tree (Ceratonia silique). This tree flourishes all over Pal, esp. on the western mountain slopes toward the sea; by the Arabs it is called kharābū. It is dioecious, has dense, dark, evergreen foliage, glossy leaves and long, curved pods, like small horns (hence the name). These pods which are from 4 to 9 in. in length, have a less specific case containing a pulpy substance in which the beans are imbedded; this pulp is of a pleasant, sweetish flavor and has a characteristic color, and is much loved by children. The pods are sold in the markets, both as cattle food and for the poor, who extract by boiling them a sweetish substance like molasses. The tradition that the "locusts" of Mt 3 4; Mk 1 6 were carob pods is preserved in the name given to them, "St. John's bread," but it has little to be said for it.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

HUYEZ, hu'az (Gen 22 21 AV). See Uz.

HUZZABB, hu'zab (ITIZE, ֔וֹזָבָה, only in Nah 2 7 AV and RVm): Its meaning is doubtful. According to Gezerina, it is a vb. Hoph. of yibb'mah ("haste"); but of yibb'tah ("flow," hence to be rendered with preceding v. "The palace is dissolved and made to flow down," Wordworth made it Pual of yize, naq'ab, "fix": "The palace is dissolved, though established," LXX renders with the next word, kē hapōstai ("the foundation [or treasure] is uncovered," AV, RVm and ARV text make it Hoph. of naq'ab, "fix," hence "It is decreed," perhaps more probably, with AV and RV text and ARV, it is a name, or noun with the article (or the corruption of such a word), referring either to the Assyr queen, or personifying Nineveh. No such queen is now known, but Assyriology may throw light. The "name" interpretation accords best with the general trend of the passage, which describes the desolation of a royal palace. BDB calls it "perhaps textual error." The Massoretic vocalization may be at fault.

PHILIP WENDELL CRANNEIL

HYACINTH, hi'synth (בֵּאְסֵנִים, haksinhos): RV uses this word in Rev 9 17 for AV "saffron," with reference, not to stone, but to dark-purple color. In Rev 21 20, where stone is meant, RV tr. "sapphire."

HYADES, hi'-des. See ASTROLOGY, 11, 4.

HYDASPES, hi'-des'pes (Ϝαντος, Hudsapes): A river mentioned in Jth 1 6 in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris, but otherwise unknown. It is possible there may be a confusion with the Hydaspes of India. Some have conjectured an identity with the Choaspe.

HYENA, hi'-ena (יוֹנָה, yôn'hâ; Jer 12 9; LXX ᾿Ιάννα, hûnā [der 12 9; Eclesus 13 15], of Arab. ַךָּב or ַךַּב, dab or dabu, "hyena"); cf לִבְּעַל, lîbâ'l, Zebaim [1 S 13 18; Neh 11 34]; also of לִבְּעַל, lîbâ'l, Zebaim [Gen 36 21 14:20; 1 Ch 1 38]; but not לִבְּעַל, lîbâ'l, Zebaim [Gen 10 19; 14 2, etc.]: EV does not contain the word "hyena," except in Eclesus 13 18, What peace is there between the hyena and the dog? and
what peace between the rich man and the poor?" In 1 Cor 2 9, where the Heb has ḥa-ayîy gâbbâth (RV "a speckled bird of prey"), LXX has πτήσις ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς, "a hyena's den," as if from a Heb origin. (Jer 4:3) But yet he had not done so, instead of ḥa-ayîy, "bird." The root gâbbâth may mean "to seize as prey" (cf Arab. seb, "lion" or "rapacious animal"), or "to dip" or "to dye" (cf Arab. zâbagh; "to dye"), hence the two tr of gâbbâth as "hyena" and as "speckled."

The hyena of Pal is the striped hyena (Hyaena striata) which ranges from India to North Africa. The striped, the spotted, and the brown hyenas constitute a distinct family of the order of Carnivora, having certain peculiarities of dentition and having four toes on each foot, instead of four behind and five in front, as in most of the order. The hyena is a nocturnal animal, rarely seen though fairly abundant, powerful but cowardly, a feeder on carrion and addicted to grave-robbing. The last habit in particular has won it the abhorrence of the natives of the countries which it inhabits. In the passage cited in Ecclus, it is to be noted that it is to the hyena that the rich man is compared. The name of the hyena is excellently strong and fitted for crushing bones which have resisted the efforts of dogs and jackals. Its dens are in desolate places and are littered with fragments of skeletons. "Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey?" (vulg) or by the name of an affluent of Wâdi-ul-Kelt. Either of these, or possibly Wâdi-ul-Kelt itself, may be the valley of Zeboim (valley of hyenas) of 1 S 13 18.

The name of Zebon the Horite (Gen 36 2, etc) is more doubtfully connected with "hyena."}

**ALFRED ELY DAY**

**HYMENAEUS, h-men-ë'as (Yµηµαιος, Hymenaios), so named from Hymen, the god of marriage, 1 Tim 1 20; 2 Tim 2 17.** A heretical teacher in Ephesus, an opponent of the apostle Paul, who in the former reference associates him with Alexander (see ALEXANDER), and in the latter, with Philets (see PHILETUS).

It is worthy of notice that in both passages where these persons are mentioned, the name of Hymenaeus occurs first, showing, perhaps, that 1. His he was the leader. In the passage in Career 1 Tim Hymenaeus is included in the list of the two persons who put away faith and a good conscience and who had made shipwreck concerning faith. The apostle adds that he had delivered Hymenaeus and Alexander unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme.

In the passage in 2 Tim, Hymenaeus and Philets are included among those who profess and vain babblings will increase unto more godliness, and whose word "will eat Denial of as doth a gangrene." The apostle the Resurrection declares that Hymenaeus and Philets are of the number of such people as those just described, and he adds that those two persons "concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some. Then, for the support of this doctrine, he goes on to say to the Jews upon the foundation of God is, "The Lord knoweth them that are his: and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." The inference intended is, that though Hymenaeus and Philets had named the name of Christ, they did not live in the spirit of discipleship. There is no doubt in regard to the identity of this Hymenaeus with the person of the same name in 1 Tim. Accordingly, the facts mentioned in the two epistles must be placed together, viz, that though he had made a Christian profession by naming the name of Christ, yet he had not done so, instead of 

**3. Incipient Gnosticism**

Paul says regarding it makes it evident that it was a form of Gnosticism. This spiritualizing of the resurrection sprung from the idea that the body is an imperfect material substance. This idea immediately led to the conclusion of the essentially evil nature of the human body, and that if man is to rise to his full stature, he must rid himself of the thraldom, not of sin, but of the body. This contempt for the body led to the denial of the resurrection in its literal sense; and all that Christ had taught on the subject was explained only, in an allusional sense, of the resurrection.

Teaching of this kind is described by Paul as having effects similar to the "eating" caused by a gangrene. It is deadly; it overthrows Christian faith.

If not destroyed, it would corrupt the communicants (1 Cor 2 18). There is no literal resurrection of the dead, then, as Paul shows in 1 Cor 15, Christ is not raised: and if the literal resurrection of Christ is false, Christian believers are yet in their sins, and the Christian religion is false.

The way in which the apostle dealt with these teachers, Hymenaeus and his companions, was not merely in the renewed assertion of the truth which they denied, but also by passing sentence upon these teachers—whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme.” In regard to the meaning of this sentence much difficulty of interpretation exists. Some understand it to mean simple excommunication from the church. But this seems quite inadequate to exhaust the meaning of the words employed by Paul. Others take it to signify the infliction of some bodily suffering or disease. This also is quite insufficient as an explanation. It seems that a person who was delivered unto Satan was cut off from all Christian privileges, he was “put away” from the body of Christian believers, and handed over to “the Satan,” the Evil One in his most distinct personality (1 Cor 2 15, 13, 11). In the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), and of Elymas (Acts 13 11).

It is important that the purpose of this terrible sentence should not be overlooked. The intention of the punishment was distinctly remedial. Both in the case of Hymenaeus and Alexander, and in that of the person dealt with in 1 Cor 6, the intention was the attaining of an ultimate good. In 1 Cor it is “for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” Similarly, Hymenaeus and Alexander were delivered unto Satan, not for their final perdition, but that they may be taught, through this terrible discipline—for such is the signification of the word which is τρεπεῖν “taught, not to blaspheme. The purpose of this discipline, for they might learn not to blaspheme, shows the dread magnitude of
impious, and of railing at Christian truth to which Hymenaeus had gone.

In the history of Hymenaeus and his companions, and in their bold and anti-Christian teaching which had overtopped the falter of the laws, we cannot fail to see the fulfillment of what Paul had said many years previously, in his farewell address to the elders of the church in Ephesus: "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter among you, not sparing the flock: and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:29 f.) It was in the Ephesian church that Hymenaeus and Alexander had acted. The gangrene-like nature of their teaching has already been described.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

HYMN, him (Ὑμνος, hýmnos): In Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:19 St. Paul bids his readers sing "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." Gregory of Nyssa (4th cent.) distinguishes these as follows: the Psalms were accompanied by instruments, the hymns were mainly vocal, and the song, ode, was a general term comprehending both. This distinction might suggest that the psalm belonged especially to the public worship of the church, while the hymn was the production, more or less spontaneous, of the individual members. The inference is, however, inconsistent with 1 Cor. 14:26, and it is probable that in the apostolic age, at least, the terms were used indiscriminately. Of Christian psalms or hymns we have examples in the NT. Lk. 1:55; 2:29; 2 Cor. 2:14 contain such hymns in the songs of Mary, Zacharias and Simeon. The Apocalypse is studied with hymns or odes, many of them quite general in character, and probably borrowed or adapted from Jewish books of praise. In the Ep. of Paul, esp. the later ones, fragments of hymns seem to be quoted. Lightfoot detects one in Eph. 5:14, and others readily suggest themselves.

It is probable that the hymn mentioned as having been sung by Jesus and the disciples after the Passover (Mt. 26:30; Mk. 14:26) was the second part of the Hallel, i.e. Ps. 113-116, and the hymns of Paul and Silas were most likely also taken from the Psalter. But the practice of interpolating and altering Jewish non-canonical books, like the Psalter of Solomon and the recently discovered Odes of Solomon, shows that the early Christians adopted for devotional purposes the rich store of sacred poetry possessed by their nation. For the music to which these psalms, etc., were sung, see Music; Song.

JAMES MILLAR

HYPOCRISY, hi-pok'ri-si, HYPOCRITE, hip'ô-krí-tē (Ὑπόκριτης, hupokritēs, ὑποκρίτες, ὑποκρίτης, hypocrites); (1) "Hypocrisy" occurs only once in the OT as the tr of hânēph (Isa. 32:6, RV "profaneness"); hânēph, from which it is derived, means properly "to cover," "to hide," or "becloud," hence to pollute, to be polluted or defiled, to make profane, to seduce; as a subst. it is τὸν "hypocrite" (Job 8:13; 13:16; 15:34; 25:5; 27:5; 34:30; 36:18): in all which instances RV has "godless man," "godless men," "godless"; Prov. 11:9, RV "the godless man"; Isa. 9:17, RV "profane"; Isa. 33:14, RV "the godless ones"); it is rendered "hypocritical," in Ps. 55:16; Isa. 10:6, RV "profane".

(2) "Hypocrisy," "hypocrite" are frequent in the NT, chiefly in Christ's discourses in the Gospels. The word hupokrīsis (primarily, "an answering," "response") meant generally, in classical Gr. stage-play, answering, the historical art; hence it came to mean "acting a part in life," etc. We find hupokrīsis in this sense in 2 Macc. 25, RV "dissimulation," and hupokrinomai, "to pretend," "to feign," etc. Ecles. 1:29; 32:15; 33:2, tr. "hypocrite"; 2 Macc.

5 25, "pretending peace," RV "playing the man of peace"; 6 21, RV "to make as if." Hypokritēs (lit. "an actor") is the LXX for hânēph (Job 34:30; 36:13), equivalent to bad, wicked, godless, which is perhaps included in some of Our Lord's uses of the word; e.g. Mt. 23:27 f., "full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (cf. vs. 29 f.; 24:51); but, in general, the meaning is acting a part, false, deceptive and deceived, formally and outwardly religious and good, but inwardly more evil and unrighteous; the hypocrite may come to deceive himself as well as others, but "the hypocrite's hope shall perish" (Job 8:13 AV). On no class did Our Lord pronounce such severe condemnation as on the hypocrites of His day.

"Hypocrisy" (hupokrisis) occurs in Mt. 23:28; Mk. 12:15; Lk. 11:41 (in Gal. 2:13 it is rendered "dissimulation"); "hypocrite" (hupokritēs), Mt. 5:8, 26; 15:7; 23:28; 23:13-15, 25. f. 29; 24:51; Mk. 7:6; Lk. 12:50; 13:16; in Jas. 3:17, anapōkois is "without hypocrisy" as RV. Rom. 12:19 ("unfeigned"). 2 Cor. 6:1; 1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:22.

W. L. WALKER

HYRANUS, hê-rê-kâ'nos (Ὑράνως, Hūrânōs): "Son of Tobias, a man of great dignity," who had a large sum of money deposited in the Temple of Jesus when Heilodorus was sent to confiscate it in 187 BC (2 Macc. 3:11 ff.). Opinions differ as to the identity of this H. with the grandson of Tobias whose birth and history are related at considerable length by Jos. (Ant. XII, iv. 6, ff.), or with another of the same name mentioned in Ant. XIII, viii, 4. See ASMONEANS; MACCABAEANS.

HYSSOP, his'up (Ἱσσόν, ἵσσον; ἱσσόσων, ἱσσόδως, Ex. 12:22; Lev. 14:4-16.49 ff.; Nu. 19:6.18; 1 K. 4:33; Ps. 61:7; Jn. 19:20; He. 9:19): A plant used for ritual cleansing purposes; a humble plant springing out of the wall (1 K. 4:35), the extreme custod of the cedar.
grow everywhere, being found even in the desert. Post thinks of all varieties the \textit{Origanum maris}, a special variety of marjoram which favors terrace walls and rocks, is the most probable.

The proposal (Royle, \textit{Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc.}, VII, 198–213) to identify the caper (\textit{Capparis spinosa}) with hyssop, which has been popularized by the works of Tristram, has not much to recommend it. It is true that the caper is very commonly seen growing out of walls all over Pal (1 K 4 33), but in no other respect it is suitable to the requirements of the Bib. references. The supposed similarity between the Arab, 'asaf ('caper') and the Heb 'ezbh is fanciful; the caper with its stiff, prickly stems and smooth, flat leaves would not furnish a bunch for sprinkling as serviceable as many species of \textit{sa'fr}. It has been specially urged that the hyssop suits the conditions of Jn 19 29, it being maintained that a stem of caper would make a good object on which to raise the "sponge full of vinegar" to the Saviour's face, the equivalent of the "reed" of Mt 27 48; Mk 15 36. For this purpose the flexible, prickly stems of the hyssop would be most unsuitable; indeed, it would be no easy matter to find one of sufficient length. It is necessary to suppose either that a bunch of hyssop accompanied the sponge with the vinegar upon the reed, or, as has been proposed by several writers (for references see art. "Hyssop," EB), that hussbō is a corruption of hussō, "javelin," and that the passage should read "They put a sponge full of vinegar upon a javelin."  

E. W. G. Masterman

\section{I}

\subsection{I.-AM, I AM THAT I AM. See God, Names of.}

\textbf{I WILL BE. See God, Names of.}

\subsection{IACIMUS, I-ac-im-us. See Alcimus.}

\subsection{IACUBUS, I-ac-ub-us (\textit{Iacobus}, Jacobus; 1 Esd 9 48): "Akkub" in Neh 8 7.}

\subsection{IADINUS, I-ad-in-us (\textit{Iadinos}, Iadeinos; 1 Esd 9 48, AV Adinus): Same as Jamin of Neh 8 7.}

\subsection{IBHAR, ib-har (\textit{ibhar}, ibhb'h, "He [God] chooses"); in S, B, \textit{Iebdr}, \textit{Ebedr}, in Ch, B, \textit{Beaup}, Badr, A, \textit{Iebdr}, \textit{Iedebdr}): One of David's sons, born at Jerus; son of a wife and not of a concubine (1 Ch 3 6; 2 S 5 15); otherwise unknown. His name in all three lists follows Solomon's. In Peshitta, "Juchabah."}

\subsection{IBIS, ib's. In Isa 34 11, yanshōph, which is rendered "owl," apparently indicates the sacred ibis (ibis religiosa). The LXX gives eibis and Vulg ibis; RVm "bittern." See Owl.}

\subsection{IBLEAM, ib'l'am (\textit{ibl'am}, ibhbb'h'am): A town in the territory of Issachar which was assigned to Manasseh (Josh 17 11). This tribe, however, failed to expel the inhabitants, so the Canaanites continued to dwell in that land (Jgs 1 27). It was on the route by which Ahaziah fled from Jehu. He was overtaken and mortally wounded "at the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam" (2 K 9 27). The name appears as Bleam in 1 Ch 6 70; and it probably corresponds to Belmen of Jth. It is now represented by the ruin of \textit{Bel'dimah} on the W. of the valley through which the road to the south runs, about half a mile from Jenin. In 2 K 18 10, where it is said that Zechariah the son of Jereboam was slain by Shallum "before the people," this last phrase, which is awkward in the Heb, should be added to read "in Bleam. Possibly "Gath-rimmon" in Josh 21 25 is a clerical error for "Ibleam." W. Ewing}

\subsection{IBNEIAH, ib-ne'ya (\textit{ibneiya}, yibhnh'yāh, "Jeh buildeth up"): A Benjamite, son of Jeroham (1 Ch 9 8).}

\subsection{IBNJIJAH, ib-nji'ja (\textit{ibnijya}, yibhnh'yāh, or \textit{ibnijya}, yibhnh'yāh, "Jeh buildeth up"): A Benjamite, father of Reuel (1 Ch 9 8).}

\subsection{IBRI, ib'ri (\textit{ibri}, ibhri, "a Hebrew"): A Merarite Levite, son of Jazaliah (1 Ch 24 27).}

\subsection{IBSAM, ib'sam (\textit{ibsam}, yibhs'am, "fragrant.") AV Jibsam): Descendant of Issachar, family of Tolath (1 Ch 7 2).}

\subsection{IBZAN, ib'zan (\textit{ibz'an), ibhzh'n): The 10th judge of Israel. His city is given as Bethlehem (whether of Judah or Zebulun is not stated). He judged Israel 7 years, and when he died he was buried in his native place. The only personal details given about him in the Bib. narrative are that he had 30 sons and a like number of daughters. He sent all of his sons "abroad" for wives and brought husbands from "abroad" for all his daughters. The exact meaning of ha-kūg, "abroad," is mere matter of speculation, but the great social importance of the man and, possibly, alliances among tribes, are suggested in the brief narrative (Jgs 12 8–10). Jewish tradition identifies Ibzan with Boaz of Bethlehem-Judah (Talm, \textit{Babba', Bathra' 91a}).}

\textbf{Ella Davis Isaacs}

\subsection{ICE, is (\textit{isc}, israh): Ice is almost unknown in Pal and Syria except on the highest mountains. At moderate heights of less than 4,000 ft. a little ice may form during the night in winter, but the warm rays of the sun melt it the next day. A great quantity of snow is packed away in caves in the mountains during the winter, and is thus preserved for use in the summer months. The word is found in the Bible in three places where it describes God's power. "Out of whose womb came the ice? And the . . . frost" (Job 38 29): "By the breath of God ice is given" (37 10): "He casteth forth his ice like morsels" (Ps 147 17).}

\textbf{Figurative: Untrue friends are compared to streams "which are black by reason of the ice" (Job 6 10).}

\textbf{Alfred H. Joy}

\subsection{ICHABOD, ik'a-bod, 'ka-bod (\textit{ichabod}, 'khabhóth, "inglorious"); B, o'ála bāwrában, o'ála bar-chabáth, A, o'álab xabáth, o'álab chabáth, "Achmou, Atimou"): Son of Phinehas, Eli's son, slain at the battle of Aphek when the ark was taken. Ichabod was born after his father's death. His mother gave him this name on her death-bed to indicate that the "glory [had] departed from Israel" (1 S 4 19 ff.). He was thus important as a symbol, though little is recorded of him as an individual. P火炬 His nephew Ahijah was one of those. P火炬 He tarried with Saul and the six hundred at Gibeath just before Jonathan's brave attack upon the Philis (1 S 14 21).}

\textbf{Henry Wallace}

\subsection{ICONIUM, i-kó'ni-um (\textit{Ikonion}, also \textit{Eikonion}, on inscriptions): Iconium was visited by St. Paul on his first and on his second missionary journey (Acts 13 51 ff.; 16 2 ff.), and}
if the “South Galatian theory” be correct, probably also on his third journey. His sufferings there are referred to in 2 Tim 3:11.

The topographical position of Iconium is clearly indicated in Acts, and the evidence of Acts has been confirmed by recent research. When Iconium was in Phrygia or in Lycaonia, and in what sense can it be said to have belonged to one ethnic division or the other? The majority of our ancient authorities (Cicero, Strabo, Pline), writing from the point of view of Rom provincial administration, give Iconium to Lycaonia, of which geography makes it the natural capital. But Xenophon, who marched with Cyrus’ expedition through Phrygia into Lycaonia, calls Iconium the last city of Phrygia. The writer of Acts 14:6 makes the same statement when he represents St. Paul and St. Barnabas as fleeing from Iconium to the cities of Lycaonia—implying that the border of Phrygia and Lycaonia passed between Iconium and Lystra, 18 miles to the S. Other ancient authorities who knew the local conditions well speak of Iconium as Phrygian until far into the Roman imperial period. At the neighboring city of Lystra (Acts 14:11), the natives used the “speech of Lycaonia.” Two inscriptions in the Phrygian language found at Iconium in 1910 prove that the Phrygian language was in use there for 2 centuries after St. Paul’s visits, and afford confirmation of the interesting topographical details in Acts (see Jour. Hell. Stud, 1911, 189). In the apostolic period, Iconium was one of the chief cities in the southern part of the Rom province Galatia, and it probably belonged to the “Phrygian region” mentioned in Acts 15:6. The emperor Claudius conferred on it the title Claudionium, which appears on coins of the city and on inscriptions, and was formerly taken as a proof that Claudius raised the city to the rank of a Rom colonia. It was Hadrian who raised the city to colonial rank: this is proved by its new title; Colonia Aelia Hadriana Iconium, and by a recently discovered inscription, which belongs to the reign of Hadrian, and which mentions the first durus, who was appointed in the new colony. Iconium was still a Hellenic city, but with a strong pro-Rom bias (as proved by its title “Claudian”) when St. Paul visited it.

About 295 AD, an enlarged province, Pisidia, was formed, with Antioch as capital, and Iconium as a “sort of secondary metropolis.”

3. Later History

The Byzantine arrangement, familiar to us in the Notitiae Episcopatuum, under which Iconium was the capital of a province Lycaonia, dates from about 372 AD. Iconium, the modern Ikonias, has always been the main trading center of the Lycaonian Plain. Trade attracted Jews to the ancient Phrygio-Hellenic city (Acts 14:1), as it attracts Greeks and Armenians to the modern Turkish town.

St. Paul’s experiences at Iconium form part of the theme of the semi-historical legend of St. Thekla, on which see Professor Ramsay’s Church in the Roman Empire, 380 ff.


V. W. CALDER

IDALASH, id’a-la-sh, yiddishash, “honey-sweet”[?]: A man of Judah, one of the sons of the father of Etam (1 Ch 4:3; LXX “sons of Etam”).

IDDO, id’dō, (1) (יִדְדָּו, יִדְדָה, "to be strong"); “happ,” “happy”[?], Ezr 8:17: The “chief at the place Caaphur,” who provided Ezra with Levites and Nehemiah, the head of the Levitical body of school, said to be one of the Nehemiah or temple slaves, but perhaps an “and” has slipped out, and it should read: “the chief of the Nehemiah.” 1 Esd 8:45.46 has “Loddeus [AV "Saddeous"], the captain who was in the place of the treasury,” kepheth meaning silver. LXX has “in the place of the silver [να ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ χρυσόν, εἰς ἵνα τιμήσην καὶ τοὺς πρεσβύτερους." . . . to his brethren and to the treasurers.”

(2) (יִדְדָּא, yiddā, “beloved,” or “loving,” 1 Ch 27:21): Son of Zechariah, and captain of the half tribe of Manasseh in Gilead, under David.


(6) (יִדְדָה, yiddā, “to be”; Kethibh יִדְדָה, ye’dāl, or יִדְדָו, yiddō, “decked,” “adorned”): Seer (boezh) and prophet (nabhī), the Chronicler’s “source” for the reign of Solomon (2 Ch 9:29): “The visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat”; and for the reign of Rehoboam (2 Ch 13:15): “The histories of Iddo יִדְדָה, yiddō the seer, after the manner of [or, “in reckoning”] genealogies” and for the reign of Abijah (2 Ch 13:22): “The commentary [midrash] of the prophet Iddo יִדְדָו, yiddō. He may have been the prophet whom the denounced Jeroboam (1 K 13), who is called by Jos and Jerome Jadon, or Iddo. Jerome makes Iddo and Oded the same.

(7) (יִדְדָה, yiddō, “loving, ” timely,” Zee 1:1): Grandfather (father, according to Ezra) of the prophet Zechariah. See also Zee 1:7; Ezr 6:1; 6:14 יִדְדָה, yiddō). In 1 Esd 6:1, “Adso.”

(8) (יִדְדָה, yiddō, “decked,” “adorned”), Neh 12:4.16: A priest who went up with Zerubbabel (ver 4); one of the priestly clans which went up (ver 16); perhaps same as (7).

PHILIP WENDELL CHANNEll

IDLE, i’dl, IDLENESS, i’dl-nes: Both words, adj. and noun, render different Heb words (from יִדוּד, “to be lazy,” יִדְדָה, “to relax,” and יִדְדָו, יִדְדָא, “to be quiet”). According to the Yahwistic narrative Pashah’s retort to the complaints of the Israelites was a charge of idleness (Ex 5:8.17). It was a favorite thought of Heb wisdom—practical wisdom of the life—what idleness inevitably led to poverty and want (Prov 19:15; Eccl 10:18). The “virtuous woman” or one who would not eat the “bread of idleness” (Prov 31:27). In Ezek 16:49 for AV “abundance of idleness,” RV “prosperous case.” In the NT ‘idle’ generally renders the Gr word ἀργος, ἀργος, lit. “inactive,” “dull,” “lazy,” ἄργος, ἄργος, “to be quiet.” According to the T. LEWIS

IDOLATRY, i-dol’a-tri, traphthim, “household idols,” “idolatry”; אֱדוֹלָטָה, edolat-
Idolatry

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

There is ever in the human mind a craving for visible forms to express religious conceptions, and this tendency does not disappear with the acceptance, or even with the constant recognition, of pure spiritual truths (see IMAGES). Idolatry originally meant the worship of idols, or the worship of false gods by means of idols, but came to mean among the OT Hebrews any worship of false gods, whether by images or otherwise, and finally the worship of Jeh through visible symbols (Hos 8:6; 10:5); and ultimately in the NT idolatry came to mean only the giving to any creature or human creation the honor or devotion which belonged to God alone, but the giving to any human desire a precedence over God's will (1 Cor 10:14; Gal 5:20; Col 3:5; 1 Pet 4:3). The neighboring gods of Phoenicia, Canaan, Moab—Baal, Melkart, Astarte, Chesmoh, Moloch, etc.—were particularly attractive to Jews, while the old Sem被称为 worship seriously affected the state religion of the Northern Kingdom (see Golden Calf). As early as the Asyria and Babylonia (8th and 7th cents. BC), various deities from the Tigris and Euphrates had intruded themselves—the worship of Tammuz becoming a little later the most popular and seductive of all (Ezk 18:14)—while the worship of the sun, moon, stars, and the Zodiace became so intensified that this was introduced into the temple itself (2 K 17:16; 21:3–7; 23:12; Jer 19:13; Ezek 8:16; Am 5:26).

The special enticements to idolatry as offered by these various cults were found in their definition of natural forces and their appeal to primitive human desires, esp. the sexual; also through associations produced by intermarriage and through the appeal to patriotism, when the help of some cruel deity was sought in time of war. Baal and Astarte worship, which was especially attractive, was closely associated with fornication and drunkenness (Am 2:7; cf 1 K 14:23, i), and also appealed greatly to magic and soothsaying (e.g. Isa 6:6; 2:2; 8:19).

Sacrifices to the idols were offered by fire (Hos 4:13); libations were poured out (Isa 66:7; Jer 17:18); the first-fruits of the earth and tithes were presented (Hos 2:8); tables of food were set before them (Isa 65:11); the worshippers kissed the idols or threw them their knelt or prostrated themselves (1 K 18:22; Jer 19:3); stretched out their hands in adoration (Isa 44:20); knelt or prostrated themselves before them and sometimes danced about the altar, gashing themselves with knives (1 K 18:26–28; for a fuller summary see Hos 4:14).

Even earlier than the Bab exile the Heb prophets taught that Jeh was not only superior to all other gods, but reigned alone as God, other deities being nonexistent (Lev 19:4; Isa 2:8; 12:20; 19:13; 31:7; 44:9–20). The severe satire of this period proves that the former fear of living demons supposed to inhabit the idols had disappeared. These prophets also taught that the temple, ark and sacrifices were not essential to true spiritual worship (e.g. Jer 3:16; Am 5:21–25). These prophecies produced a strong reaction against the previously popular idol-worship, though later indications of this worship are not infrequent (Ezk 14:1–8; Isa 42:17). The Maccabean epoch placed national heroism plainly on the side of the one God, Jeh; and although Gr and Egyg idols (2 K 18:19) were worshiped in Gaza and Ascalon and other half-heathen communities clear down to the 5th or 6th cent. of the Christian era, yet in orthodox centers like Jerus they were despised and repudiated utterly from the 2d cent. BC onward. See also Golden Calf; Gods; Images; Talmud; Prim.

Frazer, Golden Bough (3 vols); L. R. Farnell, Evolution of Religion, 1905; Bandelissen, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, Baethgen, Der Gott Israels u. die Götter der Heiden, 1888.

CANDEN M. COBERN

IDUEL, id’u-el (7Wordos, Idoelos); 1 Esd 8:43, Evm ‘Ariel’ (q.v.),

IDUMAEA, id-d’m-A’a, IDUMAEANS, id-d’m-A’-an. See Edom.

IDEDIAS, i’d-e’-das, IDEDIAS, ‘Lyassas, ‘Idedias; One who agreed to put away his foreign wife (1 Esd 9:26); called also ‘Jezeias.

IEZER, i’e-zar, IEBERITES, i’e-zar-’tas (‘Yezuz, ‘Iezer, Nu 26:30); Contracted from Abihezer (Josh 17:2, etc) (q.v.).


IGDALIAH, ig-da-l’a (‘Ygal, ‘Ygal, ‘Ygydalayh, ‘Jeh is great’); Ancestor of certain persons who had a ‘chamber’ in the temple in Jeremiah’s time (Jer 35:4).

IGEAI, i’ge-al, i’ge-al (‘Ygal, ‘Ygal, ‘he [i.e. God] redeems’); A remote descendant of Iddo (1 Ch 3:22, RV ‘Igai’).

IGNORANCE, ign’a-rans (‘Ygno, shghaghah; ‘Ynocia, ‘ignoria): ‘Ignorance’ is the tr of shghagh, ‘wandering,’ ‘going astray’ (Lev 4:2, etc; ‘if a soul sin through ignorance,’ RV ‘unwittingly,’ m ‘through error’; 5:15; Nu 16:24 ff; cf 35:11; Josh 20:3 ff; Ecd 5:6; 10:5, ‘an error’). In the Law shghaghah means ‘innocent error,’ such as had to be taken with consideration in judgment (see passages referred to). ‘Ignorance’ is also expressed by the negative lō ‘with ysdha, ‘to know’ (Isa 56:10; 63:16; Ps 73:22); also by bi-briel da’ath, lit. ‘in want of knowledge’ (Dt 19:4; cf 4:12; Josh 20:5, the ‘unawares,’ ‘unwittingly’).

In the NT the word ‘agnoia, ‘absence of knowledge’ (Acts 3:17; 17:30; Eph 4:18; 1 Pet 1:14); ‘agnomos, ‘error’ (He 9:7, RVM ‘Gr ignorances’); ‘agnosia, ‘ignorance’ (1 Pet 2:15), ‘no knowledge’ (1 Cor 15:34 RVM); ‘agnosia, ‘be without knowledge,’ ‘ignorant’ (Rom 1:13; 10:3; 11:25), ‘not knowing’ (Rom 2:4, etc), ‘understood not’ (Mk 9:32, etc), ‘ignorantly’ (Acts 17:23, RV ‘in ignorances’; 1 Tim 1:13); ‘idiot, trd ‘ignorant’ (Acts 4:13), ‘unlearned’ (1 Cor 14:16, RVM ‘him that is without gifts’), ‘unlearned’ and ‘ignorant men’; ‘agnammatos, corresponds to modern ‘illiterate’ (cf Jn 7:15; Acts 26:24); ‘idiotas’ originally denoted ‘the private man’ as distinguished from those with a knowledge of affairs, and took on the idea of contempt and scorn. In Philo it denoted the whole congregation of Israel as distinguished from the priests (De Vita Mosis, III. 29). With Paul (1 Cor 14:16,23:24) it seems to denote ‘plain believers as distinguished from those with special religious gifts.’ In Acts 4:13 it may refer to the want of Jewish learning it certainly it does not mean ignorant in the modern sense.

Paul in Rom 1:18,32 attributes the pre-Christian
ILLUSTRIUS, i-lus-trius, THE (θαυμαστός, thumastos): A title of rank and merit attached to the name of Bartaeus, the father of Apame (1 Esd 4 29, AV "the admirable"). Instead of "the illustrious" we should possibly read "colonel" (Acts XI, iii, 5; EB, s.v.). See BARTAEUS; APAME.

ILLRICUM, i-lir'i-kum (Ilium, Illirikon): A province of the Rom Empire, lying E. and N.E. of the Adriatic Sea. In his Ep. to the Rom Paul emphasizes the extent of his missionary activities in the assertion that "from Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." (16 19). An examination of this statement indicates three assertions: What is the force of the preposition "even unto" (μέχρι, méchri)? What meaning is borne by the word Illyricum? and, At what period of his missionary career did Paul reach the limit he spoke of? In Gr., as in Eng., the preposition "unto" may either be exclusive or inclusive. In other words, Paul may mean that he has preached throughout Macedonia as far as the Illyrian frontier, or his work may involve a journey within Illyricum itself, extending perhaps to Dyrrachium (mod. Durazzo) on the Adriatic seaboard, which, though belonging politically to Macedonia, lay in "Gr. Illyria." But since no word is said of any extension of Paul's travels beyond the confines of Macedonia, and since the phrase, "I have fully preached," precludes a reference to a hurried or cursory tour in Illyricum, we should probably take the word "unto" in its exclusive sense, and understand that Paul claims to have evangelized Macedonia as far as the frontier of Illyricum.

What, then, does the word "Illyricum" denote? It is sometimes used, like the Gr terms Illyris and Illyria, to signify a vast area lying between the Danube on the N. and of "Illyricum" — Macedonia and Thrace on the S., extending from the Adriatic and the Alps to the Black Sea, and inhabited by a number of warlike and semi-civilized tribes known to the Greeks under the general title of Illyrians (Appian, Illyr. 1; Suetonius, Tiberius, 16); it thus comprised the provinces of Illyricum (in the narrower sense), Pannonia and Moesia, which for certain financial and military purposes formed an administrative area, together with a strip of coast land between Dalmatia and Epirus and, at a later date, Dacia. Appian (Illyr. 6) even extends the term to include Raetia and Noricum, but in this he appears to be in error. But Illyricum has also a narrower and more precise meaning, denoting a single Roman province, which varied in extent with the advance of the Roman conquest but was finally organized in 10 AD by the emperor Augustus. At first it bore the name superius Illyricum or simply Illyricum; later it came to be known as Dalmatia (Tac. Annals, iv.5; Jos, BJ, II, xvi; Dio Cassius, xii.36, etc.). In accordance with Paul's habitual usage of such terms, together with the fact that he employs a Gr form which is a transliteration of the Lat Illyricum but does not occur in any other extant Gr writer, and the fact that he is here writing to the church at Rome, we may conclude that in Rom 15 19 Illyricum bears its more restricted meaning.

The Romans waged two Illyrian wars: in 229–228 BC and in 218 BC, but no province was formed until 167, when, after the fall of the Macedonian power, Illyria received its provincial constitution (Livy, xiv.26). At this time it extended from the Drin (mod. Drin) to Dalmatia, which was gradually subjugated by Rom arms. In 59 BC Julius Caesar received as his province Illyricum and Gaul, and
later Octavian and his generals, Aemilius Paullus and Statilius Taurus, waged war there with such success that in 27 B.C. the province of Illyricum was conquered. During the reign of Augustus and the Senate, Illyricum was regarded as wholly pacified and was assigned to the latter. Renewed disturbances led, however, to its transfer to the emperor Tiberius. Two years later the province was extended to the Danube, but in 4 B.C. by Pontius Pilate at the close of the 3rd Pannonian War, it was divided into two separate districts, Pannonia and Illyricum (Dalmatia). The latter remained an imperial province, consisting of Illyricum proper pro praetore residing at Salonae (mod. Splitak), and two legions were stationed there, at Dalmatium and at Burunae. One of these was regarded, however, by Vespasian, and thenceforward the province was garrisoned by auxiliary troops. Some circuits (consentes), that of Scardona comprising Liburnia, the northern portion of the province, while those of Sacedon and Naarona made up the district of Dalmatia in the narrower sense. The land was rugged and mountainous, and inhabited by a dozen legions; but slowly, the Romans, however, organized 8 Roman colonies within the province and a considerable number of municipia.

The extension of Paul's preaching to the Illyrian frontier must be assigned to his 3rd missionary journey, i.e., to his 2nd visit to Macedonia. His movements during the 1st Relation to visit (Acts 16 12-17) are too fully recorded to admit of our attributing it to that period, but the account in Acts 20 2 of his second tour is not only very brief, but the words, "when he had gone through in the provinces occupying, according to Romans, the summer and autumn of 56 AD. See also Dalmatia.

LITERATURE.--A. M. Pollux, Quod praepise apud Romanos advos Dioctetianam feminae Illyricum fuerti (Paris, 1846); Zippel, Die römische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus (Leipzig, 1877); H. Corn, La province romaine de Dalmatie (Paris, 1883); T. Mommsen, CIL, III, pp. 279 ff. T. Mommsen e J. Marquardt, Manuel des antiquités romaines (Pt. 1), 16, 171 ff.

M. N. Tod

IMAGE, ɪmˈdʒɪm, ɪˌmɛl, ɪˈkɒm; ikˈənː): Its usage falls under 3 main heads. (1) "Image" as object of idolatrous worship (truly about a dozen words, including ἰμάγεος, ἰμαγεὐόμαι, "molten image") [Dt 9 12, etc]; ἱματίους, ἱματία, "garmented image") [Ex 23 24, etc]; ἰμάτιον, ἰμάτια, "garment"") [Ex 20 4, etc]; ɪˌmɛl, ɪˈkɒm, "image") [2 K 11 18, etc]; ɪˈkɒm, "image") [e.g. Rev 14 9]; (2) of man as made in the image of God; (3) of Christ as the image of God. Here we shall confine ourselves to the last two usages. For "image" in connection with idolatrous practices, see Idolatry; Images; Pillar; Teraphim, etc.

1. MAN AS MADE IN THE DIVINE IMAGE.—To define man's fundamental relation to God, the priestly writer in Gen uses two words: "image" (םב, בים) and "likeness" (_yamlath; once employing both together (Gen 1 26; cf 6 5), but elsewhere one without the other, "image" only in 1 27; 9 6, and "likeness" only in 5 1. The priestly writer alone in the OT uses this expression to describe the nature of man, though the general meaning of the passage Gen 1 26 f is echoed in Ps 8 5-8, and the term itself reappears in Apoc (Sir 17 3; Wisd 2 20) and in the NT (see below).

The idea is important in relation to the Bib. doctrine of man, and has figured prominently in theological discussion. The following are some of the questions that arise:

(a) Is there any distinction to be understood between "image" and "likeness"? Most of the Fathers, and some later theologians, attempt to distinguish between them. (a) a "two-faced" (םב יד) approach, in which "image" is physiological form and "likeness" to his spiritual nature (Justin Martyr; Irenaeus). (b) Others, esp. the Alexandrian Fathers, hold by "image" to mental and moral endowments native to man, and by the "likeness" the Divine perfection man only gradually acquires through free development and moral conflict (Clement of Alexandria and Origen), or which is conferred on man as a gift of grace. (c) This became the basis of the later Roman Catholic distinction between the natural gifts of rationality and freedom (i.e. Augustinian natural endowments of grace which God bestowed on man after He had created him (the likeness = donum supernum); the man was not "created" though in an unenfeoffed state; the latter was lost through sin, but restored by Christ. This distinction, however, was rejected; maintaining that supernatural righteousness was part of the true and ideal nature of man, i.e. "image" = donum supernum, the externality of the externally superseded. Whatever truth these distinct

(2) What then, is to be understood by the Divine image? Various answers have been given.

(a) Some of the Fathers (influenced by Philo) supposed that the "image" here = the Logos (called the "image of the invisible God" in Col 1 15), on the pattern of whom man was created. But to read the Logos doctrine into the creation narrative is to ignore the historic order of doctrinal development. (b) That it connotes physical resemblance to God (see 1, above; so in the main Skinner, ICC, in loc.). It may be admitted that there is a secondary reference to the Divine dignity of the human body, but the "image" is of the matter, inasmuch as God is not represented as having physical form. (c) That it consists of dominion over the creatures (Scenician view; so also Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, etc. This would involve a "two-way" view of the image of God. (d) It is true that such "dominion" is closely associated with the image in Gen 1 26 (cf Ps 8 5-8). But the "image of God" must denote primarily man's relation to his Creator, rather than his relation to the creation. Man's lordship over Nature is not identical with the image, but is an effect of it. (e) It is best to take the term as referring to the whole dignity of man, in virtue of his fundamental affinity to God. It implies the possession by man of a free, self-conscious, rational and moral personality, like unto that of God—a nature capable of distinguishing right and wrong, of choosing the right and rejecting the wrong, and of ascending to the heights of spiritual attainment and communion with God. This is the essential distinction of man from the beast, and his supremacy as the culmination of the creative process.

(3) Does the term imply man's original perfection, lost through sin? The old Protestant divines maintained that the first man was not possessed original righteousness, not only in germ but in developed form, and that this Divine image was destroyed by the Fall. Exegetically considered, this is certainly not taught by the priestly writer, who makes no mention of the Fall, assumes that the image was transmitted from father to son (cf Gen 5 1 with 5 3), and natively speaks of post-divulgin men as created in the image of God (Gen 9 6; cf 1 Cor 11 7; Jas 3 9). Theologically considered, the idea of the perfect holiness of primitive man is based on an abstract conception of God's work in creation, which precludes the idea of development, ignores the progressive method of the Divine government and the essential place of effort and growth in human character. It is more in harmony with modern conceptions (a) to regard man as originally endowed with the power of right choice, rather than with a complete character given from the first; and (b) to think of the Divine image (though seriously affected) as losing the sinful state, as man's inalienable capacity for goodness and truth as his destination. If the Divine image in man is a self-conscious, rational and ethical personality, it cannot be a merely accidental or transitory attribute, but is an essential constituent of his being.
Two features may be distinguished in the NT doctrine of the Divine image in man: (1) man's first-century characteristic (2) his second or new creation in Christ. As to (1), the NT doctrine of the OT is assumed in the NT. Paul makes a special application of it to the question of the relation of husband and wife, which is a relation of subordination on the part of the wife, based on the fact that man alone was created immediately after the Divine image (1 Cor 11:7). Thus Paul, for the special purpose of his argument, confines the meaning of the image to man's lordly authority, so that if he regards this as exhausting its significance would be quite unwarranted. Man's affinity to God is implied, though the term "image" is not used, in Paul's sermon to the Athenians (Acts 17:28 f., man the "offspring of God"). See also Jas 3:9 (it is wrong to curse men, for they are "made after the likeness of God").

(2) More characteristic of the NT is the doctrine of the new creation. (a) The redeemed man is said to be in the image of God (the Father). He is "shewn unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col 3:10), i.e. of God the Creator, not here of Christ or the Logos (as some (cf. Eph 4:24, "after God"). Though there is here an evident reference to Gen 1:26 f., this does not imply that the new creation in Christ is identical with the original creation, but only that the two are analogous. To Paul, the spiritual man in Christ is on a higher level than the natural ("psychical") man as found in Adam (cf. Gen 1:26 f.), in whom the Divine image consisted (as we have seen) in potential goodness, rather than in full perfection. Redemption is infinitely more than the restoration of man's primitive state. (b) The Christian is further said to be gradually transformed into the image of the Son of God. This progressive metamorphosis involves not only moral and spiritual likeness to Christ, but also ultimately the Christian's future glory, including the glorified body, the "passing through a gradual assimilation of mind and character to an ultimate assimilation of mind and character to the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation" (Sanday and Headlam, Rom. 218; see Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; and cf. Phil 3:21; 1 Jn 3:2).

II. Christ the Image of God.—In 3 important passages in EV, the term "image" defines the relation of Christ to God the Father; twice in Paul: "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" (2 Cor 4:4); "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15); and once in He: "who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance" (1:3). These statements, taken in their contexts, register the highest reach of the Christology of the Eph.

In the two Pauline passages, the word used is eikón, which was generally the LXX rendering of σημεῖον (Vulg: image); it is derived from εἰκόν, εἰκόν, εἰκά, εἰκόν, to be like; "resemble," and means that which resembles an object and represents it, as a copy represents the original. In He 1:3 the word used is χαράκτηρ (charakter), which is found here only in the NT, and is tr in Vulg figura, AV "express image," RV "a representation," from χαράκτω (charaktō), "to engrave," and has passed through the following meanings: (1) an engraving instrument (active sense); (2) the engraved stamp or mark on the instrument (passive sense); (3) the mark put on wax or other object; (4) hence, generally, the exact image or expression of any person or thing as corresponding to the original, the distinguishing feature, or traits by which a person or thing is known (hence Eng. words "character." The same word occurs in the same meaning as eikón; but Westcott distinguishes them by saying that the latter "gives a complete representation, under conditions of earth, of that which it figures," while charakter conveys representative traits only (Westcott on He 1:3).

The idea here expressed is closely akin to that of the Logos doctrine in Jn (1:1–18). Like the Logos, the Image in Paul and in He is the Son of God, and is the agent of creation so applied as the medium of revelation. To Christ: "What a word (logos) is to the ear, namely a revelation of what is within, an image is to the eye; and thus in the expression there is only a translation, as it were, of the same fact from one sense to another" (Dorner, System of Ch. D., ET, III, 178). An Image, Christ is the visible representation and manifestation of the invisible God, the objective expression of the Divine nature, the face of God turned as it were toward the world, the exact likeness of the Father in all things except being the Father. Thus we receive "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor 4:6). He is the facsimile of God.

Is Christ described as the Image of God in His preincarnate, His incarnate, or else His exalted state? It is best to say that different State Does It Refer? No, if we take the whole trend of NT to the Son, Christ is essentially and, in every state, the Image of God. (a) In He 1:3 the reference seems to be to the eternal, preincarnate Son, who is inherently and essentially the expression of the Divine substance. So Paul deliberately transformed the form of God (οὐ φωτιζόμενος εἰκόνα υπάρχουσαν, en morphē theou huparchōn, Phil 2:6). (b) In Jn 1:18; 12:45; 14:9, though the term image is not used, we have the idea of the historical Jesus as a perfect revelation of the character and glory of God. (c) In the two Pauline passages (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15), the reference is probably to the glorified, exalted Christ; not to His preexistent Divine nature, nor to His temporal manifestation, but to His "whole self, in the divine-human, in the heavenly existence" (Meyer). These passages in their cumulative impressions convey the idea that the Image is an inalienable property of His personality, not to be limited to any stage of His existence. Does this involve identity of essence of Father and Son, as in the Homousion formula of the Nicene Creed? Not necessarily, for man bears the image of God, even in logical his sinful state (see I above), a fact which the Arians sought to turn to their advantage. Yet in the light of the context, we must affirm of Christ an absolutely unique kinship with God. In the Col passage, not only are vast cosmic and redemptive functions assigned to Him, but there is said to dwell in Him "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (1:19; 2:9).

In He not only is the Son the final revelation of God to men, the upholder of the universe, and the very image of the Divine nature, but also the effulgence άμμοπάσμα) of God's glory, and therefore of one nature, RV "Son of God," AV "the seed of the woman," "the seed of the woman." The superiority of the Son is not thus merely one function of but nature. On the other hand, the figure of the "image" certainly guards against any Sabellian identification of Father and Son, but it suggests that there are modes of the one Person; for we cannot identify the pattern with its copy, nor speak of anyone as an image of himself. And, finally, we must not
overlook the affinity of the Logos with man; both are the image of God, though the former in a unique sense. The Logos is at once the prototype of humanity within the Godhead, and the immanent Divine principle within humanity.

Both in Paul and in He we have an echo of the Jewish doctrine of Wisdom, and of Philo's doctrine of the Logos. In the Alexandrine Book of Wisdom, written probably under Stoic influence, Divine Wisdom is pictorially represented as "an effulgence (apau-

sharal) or radiant light, and an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image (eikon) of His goodness" (T. 26). Philo repeatedly calls the Logos or Divine world-principle the image (eikon, charakter) of God, and also describes it as an effulgence of God. But this use of current Alexandrian terminology and the superficial resemblance of ideas are no proof of conscious borrowing on the part of the apostles. There is this fundamental distinction, that Philo's Logos is not a self-conscious personality, still less a historical individual, but an abstract idea; whereas in Paul and He, as in John, the Divine archetype is actually realized in a historical person, Jesus Christ, the Son and Revealer of God.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

IMAGE OF GOD. See GOD, IMAGE OF.

IMAGERY, im'j-rî (יוֹסֵפָה, maskith, "carved figure"): Only in Ezek 12, "every man in his chambers of imagery," i.e. dark chambers on whose walls were pictures in relief portraying all kinds of reptiles and vermin, worshipped by elders of Israel. Some maintain that the cult was of foreign origin, either Egypt (Bithrothai, Comm. on Ezek), or Bab (Redpath, Lost Temples of Bab); others that it was the revival of ancient superstitions of a totemistic kind which had survived in obscure circles in Israel (W. R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, rev. ed. 357). The word here rendered "imagery" is elsewhere in AV the "image" (of stone) (Lev 26 1, RV "figured stone"), "pictures" (Nu 33 52, RV "figured stones"), Prov 25 11, RV "network"); twice it means imagination, conceit, i.e. a mental picture (Ps 78 20; Prov 18 11). "Imagery" becomes ours in Art (88 13 57 AV, isis hortophoros, isis hortophoros, RV "to preserve likeness in his portraiture").

D. MIALL EDWARDS

IMAGES, im'j-iz (יִבְקֵל, ἱερώματα, εἰκόνα, eikon):
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6. Bible References
7. Palestinian Customs
8. Jeroboam's Calves
9. Brazen Serpent
10. Tablets
11. Image of Jealousy
12. Chambers of Imagery
13. Ephod
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Images, as used here, are visible representations of supposedly supernatural or divine beings or powers. They may be (1) themselves objects of worship, (2) pictures, emblems or dwelling-places (temple, ark, pillar, priests) of deities worshipped, (3) empowered instruments (amulets, charms, etc.) of objects worshipped, (4) pictures or symbols of deities revered though not worshipped. These images may be shapeless blocks, or symmetrically carved figures, or objects of Nature, such as animals, sun, moon, stars, etc.

These visible objects may sometimes be considered, esp. by the uninstructed, as deities, while by others in the small community they are thought of as instruments or symbolizations of deity. Even when they are thought of as deities, this does not exclude a sense and apprehension of a spiritual godhead, since visible corporeal beings may have invisible souls and spiritual attributes, and even the stars may be thought of as "seats of celestial spirits." An idol is usually considered as either the deity itself or his permanent tenement; a fetish is an object which has been given a magical or divine value either because of its having been the temporary home of the deity, or because it has been formed or handled or otherwise spiritually influenced by such deity. The idol is generally communal, the fetish private; the idol is protective, the fetish is usually not for the common good. (See Jevons, Idea of God in Early Religions, 1910.) Relics and symbolic figures do not become "images" in the objectionable sense until reverence changes to worship. Until comparatively recent times the Hebrews seem to have offered no religious object to "artistic" images, as is proved not only from the description of Solomon's temple, but also from the discoveries of the highly decorated temple of Jah at Syene dating from the 6th century B.C. from ruins of synagogues dating from the pre-Christian and early Christian periods (PEP, January, 1908; Expos, December, 1907; Expos T, January and February, 1908). The Second Commandment was not an attack upon artistry but upon idolaters. Decoration by means of grave images was not anciently condemned, though, as Jos shows, by the time of the Seleucidae all plastic art was regarded with suspicion. The brazen serpent was probably destroyed at Jericho's fall, but it had ceased to be an ancient artistic relic and had become an object of worship (see below). So the destruction of the ark and altar and temple, which for so long a time had been the means of holy worship, became at last, a prophetic hope (Lea 6 7; Jer 3 6; Am 5 25; Hos 6 6; cf Zec 14 20). While the temple was not naturally thought of as an "image," it was as truly so as any Bethel. An idol was the temple in miniature—a dwelling-place of the god. Touchstone of its age was the temple, and any image of the room of the deity or a means by which a false god was worshipped, it became antagonistic to the First and Second Commandments respectively.

The learned author of the art. on "Image Worship" in the EB (11th ed) dispenses too easily of this question when he suggests that

2. Origin

Image-worship is "a continuance by adults of their childish games with dolls... Idolatrous cults reappear largely on make-believe."
and naturally accompanies the organic unfold-
ment of the human animal in his struggle toward
self-expression. This is not therefore ac-
knowledged to be true of religious feeling and instinc-
t (see esp. Rudolf Eucken, Christianity and the
New Idealism, 1909, ch 1; I. King, The Devel-
opment of Religion, 1910); it ought to be counted
equally true of religious expression. Neither can
the origin of image-worship or even of magical rites
be fully explained, as Fraser thinks, by the ordi-
nary laws of association. These associations only
become significant because the devoted worshipper
already has a body of beliefs similar to that of
Babylonia. Generalizations which make him attentive to the associations which
seem to him religiously or magically important.
(Jastrow, Aspects of Rel. Belief and Practice in Bab-
ylonia and Assyria; cf James H. Leuba, Psych-
ological Origin and Nature of Religion, 1909;
Study of Religions, 1911). So animism must be
regarded as a philosophy rather than as an original
religion, since it is based on an "explanation of
phenomena rather than an attitude of mind
basically toward the cause of these phenomena" (EB, 11th ed.
art, "Animism," and of Hoffding, Philosophy of Reli-
gion, 1906, 138). In whatever ways the various
image-worshipping cults arose historically—whether
from a primitive demonology or from the apothe-
osis of natural objects, or from symbolic, or from tal-
cults—certainly with effect in any case it had
some human need behind it and human nature
beneath it. The presence of the image testifies to
faith in the supernatural being represented by the
image and the wish to keep it close to worship.
Prayer is easier when the worshipper can
see his god or some sacred thing the god has honored
(of M. L'abbé E. Van Drival, De l'origine et des

The first man was not born with a totem-pole in
his list, nor did the earliest historic men possess
images. They lacked temples and
altars and ephods and idols, as they
lacked the fire-stick and potter's
wheel. Religion, which showed itself
earlier than Tyler and all the older scientific anthrop-
ologists supposed. Those earlier investigators
were without extended chronological data, and
although ingenuity was exercised in systematizing
the beliefs and customs of modern savages, it was
necessarily impossible to always to determine in this
way which were the most primitive cults. Exca-
vations in Babylonia, Egypt and elsewhere have
enabled us for the first time to trace with some
chronological certainty the religious expressions of
earliest historic man. That primitive man was so
stupid that he could not tell the difference between
men and things, and that therefore totemism or
fetishism or a low form of animism was necessarily
the first expression of religious thought is a theory
which can not longer be held the face of the new and striking knowledge, material
and religious, which is now seen to be incorporated in
some of the most ancient myths of mankind.
(See e.g. Winckler, Die jungste Kämpfe unter den
Sumerern, 1907; Robert Hay, "The relation of the
Deities to the Sun, Moon, Stars, and other forces of
Nature. Out of these conceptions and the mys-
tery of life—which seems to have affected early
mankind even more powerfully than ourselves—
 Gardiner, The Gods of Egypt, 1923.) The sun appears as divine and the moon as "the bull
among the stars," and rough figures of the gods were
carved in human or animal form, or these are rep-
resented pictorially by diadems or horns or ostrich
feathers, as far back as the II! Dynasty, while
even earlier than this staves and pillars and heaps
of stones are sacred. (See further, HDB, 5th vol,
176 ff; Erman, A Handbook of Egypt Rel.; Steindorf,
Rel. of the Ancient Egyptians, 1905.) These rude
and unshaped objects do not testify, as was once
supposed, to a lower form of religious development than
when sculptured images are found. The shapeless fetish, which not long ago was generally
accepted as the earliest form of image, really repre-
sents a more advanced stage and as such is a
sacrifice of religious expression than the worship of a beau-
fully or horribly carved image. It has been gen-
erally conceded since the days of Robertson Smith
that it takes at least as much imagination and
reflection to see an object of no religious im-
mence as in the carved forms. Rude objects un-
touched by human hand, even in the most fully
developed worships, have been most prized. The
earliest images were probably natural objects which,
because of their peculiar shape, suggested the
thought of either as divine or as made sacred by
the touch of deity. Multiplied copies of these ob-
jects would naturally be made when worshippers
increased or migrations occurred. While images
may have been in use in the most early cults, yet
the highest development of image-worship has
occurred among the most civilized peoples. Both
deities and idols are less numerous in the early than
in the later days of a religion. This is true in
India, Assyria, Phoenicia, and Egypt of bureau
and the Semites, whose gods were Schumer the
ancient block. These, as the fetish, were probably adored, not for
themselves, but for the spirit that was supposed to
be in them or to have touched them. Deities and
idols are multiplied easily, not only by philological,
geographical and social causes, but through inter-
tribal and international associations. One thing
absolutely proved by recent excavations has been the
to which the representations of local
deities have been modified by the symbolic art of
surrounding nations. Babylonia, for example,
was influenced by the Syro-Hittite religious art at
least as much as by that of Egypt (William Hayes
Ward, Cylinder Seals and Other Ancient Oriental Seals,
1909; Clay, Assyr. 1910). Even in adjacent
localities the same deity varied greatly in its pic-
torial representation. See Palestine Ex-
ploration, and Revue biblique, XIV, 315-48. With
the possible exception of one reign in Egypt, during
which the sun disc was worshipped without the
worshiped excepting the sun disc and himself,
"illegality outside of the Heb kingdom was never made
a crime against the state until the days of Con-
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stinate. Theodosius (302 AD) not only placed sacrifices and divination among the capital crimes, but placed a penalty upon anyone who entered a heathen temple.

The dignity of the image in common thought in Bible times may be seen from the fact that man is said to have been made in God's image (Gen 1:26, *qal lem;* cf 1 S 22 5; Nu 33 92), and Christ is said to be "the image of the invisible God" (*eikon elohim* of Col 1 15 with Rom 1 23). The study of the sun and stars and idols as being images of the gods, while the Hebrews, though Jeh's temple was imageless, thought of normal humanity as in some true sense possessing a sacred resemblance to Deity, though early Christians taught that only Christ was the Father's "image" in unique and absolute perfection. See IMAGE. The ordinary words for "image" by a slight change came to mean vermin, carrion, false gods, no gods, carcasses, dung, etc. Heathen gods were undoubtedly accounted real beings by the early Hebrews, and the images of these enemies of Jeh were doubtless looked upon as possessing an evil associated (?) power. In the earlier OT era, images, idols, and false gods are synonymous; but as early as the 8th cent. BC Heb prophets begin to reach the lofty conception that heathen gods are non-existent, or at least practically so, when compared with the ever-living Jeh, while the idols are "worthless things" or "non-entities" (Isa 2 8, 18; 10 11; 19 1; 31 7; cf Jer 14 14; Ezek 30 13; note the satiric term "el'lim, as contrasted with the powerful elohim). The many ordinary terms used by the Hebrews for an idol or image mean "copy," *simulacrum,* "likeness," "representation." These are often, however, so compounded as technically to express a particular form, as "graven" or "carved" image (e.g. Ex 20 4; 2 Ch 33 7) of wood or stone, i.e. one cut into shape by a tool; "molten image" (e.g. Ex 32 4; Lev 19 4), i.e. one cast out of melted metal (standing image) (Lev 26 1 AV, and see below), etc. However, a few of the OT terms and modes of speech of the Egyptian language, such as that of the names of the Egyptian gods and goddesses, are entirely cult technical meaning, or have been given a new interest by new discoveries, and such deserve a more extended notice.

םַפָּרָה, *mazacehah:* These were upright stone pillars, often mentioned in the OT, sometimes as obelisks (Bible word). They were well dressed (Beil 38 9) and were called "the pillars of righteousness" by the poet (Isa 1 26). The reverence for these stones is closely connected with that found among all Sem peoples for obelisks (Gen 33 20; 35 7), cairns (Gen 28 18; Josh 4 6), and circles (Josh 3 9 20). Rough stone pillars from time immemorial were used in Sem society. The Heb copy this custom, as in Heb. 2 15. They were thought of as primitively as dwelling-places of deity, and the stones and the spots where they stood were therefore accounted sacred. From very early times the mystery of life pressed itself upon human attention, and these stones were viewed as phallic images. These images were at first rough and undifferentiated, but became later well defined as male organs. At Tell Zakariyeh the end of one is sculptured to represent a human face. Some sort of phallic worship still early Sem society, the form of which is determined by the attention paid to the date palm, to the breeding of flocks, to astrology, and to social life. This phallicism did not always represent coarse thought, but sometimes a very profound spiritual conception; of Golden calf, and note Wiedemann's statement in HDB, V 180 that in Egypt the gods Hel, "Taste," and Sa, "Perception," were created from the blood of the sun-god's phallus. These images of fertility and reproduction were naturally connected in Canaan with the worship of the Baals or 'lords' of each locality, upon whose favor as possessors of the land fertility depended. They were also naturally associated with the cult of Astarte, the female counterpart of all the Baals (see Astarte). In the OT the Baalim and Asherim are almost invariably associated together, although the latter were used as symbols dedicated to a particular goddess, while "Baal" was merely a title which could be given to any male Sem deity, and sometimes even to his female associate. The mazacebthah were set up in a high place (q.v.), attracting many of its "elevation, isolation, mystery" (Vincent).

Originally these pillars were not considered as idols, but were naturally erected to Jeh (Gen 28 18; 31 45; 35 14; Ex 24 4), and even Isaiah (19 19) and Hosea (3 4) approve them, though pillars dedicated to idols must of course be destroyed (Ex 23 14; 34 13; Jer 43 13; Ezek 26 11). Only in later times or by very far-sighted law-givers were the mazacebthah erected to Jeh condemned; but after the centralization of the Jeh-worship the pillars were condemned, even when set up in the name of Jeh, and the older places of worship with their indiscriminate rituals and necessary heathen affiliations were also wisely discarded (Lev 26; 1 Pt 16 22); see also Golden images, Astarte.

יאשה, *'asherah:* Perhaps a goddess (see Ashtaroth), but as ordinarily used in the OT, a sacred tree or stump of a tree planted in the earth (Dt 16 21) or a pole made of wood and set up near the altar (Jer 6 20; 1 K 16 33; Isa 17 8).

It has been supposed that these were fertility symbols of a goddess Asherah or Ashoreth (Ishun, Baalgame), and they were certainly in primitive thought connected with the tree cult and the sacred groves in the universe honored by the Semites (see esp. W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites, 159; cf. Stade, Geschichts, 160 H; Fraser, Golden Bough, II, 56 117; John O'Neill, Night of the Gods, II, 37); but the tree of life is clearly connected in texts and pictures with the human organ of generation, and there can be no doubt that there is a phallic meaning in the image of the pole, as well as the mazacebthah described above. See references in HDB under "Ascharah," and of Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XXXIX, 4, p. 287, 62 11 "mazacebthah," and schrifstiches Textbuch zum AT. As these wooden posts from earliest times represented the god of fertility and were connected with the mystery of life, they may have become the signs and symbols in many lands of the local gods and gods-ideals of deity.

Astarte was by far the most popular deity of ancient Ph. See Ashtaroth. The sacred grove or tree grew from the 12th to the 9th cent. BC, as found at Gezer, have large hips, disclosing an exaggerated idea of fecundity. In close connection with the Astarte sanctuaries in Ph were found numberless bodies of little children, none over a week old, undoubtedly representing the sacrifice of the firstborn by these Canaanites (II, 3, Macalister, Excavation of Gezer, 3 vols). These Astarte were erected at the most sacred Heb sanctuaries, as Samaria (2 K 17 12), Bethel (2 K 23 15), and even in the Temple of Jerus (1 K 14 23). The crowning act of King Josiah's reformation was to break down these images and the astrological symbol of Baal was the sun, Astarte is often thought of as the moon-goddess, but her symbol was really Venus. She was, however, sometimes called Queen of Heaven" (Jer 7 18; 44 17; 19; but see ZATW, VI, 123 30).

חֹםָנָם, *hamman,* AV "images," "idols"; RV "sun-images" (Lev 26 30; 2 Ch 14 5; 34 4; Isa 17 8; 27 9; Ezek 6 4 6). This worship may originally have come from Babylonia, but the reverence of the sun under the name Baal-hamman had long been common in Ashur, Babylon and the Israelites entered the country. These sun-images were probably obelisks or pillars connected with the worship of some local Baal. The chariot and horses of the sun, mentioned (2 K 23 11) as having an honored place at the western entrance of the
Jerusalem Temple, represented not a local but a foreign cult. In Bab temples, sacrifices were made to the sun-god, who had a special significance in time of war (Pinches, HDB, IV, 629; see also Chariots of the Sun).

(1) Golden Calf and Jeroboam’s Calves (see Golden Calf).

(2) Brazen Serpent (Nu 21:4-9; 2 K 6:18).

—The serpent, because of its strange, lightning-like power of poison—References on their attack, its power to shed its skin, and to paralyze its prey, has been a universal symbol of evil. Living serpents were kept in Bab temples. So the cobra was the guardian of royalty in Egypt, symbolizing the kingly power of life and death. In mythology, the serpent was not always considered a bad demon, enemy of the Creator, but often appears as the emblem of wisdom, esp., in connection with health-giving and life-giving gods, such as Ea, savior of mankind from the flood, and special “god of the physicians” in Babylon; Thoth, the god of wisdom in Egypt, who healed the eye of Horus and brought Osiris to life again; Apollo, the embodiment of physical perfection, and his son, Asclepius, most famous giver of physical and moral health and cure of disease among the Greeks. Among the Hebrews also a (7000-1000 BC) shows a worshipper before a serpentine serpent raised on a pole (Wm. Hayes Ward).

In Phoen mythology the serpent is also connected with wisdom and long life, and it is found on the oldest Heb seals and on late Jewish talismans (Rev 18:1-3, 8), July, 1908, 382-94; at Gezer, in Ph, a small “brazen serpent” (a cobra) was found in the “cave of oracles,” and in early Christian art Jesus the Lord of Life is often represented standing triumphantly upon the serpent or holding it in his hand. In the Heb narrative found in Nu 21, the serpent evidently appears as a well-known symbol representing the Divine ability to cure disease, being erected before the eyes of the Israelites to encourage faith and stop the plague. It was not a totem, for the totem belongs to a single family and is never set up for the veneration of other families (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 39).

Hezekiah destroyed it because it was receiving idolatrous worship (2 K 18:4), though there is no hint that such worship was ever a part of the official temple cult (Benzinger); if for this had been done, the earlier prophets could hardly have remained silent. The above explanation seems preferable to the one formerly offered that the serpent was merely a copy of the disease-bearer, as the images offered by the Philis were copies of the ulcers that plagued them (1 S 6:4). See further Neushwan.

(3) Teraphim (תָּרָפִים, trāphim).—These are usually considered household gods, but this does not necessarily include the idea that they were images of ancestors, though this is not improbable (Nowack, Hebrew Archaeology, II, 23; HDB, II, 190); that they were images of Jeh is a baseless supposition (see Kautzsch, HDB, V, 643). Sometimes they appear in the house (1 S 19:13-16); sometimes in sanctuaries (Jgs 17:5; 18:14); sometimes as carried by travelers and armies (Gen 31:30; Ezek 21:21). They are never directly spoken of as objects of worship (yet of Gen 31:30), but are mentioned in connection with sorcerers and on special occasions by the king (1 S 2:18; 22:18; 2 S 6:14). The ephod of the high priest was an ornamental waist coat on the front of which was fastened the holy breastplate containing the pectoral of which were the Urim and Thummim (Ex 28:30; 29:5; 39:2-5; Lev 8:28).

There are several passages, however, which have convinced many scholars that another ephod is mentioned which must be an image of Jeh (see Ephod). The chief
passages relied upon are Jgs 8:26,27, where Gideon made an ephod with 1,700 shekels of gold and “set” this in Ophrah, where it became an object of worship. So in “Mace” (HDB, V. 641) concludes that this object is preserved behind the ephod, while in various places the will of Jehovah is ascertained, not by putting up the ephod, but “by bringing it near” and “bearing it” (1 S 3:3; 20:7). On the basis of these passages Kautzsch (HDB, V. 641) concludes that this object was “exclusively as an image of Jehovah.” Driver, after an examination of each text, concludes that just in one passage “ephod” is certainly an object of the gold casing of an image, and that therefore it may also be used in other passages (I. T. 1.725). It does not seem quite certain, however, that a circumstantial vestment heavily ornamented with gold might not have been “erected” in a holy place where later it might become an object of worship. If this had been an image, would Hosea have deplored its loss (Hos 3:4), and would he not have used for forbidden in some Bible passage?

The term “mace” meant primarily the garment used to clothe the Divine image, which afterwards, when its name, the image itself, is a guess unassuaged by the Scriptures quoted or. I think, by any archaeological parallel. We conclude that there is no certain evidence that this was an image of Jehovah, though the word was used ritualistically in receiving the oracles of Jehovah (cf. Exod. 13:19; Deut. 1:39; Kittel, Bibl. Wörterbuch zum hebräischen, II, 42; König, Die Hauptprobleme 59–63). See also Idolatry; Calvary, Golden.

CAMDEN M. COBERN


IMAGINATION is a mental faculty by which one grasps without the physical senses, or by which one cognizes the nature of things not present to the senses. This is whether a thing is present to the senses or not, is determined by the will. The idea is, “thought” or “imagination”: “whose mind is stayed on thee” (Rv. “or imagination”); and in Ps 103:14 it is “frame” or “shārub, obstinacy, stubbornness” (Dt 31:19; Jer 3:17; 7:24; 9:14; 11:8; 13:10; 16:12; 16:13; 19:27) and in Ps 81:12 it is “lust,” “hardness or imaginations;” 3 of mahāshēbeth, “thought” or “purpose” in AV (Prov 4:18; Lam 3:60:11), once of diənəsənā, “mind,” “understanding” (Lk 1:51); 1 of i-ma'wānā, “reasoning” (2 Cor 10:5); and of dialoγīmos, “reasoning” (Rom 1:21 AV), “reasons” (Rom 1:21). RV gives “stiffness of the neck” in each instance where “shārub” is in AV “imagination” and; in Prov 6:18 AV “reasoning.” RV in Lam 3:60:11 “and reasonings” (Rom 1:21), and “imagination” for “conceit” (Prov 18:11), and for “device” (Lam 3:62).”

"Imagination" is frequent in the A. E., e.g. Ecles 18 15 (dianōsa)" (outshined, "wicked imagination") 40 2 (dialogismos, RV "expectation").

W. L. WALKER

IMAGINE, i-maj'n (יָנַשְׁנָה, yēnash’, יָנְשָנָה, yənəshənā, diənəsənā, meleśa, melešēdo), "combing, "thick" (Job 6:26; Ps 10:2; 21:11 140:2; Hos 7:15; Nah 1:11; Zec 7:10; 8:17); we have also hāshāh in AV and ERV, but not in ARV, "to meditate," "mutter," "speak" (Ps 2:1; 30:12); zōnām, "to devise" (Gen. 20:11, AV); yāḥēdāh, "to gravi," "to break in, upon;" "attack unjustly" (Ps 62:3 AV); meleśāh, "to meditate" (Acts 4:25). W. L. WALKER

IMMACULAE, i-mal-kwē (יִמְלָכָה, i'mal'kāh, i'mal'kōh; AV Simaluce): An Arabian prince to whom his young son Antiochus. Tryphon, who had formerly been on the side of Alexander, persuaded Immacule to set up the young Antiochus (Antiochus VI) against Demetrius, who had incurred the enmity of his men of war (1 Macc 11:39,40). Antiochus confirmed Jonathan in the high-priesthood and appointed him to be one of the king’s friends (ver. 57). In Jos (And, XV, 1) the name is given as Malchus.

J. HUTCHISON

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, i-mak'-lāt kon-sep'shən, THE: The historic designation of the Roman Catholic dogma promulgated by Pope Pius IX on December 8, 1854, in the Papal Bull entitled "Ineffabilis Deus." The term is often incorrectly applied, even by those whose intelligence should make such an error impossible, to the Virgin Birth of Christ (q.v.).

The central affirmation of this proclamation, which was read in St. Peter's in the presence of over two hundred bishops, is expressed in the following words: It is proclaimed "by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and in our own authority, that the doctrine which holds the blessed Virgin Mary to have been, from the first instant of her conception, by a certain, and grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of the Saviour of Mankind, preserved free from all stain of original sin, was revealed by God, and is, therefore, to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful" (see Schaff, A History of the Creeds of Christendom, (1879; New York, 1886).)

(1) Drawn from specifically Protestant principles. —Objections to the dogma are mainly two: (a) the claim to authority upon which the proclamation rests. There is every reason to believe that one of the major motives to the entire transaction was the wish, on the part of Pius and his advisers, to make an unmistakable assertion of absolute doctrinal authority by the Roman pontiff. (b) To Protestants and to Catholics in addition to the words “by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.” (b) The tendency to Mariolatry in the entire movement. As we shall see, the adoration of divine honors to Mary is avoided in the public statement of the dogma and in the defence of it by Roman Catholic writers; but one has but to survey the course of discussion leading up to the publication of 1854, and subsequent to it, to discover a growing tendency to lift Mary out of the realm of human beings and to endow her with Divine attributes and functions. An extended discussion of Mariolatry lies beyond the range of this art. (see Mary): it is only necessary to point out the obvious connections (see Roman Catholic Dictionary and church histories, sub loc.)

(2) Drawn from Roman Catholic principles. —It is far from the truth to suppose that there are no objections to this modern dogma save those which are specifically Protestant. From the viewpoint of the devout Roman Catholic, and for the sake of the prestige of the papacy, this particular dogma seems to have been unfortunately chosen.

(a) It has no basis in Scripture. The only attempt made to provide a Scriptural argument is
by using a vague and unsatisfactory | between Mary and Eve before the Fall, to be found in the writings of certain church Fathers who did not hold the papal dogma but unconsiously provided a slender and most insecure basis for it (see Infra). Most Roman Catholic writers are intelligent enough to admit that the theory of inspired tradition alone can be appealed to in support of the idea. The ordinary and only tenable argument is that the ecclesiastical promulgation and acceptance of the doctrine prove its apostolic origin (see Catholic Dictionary, sub loc.). (6) It weakens the authority of the church. It would almost seem as if the doctrines of ecclesiastical authority and particularly of papal infallibility had, in this unfortunate proclamation, reached a reducito ad absurdum for the comfort of their foes. Notice with care the historical standing of this dogma: (a) The acknowledged absence of all positive evidence for apostolic origin and primitive authority (see Catholic Dictionary ut supra). (b) The abundant positive evidence that the principal Fathers of the early church did not believe in the sinlessness of Mary (see list of names and references given by H. C. Sheldon, History of the Christian Church, sub loc.). (c) The uncertain and equivocal testimony per contra drawn from the early Fathers. Thus, for example, Ephrem Syrus (Carmina, Hymn 27, strophe 8), where he says "Truly it is Thou and Thy mother only who are fair altogether. For in Thee there is no stain and in Thy mother no spot," St. Augustine (De gratia et graato, cap. 42): "Two were made simple, innocent, perfectly like each other, Mary and Eve," etc. To these may be added the words of Irenaeus: "The knot of Eve's disobedience was united by Mary's obedience" (Catholic Dictionary, 429). If this is true, it may reasonably be contended that even if these statements necessarily implied the Immaculate Conception of Mary, which they certainly do not, they would still have to be estimated against the many weighty statements which may be brought forward on the other side. (3) The prolonged controversy over the doctrine. From the earliest time when the idea of Mary's miraculous freedom from sin appears, up to the Old Catholic agreement of 1874, devoutful Roman Catholics have been tested against the addition of this unscriptural dogma to the faith of the church. Bonaventura (Locus Theol., VII, 1) says: "All the saints who have made mention of this matter, with one mouth have asserted that the blessed Virgin never sinned originally." With the statement of the Old Catholic agreement we may safely sum up the ecclesiastical situation, even from the viewpoint of those who hold to the doctrinal validity of tradition. Art. X reads: "We reject the New Rom doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as being contrary to the tradition of the first 13 centuries, according to which Christ alone is conceived without sin." (3) Drawn from general considerations of Christian doctrine. The most serious objections to this offensive and gratuitous dogma are not at all specifically Protestant but, rather, broadly Christian. It is necessary at this point to assure ourselves that we understand (as many Protestants evidently do not) just what is meant by the doctrine as a doctrine. According to the accepted Roman Catholic explanation, Mary, at the supposed stage of her conception when the soul was actually infused into the body waiting for it, received the special grace virtually equivalent to the death from all stain of original sin. The point which Protestants need esp. to note is that, according to Roman Catholic ideas, this gracious act of God was performed on the basis of the foreseen merits of Christ's sacrifice. This tones down the offensiveness of the doctrine in that it does not per se imply the equality of Mary with Christ, but rather the contrary, in so far as the grace bestowed upon her was gained by anticipation from Him. Roman Catholic writers naturally emphasize this fact in recommending the doctrine to Protestant minds. None the less the offence remains. The "Immaculate Conception" necessarily implies the "immaculate life," and on the same basis of supernatural grace, else would the special miracle have occurred in vain and the fall of Adam been repeated in Mary. Hence, a full account of the doctrine would be that Mary was completely and miraculously redeemed at her conception and completely and miraculously kept from sin throughout her whole life. Apart from all questions as to the rightful place of Mary in Christian thought, this idea involves utter doctrinal confusion. It means that Mary never became a true human being and never lived a true human life. Redemption by a miraculous process began at conception and carried on throughout the life is an utter impossibility.\footnote{The Holy Spirit does not work imperfectly, and miraculous holiness which is holiness of a purely Divine character, without a free, cooperating human factor, is not human holiness at all. Her dogma teaches Mary out of the human family, reduces her to an image of Christ and makes her life a phantasm. Moreover, the parallels which are adduced in its support are not true parallels at all.} Our Lord's sinlessness was not mechanically guaranteed by His miraculous conception (see Virgin Birth) but was His own achievement through the Holy Spirit granted to Him and personally appropriated. The Hallowing of Children by the Roman Catholic Church is the sanctifying of those "separated from the womb" (Gal 1 15) to God's service, does not imply the miraculous guarantee of artificial sinlessness, but such a gracious influence as enables the subject freely cooperating to obtain victory over sin by controlling principle. Actual sin and need of forgiveness is not praetermitted by such special grace.

We can only say, in conclusion, that every reason, which usually operates in a Christian mind to insure obedience to a belief, has been removed. The possibility of accepting this peculiar dogma which is Scriptureless baseless, historically unjustified and doctrinally unsound.

LITERATURE.—The best simple and reasonably fair-minded discussion of the question is found in the Catholic Dictionary already mentioned. The most searching criticism is found. For the Protestant view consult any authoritative church history, esp. that of Professor H. C. Sheldon where copious references to Protestant lit. will be found. Louis Matthews Sweet

IMMANUEL, i-man' u-el (Gr. Ἰμμανήλ, immanēl), "immanently.

The name occurs but 3 times, twice in the OT (Isa 7 14; 8 8), and once in the NT (Mt 1 23). It is a Heb word signifying "God is with us." The form "Immanuel" appears in LXX (Ἐμμανουήλ, Emmanaul).

In 735 BC Ahaz was king of Judah. The kingdom of Israel was already tributary to Assyria (2 K 15 19-20). Pekah, king of Israel, a bold and ambitious usurper, rebelled against Ahaz, and formed an Ahaz alliance, the dual object of which was, first, to organize a resistance against Assyria, and second, to force Ahaz to cooperate in their designs against the common tyrant. In the event Ahaz was overthrown, and his son Pekah was set to the throne of Tabeel, a choice of their own, upon the throne of David. To this end they waged war against Judah, advancing as far as Jerus itself, but without complete success (Isa 7 1). Ahaz, a
weak king, and now panic-stricken, determined to invoke the aid of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria (2 K 16.7). This he actually did at a later stage in the war (6 9; 15 29). Such a course would involve the loss of national independence and the payment of a heavy tribute. At this period of crisis, Isaiah, gathering his disciples around him (Isa 8 16), is told to deliver a message to the king. Ahaz, though making a show of resistance against the coalition, is in reality neither depending upon the help of Jeh nor upon the courage of his people. Isaiah, in an effort to calm his fears and prevent the fatal alliance with Assyria, offers him a sign. This method is specially characteristic of this prophet. Fearing to commit himself to the policy of Divine dependence, but with a pretense at religious scruples, "Neither will I tempt Jehovah," the king refuses (Isa 7 12). The prophet then chides him bitterly for his lack of faith, which, he says, not only wearies men, but God also (7 13).

He then proceeds to give him a sign from God Himself, the sign of "Immanuel" (7 14). The interpretation of this sign is not clear, even apart from its NT application to Christ. The Heb word "virgin" in EV means, more correctly, "bride," in the sense of "Engaged," therefore, of the person who is about to become a wife, or is still a young woman. Ps 68 25 EV gives "damsels."

Isaiah predicts that a young bride shall conceive and bear a son. The miracle of virgin-conception, therefore, is not implied. The opening of the definite article before "virgin" (ha-'almah) does not of itself indicate that the prophet had any particular young woman in his mind, as the Heb idiom often uses the definite Article indefinitely. The fact that two of the names in Hosea's "Virgins," or of the prophet, Hosea, similar to "Immanuel," is therefore, of the person he desired to be born to the Virgin. The hypothesis of some critics that a woman of the harem of Ahaz became the mother of Hezekiah, and that he was the Immanuel of the prophet's thought is not feasible. Hezekiah was at least 9 years of age when the prophecy was given (2 K 16.2). Immanuel, in the prophetic economy, evidently stands on the same level with Ethan-jashub (7 3) as the embodiment of a great idea, to which Isaiah again appeals in Isa 8 8 (see Isaiah, VII).

The question as to whether the sign given to Ahaz was favorable or not presents many difficulties. But was it a promise of good or a threat of disaster? 3. Was it a judgment? It is evident that the Promise or threat had first intended an omen of deliverance and blessing (7 4,7). Did the king's lack of faith alter the nature of the sign? Ver 9, "If ye will not believe," etc., implies that it might have done so. The omission of ver 16, and esp. the words "whose two kings thou abhorrest," greatly simplifies this theory, as "the land," singular, would more naturally refer to Judah than to Syria and Ephraim. The omission would then become an easily interpreted threat, referring to the overthrow of Judah rather than that of her enemies. Immanuel should eat curdled milk and honey (ver 15), devastation reducing the land from an agricultural to a pastoral one. The obscure nature of the passage as it stands suggests strongly that it has suffered from interpolation. The contrary theory that the sign was a promise and not a prediction of disaster, has much to commend it, though it necessitates greater freedom with the text. The name "Immanuel" implies the faith of the young mother of the child in the early deliverance of her country, and a rebuke to the lack of that quality in Ahaz. It is certain also that Isaiah looked for the destruction of Syria and Ephraim, and that, subsequent to the Assyrian invasion, salvation should come to Judah through the remnant that had been faithful (11 11). The fact that the prophet later gave the name of Maher-shalal-hash-baz to his new-born son, a name of good omen to his country, further strengthens the latter position. The omission of vs 15,17 would make the sign a prophecy of the failure of the coalition. It is plain, whichever theory be accepted, that something must be eliminated from the passage to insure a consistent reading.

The question now presents itself as to what was the relation of Immanuel to the Messianic prophecies. Should the emphasis be laid upon "a virgin," the son, or the name itself? For traditional interpretation the Mes- sianic sign lay in the virgin birth, but the "immanent" uncertainty of implied virginity in the Heb noun makes this interpretation improbable. The identification of the young mother as Zion personified, and of the "son" as the future generation, is suggested by Whitehouse and other scholars. But there is no evidence that the term 'almah was used at that time for personification. The third alternative makes Immanuel a Messiah in the wider use of the term, as anticipated by Isaiah and his contemporaries. There can be little doubt but that there existed in Judah the Messianic hope of a national saviour (2 S 7 12). Isaiah is expecting the arrival of one whose character and work shall entitle him to the great names of 9 6. In his it would dwell all the fulness of God. He was to be "of the stem of Jesse," the bringer of the Golden Age. The house of David is now beset by enemies, and its reigning representative is weak in faith. The prophet therefore announces the imminent coming of the deliverer. If he had intended the virgin-conception of Christ in the distant future, the sign of "Immanuel" would have possessed no immediate significance, nor would it have been an omen to Ahaz. With regard to the Messianic idea, Mic 6 5 ("until the time that she who travaileth hath brought forth") is of importance as indicating the prevalent thought of the time. Recent evidence shows that even in Babylonia and Egypt there existed expectations of a divinely born and wonderful saviour. To this prophecy the prophet probably appealed, his hearers being easily able to appreciate the force of oracular language that is to us obscure. There is much to confirm the view, therefore, that the prophecy is Messianic. The use of the word as it relates to the virgin birth of Christ and the incarnation cannot be dealt with here (see Person of Christ).

5. The Virgin. The LXX (which has parthenos, "virgin") and the Alexandrian Jews interpreted the passage as referring to the virgin birth and the Messianic ministry. This interpretation does not seem to have been sufficiently pronounced collectively, but it has occupied in Christological thought. See Virgin Birth. ARTHUR WALYN EVANS

IMMER, im'-er ("TZN, "imnôr").
(1) A priest of David's time (1 Ch 24.14), whose descendants are mentioned in Ezr 2 37; 10 20; Neh 3 29; 7 40. (2) A priest of Jeremiah's time (Jer 20 1).

IMMORTAL, i-môr'tal, IMMORTALITY, i-môr-tal-i'-ti, a corruption, Rom 2 7; 1 Cor 15; 2 Tim 1 10, (where it is represented as if it were "aporschis") lit. "incorruption."
lit. “incorruptible,” Rom 1 23; 1 Cor 15 52; 1 Tim 1 17):
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In hardly any subject is it more necessary to be careful in the definition of terms and clear distinction of ideas, esp. where the Bib. doctrine is concerned, than in this of “immortality.” By “immortality” is not supposed to mean simply the survival of the soul, or spiritual part of man, and Distinction of the fact that death does not end all.

The soul survives. This is commonly what is meant when we speak of “a future life,” “a future state,” “a hereafter.” Not, however, to dwell on the fact that many peoples have no clear conception of an immaterial “soul” in the modern sense (the Egyptians, e.g., distinguished several parts, the Ka, the Ba, etc., which survived death; often the surviving self is simply a ghostly semblance of the earthly self, nourished with food, offerings, etc.), there is the more serious consideration that the state into which the surviving part is supposed to enter at death is anything but a state which can be described as “life,” or worthy to be dignified with the name “immortality.” It is a state peculiar to “death” (see DEATH); in most cases, shadowy, inert, feeble, dependent, joyless, a state to be shunned and abjured, not to be hoped for. If, on the other hand, as in the hope of immortality among the nobler heathen, it is conceived of, as for some, a state of happiness—the clog of the body being shaken off—this yields the idea, which has passed over into那么多 of our modern thinking of an “immortality of the soul,” of an imperishableness of the spiritual part, sometimes supposed to extend backward as well as forward; an inherent indestructibility.

It will be seen as we advance, that the Bib. view is different from all of these. The soul, indeed, survives the body; but this disembodied state is never viewed as one of complete “life.” For the Bib. “immortality” is not merely the survival of the soul, but existing in “Sheol” or “Hades.” This is not, in itself considered, “life” or happiness. The “immortality” the Bible contemplates is an immortality of the whole person—body and soul together. It implies, therefore, deliverance from the state of Sheol. It is not a condition simply of future existence, however prolonged, but a state of blessedness, due to redemption and the possession of the “eternal life” in the soul; it includes resurrection and perfected life in both soul and body. The subject will now be considered more particularly in its different aspects.

I. THE NATURAL BELIEF.

—In some sort the belief in the survival of the spirit or self at death is a practically universal phenomenon. To what is it traceable? A favorite hypothesis with anthropologists is that it is the origin in dreams or visions suggesting the continued existence of the dead (cf. H. Spencer, Eccles. Inst., chs i, xiv).

Before, however, a dream can suggest the survival of the soul, there must be the idea of the soul, and of this there seems a simpler explanation in the consciousness which even the savage possesses of something within him that thinks, feels and wills, in distinction from his bodily organs. At death this thinking, feeling, something immortal, which remains.

What more natural than to suppose that it persists in some other state apart from the body? (Cf Max Müller, Anthrop. Religion, 281.) Dreams, etc., may help this conviction, but need not create it. It is only as we assume such a deeper root for the belief that we can account for its universality and persistence. Even this, however, while an instinctive presumption, can hardly be called a proof of survival after death, and it does not yield an idea of “immortality” in any worthy sense. It is at most, as already said, a ghostly reduplication of the earthly life that is thus far reached.

(1) The soul spiritual.—The more philosophical arguments that are adduced for the soul’s immortality (or survival) are of equal weight. The argument based on the metaphysical essence of the soul (see Plato’s Phaedo) is not in these days felt to be satisfying. On the other hand, it can be maintained against the materialist on irrefragable grounds that the soul, or thinking spirit, in man is immaterial in Nature, and, where this is granted, there is, or can be, no proof that death, or physical dissolution, destroys this conscious spirit. The presumption is powerfully the other way. Cicero of old argued that death need not even be the suspension of its powers (of Tuæc. Disp. 1.20); Butler reasons the matter from analogy (Anal. 1, ch 1); modern scientists like J. S. Mill (Three Essays, 201) and Professor Huxley (Life and Letters, 1, 217 ff; of William James, Ingersoll Lecture) concede that immortality cannot be disproved. The denial one hears from various sides more frequently than formerly is therefore not warranted. Still, not to be able to say that even if the soul survives death, its new state of existence has in it anything desirable.

It was hinted that one use which the Greeks made of the metaphysical argument, was to prove the indestructibility of the soul—its immortality in the sense of having no beginning and no end. This is not the Christian doctrine. The soul has no such inherent indestructibility. It is dependent on God, as everything else is, for its continued existence. Did He withdraw His sustaining power, it would cease to exist. That it does continue to exist is not doubted, but this must be argued on other grounds.

(2) Capacities of human nature.—A much more apprehensible argument for immortality—more strictly, of a future state of existence—is drawn from the rich capacities and possibilities of human nature, for which the earthly life affords so brief and inadequate a sphere of exercise. It is the characteristic of spirit that it has in it an element of infinitude, and aspires to the infinite. The best the world can give can never satisfy it. It has in it the possibility of endless progress, and ever higher satisfaction. It was this consideration which led Leibnitz, with all his theoretical assumption of a world’s immortality a place among his “doctrinal beliefs” (see his Critique of Pure Reason, Bohn’s tr, 590–91), and moved J. S. Mill to speak of it as the only hope
which gave adequate scope to the human faculties and feelings, "the loftier aspirations being no longer kept down but exalted to the larger sense of the insignificance of human life by the disheartening feeling of 'not worth while'" (Three Essays, 249). Yet when these arguments are calmly weighed, they amount to no more than a proof that man is constituted for immortality; they do not afford a guarantee that this destiny might not be forfeited, or if they yield such a guarantee for the good, they hardly do so for the wicked. The belief, in their case, must depend on other considerations.

Of the moral argument.—It is, as Kant also felt, when we enter the moral sphere that immortality, or the continued existence of the soul, becomes a practical certainty to the earnest mind. With moral personality is bound up the idea of moral law and moral responsibility; this, in turn, necessitates the thought of the world as a moral system, and of God as moral Ruler. The world, as we know it, is certainly a scene of moral administration—of probation, of discipline, of reward and penalty—but as obviously a scene of incomplete moral administration. The tangled condition of things in this life can satisfy no one's sense of justice. Goodness is left to suffer; wickedness outwardly triumphs. The evil-doer's own conscience proclaims him amenable, and points to future retribution; this is need for a final rectification of what is wrong here. But while a future state seems thus called for, this does not of itself secure eternal existence for the wicked, nor would such existence be "immortality" in the positive sense; it is the mystery of sin, the lamp of reason grows dim. For further light we must look to revelation.

II. The Biblical Doctrine—the OT.—The Biblical view of immortality starts from man's relation to God. Man, as God's creation and image, is fitted for the knowledge of God, for fellowship with God's Man. Him. This implies that man is more than an animal; that he has a life to God which transcends time. In it already lies the pledge of immortality if man is obedient.

Man's nature.—With this corresponds the account given of man's creation and original state. Man is formed of body and soul; body and soul are integral parts of his personality. He was created for life, not for mortality. The warning, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen 2 17), implies that if man continued obedient he would live. But this is an immortality of the soul only. It is a life in the body (of Gen 3 22). Its type is such cases as Enoch and Elijah (Gen 5 24; 2 K 2 11; 12; cf Ps 49 15; 73 24).

The frustration of this original destiny of man comes through sin. Sin entails death (see Death). Death in its physical aspect is a separation of soul and body—a breaking up of the unity of man's personality.

In one sense, therefore, it is the destruction of the immortality which was man's original destiny. It does not, however, imply the extinction of the soul. That survives, but not in a state that can be called "life." It passes into Sheol—the sad, gloomy abode of the dead, in which there is no joy, activity, knowledge of the affairs of earth, or (in the view of Nature) remembrance of God, or praise of His goodness (on this subject, and the Heb belief in the future state generally, see Eschatology on OT; Death). This is not "true life"—not "immortality.

It is the part of grace and redemption to restore immortality in the true sense. Had the world been left to develop in sin, no further hope could have come to it. The picture of Sheol would have become ever darker as the idea of retribution grew stronger. Immortality could never become brighter. But God's grace inter­vened: "Deliver him from going down to Sheol; give him life, that he may not see destruction." (Job 33 24). God's mercy breaks in on man's lot. He gives to man His promises; makes His covenant with man; admits man to His fellowship (Gen 3 15; 4 4; 6 24; 8 9; 12 1-3; 16, etc.). In this fellowship the soul was raised again to its true life even on earth. But this held in it also a hope for the future. The promises placed in the forefront as tokens of God's favors were indeed predominatingly temporal—promises for this life—but within these (the kernel within the shell) was the supreme possession of God Himself (Ps 4 6 f; 16 2). This held in it the hope of redemption and the principle of every good.

Deliverance from Sheol.—Here we reach the core of the OT hope of immortality. Such fellowship as the believer had with God could not be lost, even in Sheol; beyond that was deliverance from Sheol. In their highest moments it was this hope that sustained patriarchs, psalmists, prophets, in their outlook on the future. Doubt might cloud a man's consciousness of evil and despair; but it was impossible in moments of strong faith to believe that God would ever really desert them. The eternal God was their dwelling-place; beneath them were everlasting arms (Ps 90 1). The hope of immortality, therefore, was, in principle, the hope not merely of an "immortality of the soul," but likewise of resurrection—of complete deliverance from Sheol. Thus it is clearly in the impassioned outburst of Job (19 25-27; 14 13 f), and in the mouth of Psalms. The hope always clothes itself in the form of complete deliverance from Sheol. Thus in Ps 17 14 f, the wicked have their portion "in this life," but, "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." (AV "with beholding thy form"); and in Ps 49 14 f, the wicked are "appointed as a flock for Sheol," but "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for he will receive me." (same as that of Enoch, Gen 5 24; cf Ps 73 24). It will be remembered that when Jesus expounded the declaration, "I am the God of Abraham," etc, it was as a pledge of resurrection (Mt 22 31 f). The idea comes to final expression in the declaration in Dn 12 of a resurrection of the just and unjust (12 2). For further development and illustration see Eschatology of the OT.

Later Jewish thought carried out these ideas of the OT to further issues. A blessed future for the righteous was now accepted, and was definitely connected with the idea of resurrection. The wicked remained in Sheol, now conceived of as a place of retribution. The Gentiles, too, shared this doom. See Eschatology.

III. The Christian Hope.—In full consonance with what is revealed in part in the OT is the hope of immortality discovered in the NT.

1. Immortality: The ring of this joyful hope is heard in every part of the apostolic writings through "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," says Peter, "who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you" (1 Pet 1 3 f). Paul declares, "Our Saviour Christ Jesus, who . . . brought life and immortality [incorruption] to
light through the gospel" (2 Tim 1:10). In Rom 2:7 he had spoken of those who "by patience and well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life." This immortality, it is seen, is part of the eternal life bestowed through Jesus on believers. It is guaranteed by Christ's own resurrection and life in glory. The nature of this hope of the gospel may now be further analyzed.

(1) **Survival of the soul.**—The soul survives the body. A future state for both righteous and wicked is plainly declared by Jesus Himself. "He that believeth on me," He said to Martha, "though he die, ye shall live." And what He said to Martha He believeth on me shall never die" (Jn 11:25 f.). To His disciples He said, "If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (Jn 14:3). Of His words to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." (Lk 23:43). The survival of both righteous and wicked is implied in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31). So in many other places (e.g. Mt 22:30 ff.; d. 12:28-34; Acts 2:23-24; 1 Thess 4:14-17), the teaching of the epistle. The doctrine of a future judgment depends on and presupposes this truth (Rom 2:5-11; 2 Cor 5:10, etc.).

(2) **Union with Christ in a new world.**—Death for the believer, though a result of sin, does not destroy the soul's relation to God and to Christ. The eternal life implanted in the soul in time blossoms in its fruition into the life and blessedness of eternity (Rom 8:10 f.; Phil 1:21; Col 1:27). The soul, in its life, is an immortal image of Christ. It "waits for our adoption, to wit, for the redemption of our body" (Rom 8:23). But its state, though incomplete, is still a happy one. Hades has lost its gloom, and is for it a "Paradise." (Lk 23:43). It dwells in a chamber in the Father's house (Jn 14:2 f.; 17:24). It is to be, even in the unclad state ("absent from the body"), "at home with the Lord" (2 Cor 5:8). It is for it an object of desire to be with Christ in that state after death (Phil 1:21). The pictures in Rev, though highly figurative, indicate a condition of great blessedness (Rev 7:9-17).

(3) **The resurrection.**—The fulness of the blessedness of immortality implies the resurrection. The ressurection is a cardinal article of Christ's teaching (Mt 22:20-32; Jn 5:25-29; 11:23-26). He Himself is the Lord of life, and life-giver in the resurrection (Jn 6:25.1:26; 11:25, "I am the resurrection, and the life"). The resurrection of believers is secured by His own resurrection. Jesus died; He rose again (see RESURRECTION). His resurrection carries with it the certainty of the resurrection of all His people. This is the great theme of 1 Cor 15. As Christ lives, they shall live also (Jn 14:19). The believers who are alive at His Parousia shall be changed (1 Cor 15:51; 1 Thess 4:17); those who are dead shall be raised first of all (1 Thess 4:16). The resurrection body shall be a body like Christ's own (Phil 3:21)—incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual, immortal (1 Cor 15:42 f.58). This is not to be confused with sameness of material particles (vs 37 f.), yet there is the connection of a vital bond between the old body and the new. This is the hope of the believer, without which his redemption would not be complete.

(4) **The wicked also raised.**—The wicked also are raised, not, however, to glory, but for judgment (Jn 5:29; Acts 24:15; Rev 20:12-15). The same truth is implied in all passages on the last judgment. Excluded from the blessedness of the resurrection that is described by both Jesus and His apostles as one of uttermost tribulation and anguish (e.g. Mt 25:46; Mk 9:43-50; Rom 2:8 f.).

This is not "immortality" or "life," though the continued existence of the soul is implied in it (see PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING; HELL, REDEMPTION).

(5) **Eternal life.**—The condition of the blessed in their state of immortality is one of unseparable felicity of both soul and body forever. There are, indeed, degrees of glory—this is carefully and consistently taught (Mt 25:44 ff.; Lk 19:22 ff.; 1 Cor 3:15-16; 16:14; Phil 3:10-14; 2 Tim 4:7 f; 1 Jn 2:28—but the condition as a whole is one of perfect satisfaction, holiness and blessedness (cf. Mt 13:43; 26:34; Rom 2:6; Eph 2:2 f; 1 Thess 4:16; Rev 22:3 f, etc). The blessedness of this eternal state includes such elements as the following: (1) restoration to God's image and likeness to Christ (1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 5:18; Eph 4:22; Col 3:10; 1 Jn 3:2); (2) perfect holiness in the possession of God's Spirit (2 Cor 7:1; Phil 1:6; Rev 21:27; 22:4); (3) the unveiled vision of God's glory (Rev 22:4; cf Ps 17:15); (4) freedom from all sorrow, pain and death (Rev 21:3 f); (5) power of unreserved service (Rev 22:3).

The contrast between the Bible's teaching of immortality and that of heathenism and of the schools will now be obvious. It is not mere

2. Contrast's future existence; not a bare, abstract immortality of the soul; it is the result of redemption. Though it is a result of the resurrection which embraces the whole personality, soul and body; it is not shared by the unholy; it includes the perfection of rational, moral and spiritual blessedness, in an environment suitable to such glorified existence. As such it is the supreme hope in which every believer is called to strive (Phil 3:13 f).

**LITERATURE.**—Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality, by Professor William James, Professor Osler, etc; Salmon, Christian Doctrine of Immortality (4th.); Christianity's View of God and the World, Lects iv. v. with App. to v.; works specified in art. on ENSCHATOLOGY.

**JAMES ORR.**

**IMMUTABILITY.** in-mu'ta-b'l. IMMUTABLE, i-mu'ta-b'l (μορμάδειος, amóthádeis): Occurs in Heb 6:17.18 of the unchangeableness of the Divine counsel. It is the perfection of Jehovah that He changes not in character, will, purpose, aim (Mal 3:6; so of Christ, He 13:8). See FAITHFULNESS; UNCHANGEABLE.

**IMNA, i-m'na (יִמָּה, yímná): A descendant of Asher (1 Ch 7:35).**

**IMNAH, i-m'nah (יִמָּה, yímnáh):**

1. Eldest son of Asher (Gen 46:17, AV "Jimnah"); Nu 26:44, AV "Jimná"; 1 Ch 7:30).

2. A Levite of Hezekiah's time (2 Ch 31:14).

**IMNITES, im'ni'tas (יִמָּה, yímná): Descendants of Imnah (q.v. [1]) (Nu 26:44, AV "Jimmates").**

**IMPART, im-pârt' (metadíkonta, metadíkonti, "to share");"They... imparted [AV "added"] nothing to me" (Gal 2:6); that is, did not propose any correction or addition to my teaching. "That I may impart unto you some spiritual gift" (Rom 1:11) expresses the apostle's hope that the Rom believers may increase in faith and love through his teaching and influence.

"To impart unto you... our own soul" (1 Thess 2:8) meant to spend their utmost strength and to expose their lives in their service.

**IMPEDEMENT, im-ped'i-ment: Found in Mk 7:32, "had an impediment in his speech," as a tr of μεταδίκασα, metadíkasa, comp. of μετά, metá, "toil" and δίκασα, dikas, "speech," i.e. one who speaks with difficulty. In the LXX the word is used as a tr of דָּם, dem, "dumb" (Isa 35:6).**
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

IMPLEAD, im-pled' (Acts 19 38 AV, “Let them implead one another’): “Impled” means “to sue at law,” hence RV “Let them accuse one another.” Court days are kept, let them prosecute the suit in court and not settle matters in riot. ἐγκαλέω, ἐγκαλέων, means “to call in,” “to call to account.”

IMPORTABLE, im-pōr-ta-b'l (δουσβάστατος, doubsástatos): An obsolete word, meaning “unbearable” (Lat. im, “not,” portabilis, “bearable”) found in Pr Man, “Thine angry threatening RV [the anger of thy threatening]” toward sinners is importable”: cf. He 2 14, “laying the heavy burdens and importable”; Chaucer (“Clerk’s Tale”) C.T.), “For it were importable though they wold.”

IMPORTUNITY, im-pōr-tū-n'iti: Occurs only in Lk 11 8, where it is the rendering of ἀνάλεια (WH, ἀνάλεια, anaidela). This Gr word implies an element of impudent insistence rising to the point of shamelessness which the Eng. word “importunity” fails to express, thus weakening the argument of the parable, which is that it is by shameless insistence a favor may be won, even from one unwilling and ungracious, still more surely will God answer the earnest prayer of His people. God’s willingness to give exceeds our ability to ask. The parable teaches by way of contrast, not by parallel.

DAVID FOSTER ESTES

IMPOSITION, im-pōr-zish'un, OF HANDS. See HANDS, IMPOSITION (LAYING ON) OF.

IMPOSSIBLE, im-pōs'i-ble (vb. ἀδύνατος, adynatō; adj ἀδύνατος, adynatos): “To be impossible” is the tr of adunatos, “to be powerless,” “impossible” (Mt 17 20; Lk 1 37, RV “void of power”); adunatos, “powerless,” etc. is tr impossible (Mt 19 26; Mk 10 27; Lk 18 27; He 6 4 18; 11 6; “impossible” in He 6 4 is in RV transferred to ver 6); anévdktos, “not to be received” or “accepted,” is also tr impossible (Lk 17 1). In several of these passages it is affirmed that “nothing is impossible with God,” but, of course, this means nothing that is consistent with the Divine nature, e.g. (as He 6 18) it is not possible for God to lie. So, when it is said that nothing is impossible to faith, the same limitation applies and also that of the mind or will of God for us. But much more is possible to a strong faith than a weak faith realizes, or even believes.

W. L. WALKER

IMPOTENT, im-pōt'ent (ἀσθένω, asthēnō, ἀσθενός, adnatos): The vb. signifies “to be without strength” and derivatives of it are used in Jn 5 3 7 AV and Acts 4 9 to characterize the paralyzed man at Bethesda and the cripple at the Temple gate. For the same condition of the Lystra lame man the word adunatos is used, which is synonymous. In these cases it is the weakness of disease. In this sense the word is used by Shakespeare (Love’s Labor Lost, V, ii, 864; Hamlet, I, i, 29). The impotent folk referred to in the Epistle of Jeremy (Bar 6 28) were those weak and feeble from age and want of impotence and snail-paced beggary” (Richard III, IV, iii, 53).

ALEX. MACALISTER

IMPRISONMENT, im-priz'n-ment. See PUNISHMENTS; PRISON.

IMPUITY, im-pū'ri-ti. See UNEASINESS.

IMPUTATION, im-pū-ta'shun: I. MEANING AND USE OF THE TERM II. THE THREEFOLD USE OF THE TERM IN THEOLOGY III. THE SCRIPTURAL BASIS OF THESE DOCTRINES

1. Imputation of Adam’s Sin to His posterity

2. Imputation of the Sins of His People to Christ

3. Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to His People

LITERATURE

1. Meaning and Use of the Term. The word “imputation,” according to the Scriptural usage, denotes an attributing of something to a person, or a charge of something to a person, or a setting of something to one’s account. This takes place sometimes in a judicial manner, so that the thing imputed becomes a ground of reward or punishment. The word is used in AV a number of times to translate the Heb vb. ḥāshāh and the Gr vb. logizomai. These words, both of which occur frequently in Scripture, and which in a number of instances mean simply “to think,” express the above idea. That this is the case is clear also from the other Eng. words used in AV to translate these Heb and Gr words, as, for example, “to count, to reckon, to esteem.” Thus ḥāshāh is tr in AV by the vb. “to impute” (Lev 7 15; 17 4; 2 S 19 19); by the vb. “to reckon” (2 S 4 3); by “to count” as something (Lev 25 31 EV). The vb. in 1 S 22 15 is ἁκοῦμ, sim. Similarly, logizomai is tr by the vb. “to impute” (Rom 4 6.8.11.22.23.24; 2 Cor 5 19; Jas 2 20) builder (Rom 2 26; 4 3 5); “to account” (Gal 3 6); and by the vb. “to reckon” (Rom 4 4 9.10). In AV the word used to render logizomai is the vb. “to reckon.”

These synonyms of the vb. “to impute” bring out the idea of reckoning or charging to one’s account. It makes no difference, so far as the meaning of imputation is concerned, who it is that imputes, whether man (1 S 22 15) or God (Ps 32 2); it makes no difference what is imputed, whether a good deed for reward (Ps 106 301) or a bad deed for punishment (Lev 17 4); and it makes no difference whether that which is imputed is something which is personally one’s own prior to the imputation, as in the case above cited, where his own good deed was imputed to Phinehas (Ps 106 30 f), or something which is not personally one’s own prior to the imputation, as where Paul asks that a debt not personally his own be charged to him (Philem ver 18). In all these cases the act of imputation is simply the charging of one with something. It denotes just what we mean by our ordinary English verb “to charge.”

It does not change the inward state or character of the person to whom something is imputed. When, for example, we say that we impute bad motives to anyone, we do not mean that we make such a one bad; and just as in Scripture the phrase “to impute iniquity” does not mean to make one personally bad, but simply to lay iniquity to his charge. Hence when God is said “to impute sin” to anyone, the meaning is that God accounts such a one to be a sinner, and consequently guilty and liable to punishment. Similarly, the non-imputation of sin means simply not to lay it to one’s charge as a ground of punishment (Ps 32 2). In the same manner, when God is said “to impute righteousness” to a person, the meaning is that He judicially accounts such a one to be righteous and entitled to all the rewards of a righteous person (Rom 4 6.11).

II. The Threefold Use of the Term in Theology. The three acts of imputation are given special prominence in the Scripture, and are implicated in the Scriptural doctrines of Original Sin, Atonement and Justification, though not usually expressed by the words ḥāshāh and logizomai. Because, however, of its “forensic” or “judicial” meaning, and possibly through its use in the case to translate logizomai in Rom 4 8, the term “imputation” has been used in theology in a threefold sense to denote the judicial acts of God by which the guilt of Adam’s sin is imputed to his posterity; by which the sins
of Christ's people are imputed to Him; and by which the righteousness of Christ is imputed to His people. The act of imputation is precisely the same in each case. It is not meant that Adam's sin was personally the sin of his descendants, but that it was treated as their sin, so that they share its guilt and penalty. It is not meant that Christ's people are made personally holy or inwardly righteous by the imputation of His righteousness to them, but that His righteousness is set to their account, so that they are entitled to all the rewards of that perfect righteousness.

These doctrines have had a place in the theology of the Christian church from the earliest Christian centuries, though the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ was first fully and clearly stated at the time of and following the Reformation. The first two of these doctrines have been the possession of the entire Christian church, while the third one of them is affirmed by both the Reformed and Lutheran branches of Protestantism.

III. The Scriptural Basis of These Doctrines.

These three doctrines have a basis in the Scripture, and are Scriptural terms of Original Sin, Atonement, and Justification.

The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is implied in the account of the Fall in Gen 2 and 3, taken in connection with the subsequent history of the human race as recorded in Gen and in the rest of the OT. Many ancient and modern interpreters regard this Posternity narrative as an allegorical, mythical and symbolical view of the historical form, either of a psychological fact, i.e. of something which takes place in every individual, or of certain general truths concerning sin. By some exegetes, following Kant, it has been held to depict an advance of the race in culture or ethical knowledge (Reuss; against which view of Budde, Clemen); by others it has been regarded as a symbolic representation of certain truths concerning sin (Oehler, Schults); by others it has been regarded as historical (Dittrich). All these are the one which accords with the narrative itself. It is evidently intended as historical by its author, and is so regarded by the NT writers. It is, moreover, introduced to explain, not an advance of the race, but an advance of sin from the first to its manifestation in certain penal evils with sin. It does this by showing how these evils came upon Adam as a punishment for his disobedience, and the subsequent history shows that his posterity were subjected to the same evils. It is true that the threat of punishment to Adam in case of disobedience was made to him alone, and that the penalties threatened are said to have come only upon him and Eve (Gen 3 16–19). Nevertheless, it is clear from the account of the subsequent history of the race that it actually shared in the punishments inflicted upon Adam, and that this was in consequence of his sin. This implies that in Gen 2 16 f are contained the terms of a covenant in which Adam acted as the representative of the race. If, therefore, the race shares in the penalty of Adam's sin, it must also share in his guilt or the judicial obligation to suffer punishment. And this is precisely what the theology of the entire Christian church has meant by saying that the guilt of Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity. This is in accordance with God's method of dealing with men in other recorded instances (Gen 19 15; Ex 20 5; Dt 1 37; 3 26); and the assertion of the principle of personal responsibility by Ezekiel and Jeremiah against an

abuse of the principle of representative responsibility implies a recognition of the latter (Ezek 18 24; 33 12; Jer 31 29).

The universality of sin and death is not brought into connection with the Fall of Adam by the other OT writers, but by Paul. In 1 Cor 15 21 f, Paul says that the death of all men has its cause in the man Adam in the same way in which the resurrection from the dead has its cause in the man Christ. The death of all men, accordingly, is not brought about by their personal sins, but has come upon all through the disobedience of Adam. Upon what ground this takes place, Paul states in the passage Rom 5 12–21. He introduces the subject of Adam's relation to the race to illustrate his doctrine of the justification of sinners on the ground of a righteousness which is not personally their own. In order to do this he takes the truth, well known to his readers, that all men are under condemnation on account of Adam's sin. The comparison is between Adam and Christ, and the specific point of the comparison is imputed sin and imputed righteousness. Hence in ver 12 Paul does not mean simply to affirm that as Adam sinned and consequently died, so men sin and die. Nor can he mean to say that just as God established a precedent in Adam's case that death should follow sin, so He acts upon this precedent in the case of all men because all sin, the real ground of the reign of death being the fact that all sin, and the formal ground being this precedent (B. Weiss); nor that men are condemned by the fact that they have sinned (Dillmann). Paul's purpose is to illustrate his doctrine of the way in which men are delivered from sin and death by the way in which they are brought into condemnation. The main thought of the passage is that, just as men are condemned on account of the imputation to them of the guilt of Adam's sin, so they are justified on account of the imputation to them of the righteousness of Christ. Paul says that it was by one man that sin and death entered into the world, viz. Adam, and that the latter ground the former, i.e. that the latter have been the imputation of the guilt of that one man's sin (vs 13,14,15). Hence there is a precise parallel between Adam and Christ. Just as men are condemned on account of Adam's disobedience, so they are justified on account of the obedience of Christ (vs 18,19). The thought of the passage is imputed sin and imputed righteousness as the ground of condemnation and of justification respectively.

That our sins are imputed to Christ is not expressly stated if the race are not regarded as a corporate body. This is, however, the teaching of the NT, and is implied in those passages which affirm that Christ 'bore our sins,' and that our iniquities were laid upon Him by Jeh. To bear iniquity or sin, though it may sometimes mean to bear it away or remove it, is an expression often applied in Scripture to persons charged with guilt and subjected to the punishment of their own sin (Lev 5 17; 7 18; 19 8; 22 9). That the Heb vb. nakan has this also indicated by its being interchanged with the vb. sabbal, which means 'to bear as a burden' and is used to denote the bearing of the punishment of sin (Isa 53 11). In the OT sacrificial system, which according to the NT is typical of the sacrifice of
Christ, the imposition of hands on the head of the victim signified the substitution of it for the offender and the transfer of his guilt to it. This idea is brought out clearly in the case of the two goats on the great Day of Atonement (Lev 16). When, therefore, the prophet Is 53 is said to "bear iniquity" (ver 11), or that "the chastisement of our peace was upon him" (ver 5), or that "Jeh hath laid (lit. "caused to fall") on him the iniquity of us all" (ver 6), the idea expressed is that Christ bore the punishment of our sin vicariously, its guilt having been imputed to Him. The thought of the prophecy is, as Delitzsch says, that of vicarious punishment, which implies the idea of the imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ.

The same idea underlies these expressions when they occur in the NT. When Peter wishes to hold up Christ as an example of patience in suffering, he takes up the thought of Isa, and adduces the fact that Christ "his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree" (1 Pet 2 24). The context indicates that Peter had the prophecy of Is 53 in mind, so that his meaning is, not that Christ carried our sins even up to the cross, but that in His death on the cross Christ bore the punishment of our sin, its guilt having been imposed vicariously, its guilt having been imputed to Him. The thought of the prophecy is, as Delitzsch says, that of vicarious punishment, which implies the idea of the imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ.

The same idea underlies these expressions when they occur in the OT. When Peter wishes to hold up Christ as an example of patience in suffering, he takes up the thought of Isa, and adduces the fact that Christ "his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree" (1 Pet 2 24). The context indicates that Peter had the prophecy of Is 53 in mind, so that his meaning is, not that Christ carried our sins even up to the cross, but that in His death on the cross Christ bore the punishment of our sin, its guilt having been imposed vicariously, its guilt having been imputed to Him. The thought of the prophecy is, as Delitzsch says, that of vicarious punishment, which implies the idea of the imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ.

This idea is taken up by Paul, who makes explicit the way in which this righteousness comes to sinners, and who puts the idea of imputed righteousness at the basis of his doctrine of Justification. By the righteousness of Christ Paul means Christ's legal status, or the merit acquired by all that He did in satisfying the demands of God's law, including what has been called His active and passive obedience. Notwithstanding the fact that most of the modern expositors of Paul's doctrine have denied that he teaches the imputation of Christ's obedience, this doctrine has a basis in the apostle's teaching. Justification leads to life and final glorification (Rom 6 18; 8 30); and Paul always conveys the obtaining of life as dependent on the fulfilment of the law. If, therefore, Christ secures life for us, it can only be in accordance with this principle. Accordingly, the apostle emphasizes the element of imputation of Christ's righteousness, which places this act of obedience at the basis of the sinner's justification (Rom 5 18). He also represents the obedience of the cross as the culminating point of a life of obedience on Christ's part (Phil 2 8). Moreover, he affirms that from all the demands of the law is secured by the fact that Christ was born under law (Gal 4 4). This cannot be restricted to the fact that Christ was under the curse of the law, for He was born under law and the result of this is that we are free from all of its demands. This doctrine is also implied in the apostle's teaching that Justification is absolutely gracious, taken in connection with the fact that it leads to a complete salvation.

The importance in Paul's thought of the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer can be seen from the fact that the question how righteousness was to be obtained occupied a central place in his religious consciousness, both before and after his conversion. His redemption by the appearance of the risen Christ determined his conception of the true way of obtaining righteousness, since the resurrection of Christ meant for Paul the condemnation of his entire past search for righteousness by works of the law.

That the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer does lie at the basis of Paul's doctrine of Justification can be further seen from the fact that Justification is absolutely free and unmerited so far as the sinner is concerned (Rom 3 24; 6 15; Gal 5 4; Tit 3 7); its object being one who is ungodly (Rom 4 5); so that it is not by works (Rom 3 20; 2 16; 3 11; 5 4; Phil 3 9); and yet that it is not a mere part of sin, but is a strictly "forensic" or judicial judgment, freeing the sinner from all the claims of the law, and granting him the right to eternal life. This last truth is plain because God's retributive righteousness lies at the basis of Paul's doctrine of Justification (Rom 2); is manifested in it (Rom 3 25); because Christ's expiatory work is its ground (Rom 3 25); and because our redemption from the curse of the law rests upon Christ's having borne it for us, and our redemption from the curse of the law depends upon their fulfilment by Christ (Gal 3 13; 4 4). Hence the gracious character of Justification, according to Paul, does not consist in its being merely a gracious pardon without any judicial basis (Ritschl); or in God's acceptance of a subjective righteousness produced by Him in the
sinner (Tobc); or in the acceptance of faith instead of a perfect righteousness (Cremer). The gracious character of Justification consists for Paul in the fact that the righteousness on the ground of which God justifies the ungodly is a righteousness which is graciously provided by God, and which Paul contrasts with the righteousness which comes from law works (Phil 3 9). The sinner, therefore, is pardoned and accepted as a righteous person, not on account of anything in himself, but only on account of what Christ has done for him, and which is only the clear demonstration of Christ’s suffering and obedience are imputed to the sinner as the ground of his justification.

This truth is explicitly affirmed by Paul, who speaks of God’s imputing righteousness without works, and of righteousness being imputed (Rom 4 6 11). The idea of the imputation of righteousness here is made clear by the context. The one who is declared righteous is said to be “ungodly” (4 5). Hence he is righteous only by God’s imputation of righteousness to him. This is also clear from the contrast between imputation according to grace and according to debt (4 4). He who seeks righteousness by works would be justified as a reward for his works, in antithesis to which, imputation comes to be the change one with a righteousness which he does not possess. Accordingly, at the basis of justification there is a reckoning to the sinner of an objective righteousness. This same idea is also implied and asserted by Paul in a parallel which he draws between Adam and Christ (Rom 5 15 f). The apostle says that just as men are condemned on account of a sin not their own, so they are justified on account of a righteousness which is not their own. The idea of the imputed sin and imputed righteousness is, is the precise point of the parallelism between condemnation in Adam and justification in Christ. This is also the idea which underlies the apostle’s contrast of the Old and New Covenants (2 Cor 3 9). The New Covenant is described as a “ministry of righteousness,” and contrasted with the Old Covenant which is described as a “ministry of condemnation.” If, therefore, this last expression does not denote a subjective condition of men under the old dispensation, but their relation to God in condemnation, righteousness must denote the opposite of this relation to the law, and must depend on God’s judicial acquittal. The same truth is expressed by Paul more concretely by saying that Christ has “made unto us righteousness” (Rom 3 20). Here the concrete mode of expression is chosen because Paul speaks also of Christ being our sanctification and redemption, so that an expression had to be chosen which would cover all of these ideas. One of the clearest statements concerning this objective righteousness is Phil 3 9. The apostle here affirms that the righteousness which the believer in Christ obtains is directly opposite to his own righteousness. This latter comes from works of the law, whereas the former comes from God and through faith in Christ. It is, therefore, objective to man, comes to him from God, is connected with the work of Christ, and is mediated by faith in Christ. The idea clearly stated in this last passage of a righteousness which is objective to the sinner and which comes to him from God, i.e. the idea of a new legal standing given to the believer by God, explains the meaning, in most cases, of the Pauline phrase “righteousness of God.” This phrase is used by Paul 9 t. Rom 1 17, 3 5 21, 25 f; 10 3 (twice), 4 f. 2 Cor 5 21. It expresses the Divine attribute of righteousness in Rom 3 5 25 f. The customary exegesis was to regard the other instances as denoting the righteousness of a sinner which comes to him from God, in accordance with Phil 3 9. More recently Haering, following Köhling in general, has interpreted all these instances as denoting God’s justifying action. But this interpretation is most strained in 2 Cor 5 21, where we are said to “become the righteousness of God” according to Rom 10 4, where the righteousness of God is identified with the righteousness which comes from faith, this latter being contrasted with man’s own inward righteousness. That a righteousness of man which he receives from God is here referred to, is confirmed by the fact that the reason given for the error of the Jews in seeking a righteousness from law works is the fact that the work of Christ has made an end of this method of obtaining righteousness (Rom 10 4). This righteousness, therefore, is one of which man is the possessor. The phrase, however, cannot mean a righteousness which is valid in God’s sight (Luther), although this thought is elsewhere expressed by Paul (Rom 3 20; Gal 3 11). It means a righteousness which comes from God and of which He is the author. This is not, however, by making man inwardly righteous, since all the above passages show the purely objective character of this righteousness. It is the righteousness of Phil 3 9; the righteousness which God imputes to the believer in Christ. Thus we “become the righteousness of God” in precisely the same sense in which Christ was “made to be sin” (2 Cor 5 21). Since Christ was made sin by having the guilt of our sin imputed to Him so that He bore its penalty, Paul must mean that we “become the righteousness of God” in the same objective sense through the imputation to us of the righteousness of Christ. In the same way, in Rom 10 3, the contrast between God’s righteousness and the Jew’s righteousness by works shows that in each case right standing with God comes from God by imputation. It is this same imputed righteousness which makes the gospel the power of God unto salvation (Rom 1 17), which has been revealed by the law and the prophets, which is received by faith in Christ by whose expiatory death God’s retributive righteousness has been manifested (Rom 3 21, 22, 25, 26), and which is represented by Peter as the object of Christian faith (2 Pet 1 1). It affirms that Abraham believed God and “it was imputed to him for righteousness” (Rom 4 3 AV; Gal 3 6). The old Arminian theologians, and some modern exegetes (H. Cremer) assert that Paul means that Abraham’s faith was accepted by God instead of his righteousness as the meritorious ground of his justification. This, however, cannot be the apostle’s meaning. It is diametrically opposed to the context where Paul introduces the case of Abraham for the very purpose of proving that he was justified without any merit on his part; it is opposed to Paul’s idea of the nature of faith which involves the renunciation of all claim to merit, and is a simple resting on Christ from whom all its saving efficacy is derived; and this interpretation is also contrary to Paul’s doctrine of the absolutely gracious character of Justification. The apostle in these passages wishes to illustrate from the case of Abraham the gracious character of Justification, and quotes the untechnical language of Gen 15 6. His meaning is simply that Abraham was justified as a believer in God, and not as one who sought righteousness by works. See SIN; ATONEMENT; JUSTIFICATION.

LITERATURE.—Besides the Comm., see works on OT Theology by Dillmann, Davidson, Oehler, Seeck, Dietrich, on NT Theology by H. Holtzmann, B. Weiss, Schmitt, also Chemnitz, De Vocacio Impositionis, Loc. Theol., 1604, 11, 320 f; J. Martin, Theol. Higher der Bibel, 1854, 1834, 20–46; Clemen, Die christliche Lehre von der Vergebung der Sünde, I, 1897, 151–79; Dietrich, Christliche Lehre von der Vergebung der Sünde, 1871; Hünfeld, Rom 5 12–21, 1890; Crawford, The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement.
INCENSE, in'sens (בְּהֵבָן, kīṭōrāh; in Jer 44 21, בֶּשְׁאֶם, 'ṣētor; in Mal 1 11, בְּשֶׁמ, 'kōtar, "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name"; the word בְּהֵבָן, ṣbhōn, trf "incense" in several passages in Isa and Jer in AV, is properly "frankincense," and is so rendered in RV): The offering of incense, or burning of aromatic substances, is common in the religious ceremonies of nearly all nations (Egyptians, Babylonians, Assurians, Phoenicians, etc), and it is natural to find it holding a prominent place in the tabernacle and temple-worship of Israel. The newer critical theory that incense was a late importation into the religion of Israel, and that the altar of incense described in Ex 30 1 ff is a post-exilian invention, rests on pre-suppositions which are not here admitted, and is in contradiction to the express notices of the altar of incense in 1 K 6 20, 22; 7 48; 9 25; of 2 Ch 4 19 (see discussion of the subject by Delitzsch in Luthardt's Zeitsschrift, 1880, 113 ff). In the de-nunciation of Eli in 1 S 2 27 ff, the burning of incense is mentioned as one of the functions of the priesthood (ver 28). The "smoke" that filled the temple in Isaiah's vision (Isa 6 4) may be presumed to be the smoke of the incense. The word kīṭōrāh itself properly denotes "smoke." For the altar of incense see art. on that subject, and TABERNACLE AND TEMPLE. The incense used in the tabernacle service—called 'sweet incense' (kīṭōrāh ha-gammīm, Ex 26 6, etc)—was compounded according to a definite prescription of the perfumes, stacte, omyra, galbanum and pure frankincense (Ex 30 34 f), and incense not so compounded was rejected as 'strange incense' (kīṭōrāh zara'īm, 30 9). In the offering of incense, burning coals from the altar of burnt offering were borne in a censer and put upon the altar of incense (the "golden altar" before the oracle), then the fragrant incense was sprinkled on the fire (of Lk 1 91). Ample details of the rabbinical rules about incense may be seen in the art. "Incense," in DB. See CENSE.

Figuratively, incense was symbolical of ascending prayer. The multitude were praying while Zacharias offered incense (Lk 1 10, ποιημα, thulmatma), and in Rev 5 8; 8 3 f, the incense in the heavenly temple was connected and even identified (8) with "the prayers of the saints." See IMMORTALITY.

INCENT, in'sest. See CREMES.

INCONTINENCY, in-kon-ti-nen-si (ἀκαρσία, akarsia, "without control"): In 1 Cor 7 5, it evidently refers to lack of control in a particular matter, and signifies unfaithfulness. In Mt 23 25, the Gr word is τράπανες in both AV and ARV by "excess."

INCORRUPTION, in-kör-ru'pshun. See IMMORTALITY.

INCREASE, in'kres (noun), in'kres (vb): Employed in the Eng. Bible both as vb. and as noun, and in both cases to represent a number of different words in the original. As a vb. it is used in the ordinary sense of the term. As a noun it is usually used of plant life, or of the herds and flocks, to denote the fruitage or the offspring; more rarely of money, to denote the interest. As examples of the different terms trf by this word, students who read Gr may compare Dt 7 22; Prov 16 21; Job 10 16 AV; Dl 23; Nu 18 30; Dt 7 13; Ezek 22 12 in the OT, and Jn 3 30; 1 Cor 3 6; Col 2 19; Eph 4 16 in the NT.

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

IMRah

IMRAH, im'rah (יִמְרָה, yirmah): A descendant of Asher (1 Ch 7 36).

IMRI, im'ri (יִימְרִי, yirmi): (A) A Judahite (1 Ch 9 4). (B) Father of Zaeceur who helped to rebuild the walls of Jerus under Nehemiah (Neh 3 2).

IN: A principal thing to notice about this prep., which in AV represents about 16 Heb and as many Gr words and preps., is, that in hundreds of cases (again, as in "an") it frequently also in the NT and in the LXX where RV the rendering is changed to more exact forms ("to," "unto," "by," "upon," "at," "with," "among," "for," "throughout," etc; cf e.g. Gen 16 10; 17 11; 31 54; 40 7; 49 17; Ex 8 14, 24; Lev 3 17; 4 2, etc). The chief Gr prep. εν, en, is frequently adhered to as "in" in RV where AV has other forms (e.g., "among" with "in" or "of" "in the teachings of John's baptism, Mt 3 11, and; in the tombs" for "among the tombs," Mk 5 3). In 2 Thess 2 2, "shaken in mind" in AV is more correctly rendered in RV 'shaken from [πόδι] your mind.' There are numerous such instructive changes.

JAMES ORR

IN THE LORD (εν Κυρίῳ, en Kuríō): A favorite Pauline expression, denoting that intimate union and fellowship of the Christian with the Lord Jesus Christ. The basis of all Christian relations and conduct, and the distinctive element in which the Christian life has its specific character. Cf the synonymous Pauline phrases, "in Christ," "in Jesus Christ," "in the Christian church," "in the Christian church," "abiding in Christ." "In the Lord" designates: (1) the motive, quality, or character of a Christian duty or virtue, as based on union with Christ, e.g. "free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord" (1 Cor 7 39), i.e. provided the marriage be consistent with the Christian life. Cf 1 Cor 15 58; Phil 3 1; 4 12. 4.10; Eph 6 1.10; Col 3 18, etc; (2) the ground of Christian unity, fellowship, and brotherly salutation, e.g. Rom 16 2.5.22; 1 Cor 16 19; Col 4 7; (3) it is often practically synonymous with "Christian" (noun or adj.), "as Christians" or "as a Christian," e.g. "Salute them of the household of Narcissus, that are in the Lord," i.e. that are Christians (Rom 16 14); "I . . . the prisoner of the Lord," i.e. the Christian prisoner (Eph 4 1); of Rom 16 13; 1 Cor 9 1.2; Eph 6 21 ("faithful minister in the Lord"—faithful Christian minister); Col 4 17 (see Grimm-Thayer, Lex. of NT, εν, en, 1, 6). D. MIALLA EDWARDS

INCANTATION, in-kan-ta'shun. See Magic.

INCARNATION, in-kär-nä'shen. See PERSON OF CHRIST.
INDIA, in’di-a (ินเดีย, हिन्दु; ḥ ʼIssak, हे इस्लाम): The name occurs in canonical Scripture only in Est 1 1; 8 9, of the country which marked the eastern boundary of the territory of Abahserus. The Heb word comes from the name of the Indus, Hound, and denotes, not the peninsula of Hindustan, but the country drained by that great river. This is the meaning also in 1 Est 3 2; Ad Est 3 2; 16 1. Many have thought that this country is intended by Havelah in Gen 21 11 and that the Indus is the Pishon. The drivers of the elephants (1 Mace 6 37) were doubtless natives of this land. The name in 1 Mace 8 9 is certainly an error. India never formed part of the dominions of An- trochos the Great. It may possibly be a clerical error for “Tonia,” as Media is possibly a mistake for Mysia. If the Israelites in early times had no direct trade routes with India, many characteristic Indian products seem to have found their way into Palest- inian markets by way of the Arabian and Syrian trade routes, or by means of the Red Sea fleets (1 K 10 11.15; Est 27 15 ff, etc). Among these may be noted “horns of ivory and ebony,” “cassia and calamus,” alnus (sandalwood), and peacocks. W. EVING

INDIGNITIES, in-dig’ni-tz. See PUNISHMENTS.

INDITE, in-dit’; AV Ps 45 1, “My heart is inditing a good matter”; RV “My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter,” is in harmony with יִצְכֹּל (tzqal), “to bubble up,” of LXX ἐξερευκόμη, εξερέαται, “to pour out,” “Indite” in Eng. is becoming obsolete. It may mean “to dictate,” “to invite,” “to compose.” In the latter meaning it is used in the above passage.

INFANCY, in’fan-si, GOSPEL OF THE. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

INFANT, in’fan, BAPTISM. See BAPTISM.

INFANCITIDE, in’fan-ti-đ. See CRIMES.

INFIDEL, in’fl-d. (ἀπόστατος, ἄπιστος, “unbelieving,” “incredulous”): AV has this word twice: “What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?” (2 Cor 6 15); “If any provide not for his own, . . . it is worse than an infidel” (1 Tim 5 8). In both passages ERV and ARV have “unbelieving” in harmony with numerous other instances of the use of the Gr ἄπιστος. The word nowhere corresponds to the modern conception of an infidel, one who denies the existence of God, or repudiates the Chris- tian faith; but always signifies one who has not be- come a believer in Christ. It was formerly so used in Eng., and some of the older VSS have it in other passages, besides these two. It is not found in the OT, but “infidelity” (incredulity) occurs in 2 Est 74 44 [114]. WILIAM OWEN CARVER

INFINITE, in’fant, INFINITUDE, in’fin-uit-đ. The word “infinite” occurs 8 times only in the text of AV (Job 22 5; Ps 147 5; Nah 3 9) 1. Scripture and ones in m (Nah 2 9). In Ps 147 5, “Is understanding infinite,” it represents the Heb יְבָשָׁם, יְבָשָׁם, “no number”; in the other passages the Heb יְבָשָׁם, יְבָשָׁם (Job 22 5, of iniquities) and יְבָשָׁם, יְבָשָׁם (Nah 3 9, of strength of Ethio- pia and Egypt; AVM 2 9, of “apolo.”), meaning “no end.” RV, therefore, renders in Job 22 5, “Neither is there any end to thine iniquities,” and drops the marginal reference in Nah 2 9. Ps 147 5 is thus the only passage in which the term is directly applied to God. It there correctly conveys the idea of absence of all limitation. There is nothing beyond the compass of God’s understand- ing, or, positively, His understanding embraces everything there is to know.

2. Application to God Past, present and future; all things possible and actual; the inmost thoughts and purposes of man, as well as his outward actions, bare to God’s knowledge (He 4 13; see OUTSIDE.

While, however, the term is not found, the truth that God is infinite, not only in His understanding, but in His being and all His perfections, natural and moral, is, on the contrary, as a law, true not only in a relative, yet the ideas for which these terms stand were all of them attributed in their conceptions to God. They did not, e.g. conceive of God as having been born, or as having a beginning, as the Bab and Gr gods had, but thought of Him as the ever-existing One (Ps 90 1.2), and free Creator and Disposer of all that exists. This means that God has self-existence, and for the same reason that He is not bound by His own creation. He must be thought of as raised above all creaturely limits, that is, as infinite.

The anthropomorphisms of the Bible, indeed, are often exceedingly naive, as when Jeh is said to “go down” to see what is being done (Gen 11 5.7; 12 21), or represent His actions (Gen 6 6); but these repre- sentations stand in contexts which show that the authors knew God to be unlimited in time, space, knowledge and power (Gen 6 7; God, Creator of all; 11 8.9; universal Ruler; 18 25, universal Judge; Nu 23 19, in- capable of repentance, etc). Like anthropomorphisms are found in Dt and the Prophets, where it is not doubted that the higher conceptions existed. In this infinity of God is implied His unspeakableness (Job 11 7; Ps 145 3; Rom 11 33); conversely, the latter attribute implies His infinity.

This infinity of God is displayed in all His attributes—in His eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, etc—see the separate arts. As regards the a Perfection proper conception of infinity, one has never the term chiefly to guard against figuring it under too quantitative an aspect. Quantitative boundlessness is the natural symbol we employ to represent infinity, yet reflection will convince us that it is inadequate as applied to a spiritual magnitude. Infinitude in power, e.g. is not an infinite quantity of power, but the potentiality in God of accomplishing without limit everything that is possible to power. It is a perfection, not a quantity. Still more is this appar- ent in moral attributes like love, righteousness, truth, holiness. These attributes are not quanti- ties (a quantity can never be truly infinite), but perfections; the infinity is qualitative, consisting in the absence of all defect or limitation in degree, not in amount.

The recollection of the fact now stated will free the mind from most of the perplexities that have been raised by metaphysical writers as to the abstract possibility of the existence of infinite attributes in God (thus e.g. Mansel); the recon- ciliability of God’s infinity with His Personality, or with the concept of a finite world; the power of the human mind to conceive infinity, etc. How, it is asked,
can the idea of infinity get into our finite minds? It might as well be asked how the brain can take in the idea of the sun's distance of some 90 millions of miles from the earth, when the skull that holds the brain is only a few cubic inches in capacity. The idea of a mile is not a mile big, nor is the idea of infinity so large to be thought of by the mind of man. The essence of the power of thought is its capacity for the universal, and it cannot rest till it has apprehended the most universal idea of all—the infinite.

JAMES OUR

INFIRMITY, in-für-mi’ty (יִפּוּךְ, dāwēh, יִמּוּךְ, ḫōlah, יִמְמָךְ, mahālāh; ἄσθενε, astheneia): This word is used either in the singular or plural (the latter only in the NT) and with somewhat varying significance. (1) As sickness or bodily disease (Jn 5 5; Mt 8 17; Lk 5 13; 8 2; 1 Tim 5 23). In the last instance the affections seem to have been dyspeptic, the discomfort of which might be relieved by alcohol, although the disease would not be cured thereby. It is probable that this condition of body produced a certain slackness in Timothy's work, and Paul, in his letters, cautions against it. In Lk 7 21 RV has "diseases" which is a better rendering of the Gr ἀσθένη, used here, than the AV "infirmities." (2) Imperfections or weaknesses of body (Rom 6 19; 2 Cor 11 30 AV; 12 5.9.10 AV; Gal 4 4 AV). (3) Moral or spiritual weaknesses and defects (Ps 77 10; Rom 8 26; 15 1; He 4 15; 5 2; 7 28). In this sense it is often used by the classic Eng. writers, as in Milton's "the last infirmity of noble minds"; cf. Censor, IV, iii, 86. The infirmity which a man of resolution can keep under by his will (Prov 18 14) may be either moral or physical. In Lk 13 11 the woman's physical infirmity is ascribed to the influence of an evil spirit.

ALEX. MACALISTER

INFLAME, in-flām’, ENFLAME, en-flām’ (יָמַק, dáleḵ): "To inflame" in the meaning "to excite passion" is found in Isa 5 11, "thine wine inflame them." In some AV passages (e.g. Isa 67 5) we find "enflaming" with the same meaning; cf AV Sus ver 8 and Sir 38 10 AV (RV "inflame").

INFLAMMATION, in-flām-mā’shun (יָמַק, ὀλέθζη, ἐρυγός, ῥήγος): Only in Dt 25 22, was considered by Jewish writers as "burning fever," by LXX as a form of ague. Both this and typhoid fever are acute, and probably caused by the same disease of the diseases of Pal. See Fever. In Lev 13 28 AV has "inflammation" as the rendering of čārebheth, which LXX reads ḥarakēth, and for which the proper Eng. equivalent is 'scar,' as in RV.

INFLUENCES, in-flū’’nses-iz (יָמַק, מְדַחַנִית): This word occurs only in Job 38 31 AV, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" RV "the cluster of the Pleiades," m "or chain, or sweet influences"; Deitzeili, Dillmann and others render "letters" that which binds the group together; "influences" if correct, would refer to the seasons, which were believed to be regulated, so far, by the Pleiades (q.v.). In Wisd 7 25, it is said of Wisdom that she is "a pure influence (ἀπόρροια, RV "influence") flow'ing from the glory of the Almighty.

W. L. WALKER

INGATHERING, in-gath’er-ing, FEAST OF, See FEASTS AND FASTS; Booth.

INHABIT, in-hab’it, INHABITANT, in-hab’it-ant (בָנָי, yāshāb, "to sit," "remain," "dwell," "inhabit," בְּנֵי, shākḥān, "to settle down," "tabernacle," "dwell"; קָרָוֹח, kārōkah, "to settle," "dwell"); See DWELL. The vb. "to in-

habit," now used only transitively, had once an intransitive meaning as well. Cf Cowper, Olney Hymns, XIV, "Who built it, who inhabits there?"

So in 1 Ch 5 9 AV, "And eastward he inhabited unto the entering in of the wilderness" (but RV "dwell") and Rev 13 12 AV (but omitted in RV). The rare inhabitress (fem.) is found only in Jer 10 17 m; "the church called the inhabitress of the gardens" (Bishop Richardson).

D. MIALL EDWARDS

INHERITANCE, in-her’-tans (יָמַק, nahālāh, "something inherited," "occupancy," "inheritance," "estates," "portion"): The word is used in its widest application in the OT Scriptures, referring not only to an estate received by a child from its parents, but also to the land received by the children of Israel as a gift from Jehovah. And in the figurative and poetical sense, the expression is applied to the kingdom of God as represented in the consecrated lives of His followers. "In a similar sense, the Psalmist is represented as speaking of the Lord as the inheritance of his people. In addition to the above word, the King James Version trs as inheritance, נאַמַה, mōrdākhāh, "a possession," "heritage" (Dt 33 4; Ezk 33 24); נאַמַה , yrushāhāh, "something occupied," "a patrimony," "possessions" (Jgs 21 17; פִּתְחָה, Ḫelek, "smoothness," "allotment" (Ps 16 5)); קָרָוֹחִים, קָרָוֹחִים, "to inherit" (Mt 5 5, etc.); קָרָוֹחִים, קָרָוֹחִים, "heir" (Mt 21 38, etc.); קָרָוֹחִים, קָרָוֹחִים, "inheritance," "patrimony," "possession"; or קָרָוֹחִים, קָרָוֹחִים, "an acquisition," "portion," "inheritance," from קָרָוֹחֵק, kārōkh, "to assign," "to allot," "to obtain an inheritance" (Mt 21 38; Lk 13 13; Acts 7 20, 32, 26, 18; Gal 3 18; Eph 1 11.14.18; 6 5; Col 1 12; 3 24; He 1 4; 9 15; 11 8; 1 Pet 1 4).

The Pent distinguishes clearly between real and personal property, the fundamental idea regarding the former being the thought that the land is God's, given by Him to His children, the people of Israel, and hence cannot be alienated (Lev 25 23-28). In order that there might not be any respecter of persons in the division, the lot was determined to the specific piece to be owned by each family head (Nu 26 52-56; 33 54). Consequently, any change of circumstances, a homestead was sold, the title could pass only temporarily; for in the year of Jubilee every homestead must again return to the original owner or heir (Lev 25 25-34). Real estate given to the priesthood must be appraised, and could be redeemed by the payment of the appraised valuation, thus preventing the transfer of real property even in this case (Lev 27 14-25). Inheritance was controlled by the following regulations: (1) The firstborn son inherited the double portion of all the father's possessions (Dt 21 15-17); (2) the daughters were entitled to an inheritance, provided there were no sons in the family (Nu 27 8); (3) in case there were no direct heirs, the brothers or more distant kinsmen were recognized (vs 9-11); in no case should an estate pass from one tribe to another. The above points were made the subject of statutory law at the instance of the daughters of Zelophehad, the entire case being clearly set forth in Nu 27 1-36.

FRANK E. HIBBACH

INQUIETY, in-ik’wi-ti (יִפּוּךְ, ḥăwôn; ṣawwa, anomia): In the OT of the 11 words trs "iniquity," by far the most common and important is ḥăwôn (about 215 t). Etymologically, it is customary to explain it as meaning lit. "crookedness," "per-
vereness," i.e., evil regarded as that which is not straight or upright, moral distortion (from תרן, 'trown, "to bend," "make crooked," "pervert").

Driver, however (following Lagarde), maintains that two roots, distinct in Aram., have been confused in Heb, one = "to bend," "pervert" (as above), and the other = "to err," "go astray"; that thatno is derived from the latter, and consequently expresses the idea of error, deviation from the right path, rather than that of perversion (Driver, Notes on Sam. 135 n.). Whichever etymology is adopted, in actual use it has three meanings which almost imperceptibly pass into each other: (1) iniquity, (2) guilt of iniquity, (3) punishment of iniquity. Primarily, it denotes "not an action, but the character of an action" (Oehler), and is distinguished from "sin" (haddoth). Hence we have the expression "the iniquity of my sin" (Ps 32 2). Thus the meaning glides into that of "guilt," which might often take the place of "iniquity" as the tr of יבונ (Gen 15 16; Ex 34 7; Jer 2 22, etc.). From "guilt" it again passes into the meaning of "punishments of guilt" (Budge, Lat. piaculum may denote both guilt and its punishment. The transition is all the easier in Heb because of the Heb sense of the intimate relation of sin and suffering, e.g. Gen 4 13, "My punishment is greater than I can bear"; which is obviously preferred to AVm, RVm "My iniquity is greater than can be forgiven," for Cain is not so much expressing sorrow for his sin, as complaining of the severity of his punishment; of 2 K 7 9 (RV "punishment," RVm "punishment"); Isa 5 18 (where for "iniquity" we might have "punishment of iniquity," as in Lev 26 41,43, etc); Isa 40 2 ("iniquity," RVm "punishment"). The phrase "bear iniquity" is a standing expression for bearing its consequences. of course, of the innermost bearing of the results of his own iniquity (Lev 17 16; 20 17,19; Nu 14 34; Ezk 44 10, etc), but sometimes of one bearing the iniquity of another vicariously, and so taking it away (e.g. Ezk 4 4; 18 19). Of special interest in the latter sense are the sufferings of the Servant of Jehovah, who shall "bear the iniquities" of the people (Isa 53 11; cf ver 6).

Other words frequently tr 4 "iniquity" are: יִתָנ, 'etan, lit. "worthlessness," "vanity," hence "naughtiness," "miscief" (47 t in AV, esp. in the phrase "worker of iniquity," Job 4 8; Ps 5 5; 8 6; Prov 10 29, etc); שַטָנָה, 'atana, lit. "perverse" (Dt 32 4; Job 6 29 AV, etc).

In the NT "iniquity" stands for ἀνομία = prop., "the condition of one without law," "lawlessness" (so trs 1 in 1 Jn 3 4, elsewhere "iniquity," e.g. Mt 7 23, a word which frequently stood for ἀδικία in LXX; and adikia, lit. "unrighteousness" (e.g. Lk 13 27). D. Miall Edwards

INJOIN, in-join'. See ENJOIN.

INJURIOUS, in-jor'-i-us, in-ju'-r-i-us (נֵבְרֹת, hubरות, "insolent"): In former usage, the word was strongly expressive of insult as well as hurtfulness. So in 1 Tim 1 13; in Rom 1 30 the same adj. is tr 4 "insolent." (AV "despightful").

INJURY, in-jur-i, in-jor'-i. See CRIMES.

INK, ink (יָנָק, yānāq, from root meaning "slowly flowing," BDB, 188; מָלָע, mēlāq, "black"): Any fluid substance used with pen or brush to form written characters. In this sense ink is mentioned only in the Heb Bible (Jer 36 2) and 3 t in the Gr NT (2 Cor 11 23; Phil 2 16; Rev 19 13), and it is implied in all references to writing on papyrus or on leather. The inference from the "blotting out" of Ex 33 33 and Nu 5 23 that the Heb ink was a lamp-black and gum, or some other dry ink, is confirmed by the general usage of antiquity, by the later Jewish prejudice against other inks (OTJ, 71 n.) and by a Jewish receipt referring to ink-tablets (Drach, "Notice sur l'encre des Hébreux," Ann. philos. chrét., 42, 45, 353). The question is, however, not being put on a wholly new basis by the study of the Elephantine Jewish documents (Meyer, Papyri fund., 1912, 15, 21), and above all of the Harvard Ostracons from Samaria which give actual specimens of the ink in Pal in the time of Ahab (Harvard Theol. Rev., Jan. 1911, 139-43). It is likely, however, that during the long period of Bible history various inks were used. The official copy of the law in the time of Ptolemy Philadephus was, according to Jos (Ant., XII, ii, 11), written in gold, and the vermilion and red paints and dyes mentioned in Jer 22 14; Ezk 22 14, and Woes 13 14 (mildē kot phakes) were probably used also for writing books or coloring inscribed inscriptions. See literature under Writing; esp. Krauss, Talm. Arch. 6, 148-53; Garthausen, Gr Pal., 1911, 1, 202-17, and his bibliographical references, 245-7.

INK-HORN, ink 'horn (נֶפֶלָן, nefelān, kepheth = κεφθή, BDB, 903): This term "inkhorn" occurs 3 t in Ezk 9 (vs 2.3.11), in the phrase "writer's inkhorn upon his loins" (or "by his side"). The word is more exactly "implement case," or "writing-case" (calamarium atramentarium, theca calamaria, theca librariorum, grapharia). This may have been the Egyptian palette (Budge, Mummy, 350-52) seen so often in the monuments of all periods, or the later form of pen-case with ink-well attached, which is a modified form adapted for ink carried in fluid form. The Egyptian palette was carried characteristically over the shoulder or under the arm, neither of which methods is strictly "upon the loins." The manner of carrying, therefore, was doubtless in the girdle, as in modern oriental usage (Benzinger, Heb Archæol., 185). A good example of the pen-case and inkwell writing-case (given also in Garucci, Daremberg-Saglio, Garthausen, etc) is given from the original in Birt, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst, 220, and is reproduced (a) in this article, together with (b) an Egyptian palette. Whether the form of Ezekiel's case approached the palette or the ink-well type probably depends on the question of whether dry ink or fluid ink was used in Ezekiel's time (see Ink). Compare Hieronymus ad loc., and for literature,
see Writing, and esp. Garthauden, Gr Pal, 1911, pp. 1, 93-94.

E. C. Richardson

---

**INN** (יוֹרְק, mälon; πανδοχεῖον, pandochrome, κατάλυμα, kataluma): The Heb word mälon means lit. a “night resting-place,” and might be applied to any spot where caravans encamped for the night. In the slightly altered form πανδοχεῖον, the same word is used of a night-watchman’s lodge in a garden (Isa 1:5; 24:20, AV “cottage”). The word in itself does not imply the presence of any building, and in the case of caravans and travelers was doubtless originally, as very often at the present day, only a convenient level bit of ground near some spring, where baggage might be unloaded, animals watered and tethered, and men rest on the bare ground. Nothing in the OT suggests the occupancy of a house in such cases. The nearest approach to such an idea occurs in Jer 41:17, where גֵּרָּד מֹקְחֵֽם is tr “the lodging-place of Chimham,” but the text is very doubtful and probably refers rather to sheepfolds. We cannot say when buildings were first used, but the need of shelter for caravans traveling in winter, and of protection in dangerous times and districts, would lead to their introduction at an early period in the history of trade.

It is noteworthy that all the indisputable designations of “inn” come in with the Gr period. Jos (1 Macc, XV, v, 1; 2 Macc, xxi, 7) speaks of “public inn” under the name of a ἱκατογατι, while in the Aram. Jewish writings we meet with ἀνεσμία, from Lat hospitium, and ἀκογαγα from the Gr zenia; the NT designation pandochrome has passed into the Aram. pandheki and the Arab. funduk. All these are used of public inns, and they all correspond to the modern “khan” or “caravanserai.” These are to be found on the great trade routes all over the East. In their most elaborate form they have almost the strength of a fortress. They consist of a great quadrangle into which admission is gained through a broad, strong gateway. The quadrangle is enclosed on all sides by a 2-story building, the windows in the case of the lower story opening only to the interior. The upper story is reached by stairways, and has a gangway all around, giving access to the practically bare rooms which are at the disposal of travelers.

The interior of the room. There is usually a well of good water in the center of the quadrangle, and as a rule bring own food and often that of their animals (Jgs 19:19) with them. Their Evil Name are no fixed payments, and on departure, the arrangement of *haqq el-khan* generally means a disagreeable dispute, as the innkeepers are invariably untruthful, dishonest and oppressive. They have ever been regarded as of infamous character. The Rom laws recognize many places of this kind, and the Targum adds: *'Abbōdāh Zārāh,* i.e. places them in the lowest scale of degradation. The NT is quite clear in speaking of *Rahab the harlot* (He 11:31; Jas 2:25). The Tg designates her an “innkeeper,” while Rashkīn tr zāādah as “a seller of kinds of food,” a meaning the word will bear. Kimḥi, however, accepts both meanings. This evil repute of public inns, together with the Sem spirit of hospitality, led the Jews and the early Chrisians also to prefer to recommend the opening of open house for the entertainment of strangers. In the Jewish Morning Prayers, even in our day, such action is linked with great promises, and the NT repeatedly (He 13:2; 1 Pet 4:9; 3 in ver 5) commends hospitality. It is remarkable that both the Talm (Shab 127a) and the NT (He 13:2) quote the same passage (Gen 18:3) in recommending it.

The best-known khan’s in Pal are Khan Jubb-Yusef, N. of the Lake of Galilee, Khan el-Tûbūn under the shadow of Tabor, Khan el-Lubbān (of Jgs 21:19), and Khan Ḥadur, midway between Jerus and Jericho. This last certainly occupies the site of the inn referred to in Lk 10:34, and it is not without interest that we read in Mish, Ybāmōt, of another sick man being left at that same inn. See illustration, p. 64.

The Gr word kataluma, though implying a “loos- ing” for the night, seems rather to be connected with the idea of hosting. The idea of “hostel” is sometimes tr *kataluma, and it appears in Lk 9:22 for lishkāh, AV “parlour.” It is the word used of the “upper room” where the Last Supper was held (Mt 14:14; Lk 22:11, “guest-chamber”), and of the place of reception in Bethphalom where Joseph and Mary failed to find quarters (Lk 2:7). It thus corresponds to the spare or upper room in a private house or in a village, i.e. to the *mansṭ* adjoining the house of the sheikh, where travelers received hospitality and where no payment was expected, except a trifle to the caretaker. In Jerus such payments were made by leaving behind the earthware vessels that had been used, and the skins of the animals that had been slaughtered (Yoma 12a).

Judging from the word used, and the conditions implied, we are led to believe that Joseph and Mary had at first expected reception in the

5. Birth upper room or *mansṭ* at the house of Christ the sheikh of Bethphalom, probably a friend and member of the house of David; that in this they were disappointed, and had to content themselves with the next best, the elevated platform alongside the interior of the stable, and on which those having the care of the animals generally slept. It being now the season when they were in the fields (Lk 2:8), the stable would be empty and clean. There then the Lord Jesus was born and laid in the safest and most convenient place, the nearest empty manger alongside of this elevated platform. Humble though the circumstances were, the family were preserved from all the annoyance and evil associated with the life of the khan, and all the demands of delicacy and privacy were duly met.

W. M. Christie

INNER MAN. See inward Man.

INNOCENCE, in'ō-sēn, INNOCENCY, in'ō-sen-si, INNOCENT, in'ō-sent ([פִּי], zāhā, [יָד], yād)
II. Analysis of Narrative with Special Reference to Motive. — In estimating the value of such a narrative, apart from the viewpoint of historicity, the first and most important step is to gauge the motive. Why was the story told? This question is not always easy to answer, but in the present instance there is a very simple and effective test at hand. In Mt's infancy section (chs 1 and 2) there are five quotations from the OT which are set into the narrative of events. These five quotations represent the cardinal and outstanding points of interest. The quotations are:

1. Focus of Narrative — points of interest.
2. Corollaries from Above Facts
3. Marks of Historicity

I. Meaning and History of the Term. — The conventional, ecclesiastical name given to the slaughter by Herod I (q.v.) of children two years old and under in Bethlehem and its environs at the time of the birth of Christ (Mt 2:16). The accepted title for this event may be traced through Augustine to Cyprian.

Irenaeus (d. 202 AD) calls these children “martyrs,” and in a very beautiful passage interprets their tragedy as that which ended their brief lives as a gracious, tender “sending before” into His kingdom by the Lord Himself. Cyprian (d. 258 AD) says: “That it might be manifest that they who are slain for Christ’s sake are innocent, innocent infancy was put to death for the Lord’s sake” (Ep. 1). John Augustine (b. 354 AD), following Cyprian, speaks of the children, formally, as “the Innocents” (Comm. on Ps 43:5).

The ecclesiastical treatment of the incident is remarkable because of the exaggeration which was indulged in as to the extent of the massacre and the number of victims. At an early date the Gr church canonized 14,000, and afterward, by a curious misinterpretation of Rev 14:13, the number was increased to 144,000.

According to Milman the liturgy of the Church of England retains a reminiscence of this ancient error in the use of Rev 14 on Holy Innocents’ Day (see History of Christianity, I, 107, n. e). This exaggeration, of which there is no hint in the NT, is worthy of note because the most serious general argument against the historicity of the narrative is drawn from the silence of Jos. As in all probability there could not have been more than twenty children involved (cf Farrar, Life of Christ, I, 45, n.), the incident could not have bulked very largely in the series of horrors perpetrated and planned by Herod in the last months of his life (cf Farrar, The Herods, 144 f.).
return home. Interest in them flags as soon as their brief connection with the movement of the historic Jesus ceases. And the intensely Hebraic character of Mt's Incarnation setting as a whole is indebted to evidence pointing in the same direction (cf. remarks of the writer, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 70 f.).

It is clear that the story is told to emphasize the wonder-element in connection with the birth of Christ. The facts contradict this. In addition to the primary consideration, the subordinate position, there are others of great value. That the Magi were providentially guided to the feeding of the infant Jesus is demonstrated by the coincidence of the Messiah's birth and the Magi's visit. The striking feature of the story is that the whole belief in his mind he keeps so strictly within the limits of the natural order. In vs. 9 and 10 only is there apparent exception. Of these the statement that he came down to this earth is in itself perfectly in harmony with the idea that the Magi were providentially guided to the feeding of the infant Jesus. The interest of the writer was not in the wonder-element, else, infallibly, he would have developed its outlines and expurgated all ambiguity as to the nature of the occurrence.

We may now glance at the positive evidence for the historicity of the event.

1. The centering of the narrative about the birth of Jesus at Nazareth. This not only brings Lk's Gospel in support of the center, but groups the story around a point of known interest to the first generation of believers. It is interesting to note the parallel evidence in Egypt has independent backing of a sort. There are two existences of two stories, one traced by Origen through Jews of his own day to earlier times, and the other in the Talm, which connect Jesus with Egypt and attempt to account for his miraculous by reference to Egypt magic (see Plummer, "Matthew," Ez. Comm., 11,15).

2. The fact that the story of the Magi is told so objectively and with such personal detachment. Both Jews and early Christians had strong views both as to the divinity and the historicity of Jesus (see Plummer, op. cit., 15), but the author of this Gospel tells the story without emphasis and without comment and from the viewpoint of the Magi. His interest is purely historical and matter-of-fact.

3. That Herod the Great was so far as Herod is concerned the incident is usually discussed with exclusive reference to the savagery involved. By many it is affirmed that we have here a hostile and unfair portrait. This contention could hardly be sustained even if the question turned entirely upon the point of savagery. But there is far more than savagery in the incident. (a) In the first place there is this undeniable element of inherent probability in the story. Practically all of Herod's moral and religious side was devoted to the salvation of his sons, were perpetrated under the sway of one emotion and in obedience to a single motive. They were in practically every instance for the purpose of consolidating or perpetuating his power. He not only destroyed his own immediate family in the half dozen that on occasion drove him to the very limits of ferocity, simply because they were accused of plotting against him. The accusations were largely false, but the suspicion doomed those accused. The murder of the Innocents was another cruel episode of the same sort. The old king was obsessed by the fear of a claimant to his petty throne; the Messianic hope of the Jews was a perpetual secret torment, and the murder of the children, in the attempt to reach the child whose advent threatened him, was at once so original in method and so characteristic in purpose as to be unsurpassed and similitude to the whole narrative. There are also other traits of truth. (b) Herod's prompt discovery of the visit of the Magi and their questions is in harmony with what we know of the old ruler's watchfulness and his elaborate account and propaganda.

(c) Characteristic of this is the story of the king's pretended interest in the quest of the strangers, the solemn conclave of Jewish leaders in his presence, the tendency to uphold the claims of the throne in the rôle of cosmic inquirer, his urgent request for information that he may worship also, followed by his swift anger (note that ἐπεστήσατο, ἐκβολήθη, "was wroth," ver 16, is not used elsewhere in the NT) at being deceived, and the blind but terrible stroke of his questing vengeance.

All these items are so true to the man, to the atmosphere which always surrounded him, and to the historic situation, that we are forced to conclude, either that we have veracious history more or less mixed up with pure fancy, or that we are in the presence of the events described, or the work of an incomparably clever romancer. Louis Matthews Sweet

INORDINATE, in-ör-di-nät, ("ill-regulated," hence "immoderate," "excessive;" Lat. in, "not," ordinatus, "set in order"): Only twice in AV. In each case there is no corresponding adj. in the original, but the word was inserted by the translators as being implied in the noun. It disappears in RSV: Ezk 23 11, "in her inordinate love" (RV "in her doting"); ἐγκαυμάσθη, ἀγάθαβαβα, "lust"; Col 3 5 "inordinate affection" (RV "passion"); τράδω, πθᾶθω, a word which in classical Gr may have either a good or a bad sense (any affection, especially affection of the mind), but in the NT is used only in a bad sense (passion). D. Miall Edwards

INQUIRE, in-kwīr' (ἐρωτάω, ἱκανεῖν, "to ask," "desire"; ὑπονεῖσαι, "to seek"). A form sometimes employed with reference to the practice of divination, as where Saul "inquires of" (or "consults") the witch of Endor as to the issue of the coming battle (1 S 28 6,7) (see DIVINATION).

In Job 19 6, "to inquire" [ἐρωτάω, ἐκβαρεί] after inquiry signifies to bring to light that which was hidden, and Job asks distractedly if God's time is soon short that He is in a hurry to find him guilty and to punish him as if He had only a man's few days to live. To inquire of Jehovah" denotes the consultation of oracle, priest, prophet or Jehovah Himself, as to a certain course of action or as to necessary supplies (Jgs 20 27 AV, "to ask"); 1 K 22 5; 1 S 9 9 [ἐρώτησα, δαραζάω]; 10 22 AV; 2 S 2 1; 6 19,23; Ezk 36 37.

"To inquire" [ἐρωτάω, ἐκβαρεί] in his temple" (palace) means to find out all that constant fellowship or unbroken intercourse with God can teach (Ps 27 4).

Prov 20 25 warns against rashness in making a vow and afterward considering (ἐκβαρεί, "to make inquiry") as to whether it can be fulfilled or how it may be eluded. In the AV, the tr of several Gr words: diáγινωσκό, "to know thoroughly" (Acts 23 15); ἐκβαρεί, ἐκβαρεί, "to seek after" (Acts 19 39); ἐκβαρεί, ἐκβαρεί, "to seek to get together" (Lk 22 23); ἐκβαρεί, ἐκβαρεί, "to search out" (Mt 10 11).

M. O. Evans

INQUESTION, in-kiw-si mañana, "to follow," "diligently inquire," "question," "search" [Dt 19 18; Ps 9 12], ἐπισκόπησα, "to search out," "to strive after," "inquire" [Est 2 23]: The term refers, as indicated by these passages, first of all to a careful and diligent inquiry necessary
The word "inspire" and its derivatives seen to have come into Middle Eng. from the Fr., and have been employed from the first (early in the 14th cent.) in a considerable number of terms of signification, physical and metaphysical, secular and religious. The derivatives have been multiplied and their applications extended during the process of the years, until they have acquired a very wide and varied use. Underlying all their use, however, is the constant implication of an influence from without, producing in its object movements that are essentially, or at least its ordinary powers. The noun "inspiration," although already in use in the 14th cent., seems not to occur in any but a theological sense until late in the 16th cent. This specifically theological sense of all these terms is governed, of course, by their usage in Lat. theology; and this rests ultimately on their employment in the Lat. Bible. In the Vulg. Lat. Bible the vb. "inspire" (Gen 2 7; Wisd 15 11; Ecclus 4 12; 2 Tim 3 16; 2 Pet 1 21) and the noun "inspiration" (2 Sam 22 16; Job 32 8; Ps 18 15; Acts 27 25) both occur 4 or 5 t in somewhat diverse applications. In the development of a theological nomenclature, however, they have acquired (along with other less frequent applications) a technical sense with reference to the Bible. Writers, and the Bible. The Bible. books are called inspired as the Divinely determined products of inspired men; the Bible writers are called inspired as breathed into the Holy Spirit, so that the products of these are made human powers and becomes Divinely authoritative. Inspiration is, therefore, usually defined as a supernatural influence exerted on the sacred writers by the Spirit of God, by virtue of which their writings are given Divine trustworthiness.

Meanwhile, for Eng. speaking men, these terms have virtually ceased to be Bib. terms. They naturally passed from the Lat Vulg into the Eng. VSS made it from (most fully reoces in into the Rheims-Douay: Job 32 8; the Bible Wisd 16 11; Ecclus 4 12; 2 Tim 3 16; 2 Pet 1 21). But in the development of the Eng. Bible they have found everlasting placing. In and in the biblical books the nominal form alone occurs in AV and that only twice: Job 32 8, but there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding'; and also: 2 Tim 3 16, 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' The RV removes the former of these instances, substituting "breath" for "inspiration"; and alters the latter so as to read: 'Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable, for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness,' with a marginal alternative in the form of, 'Every scripture is inspired of God and profitable,' etc. The word "inspiration" thus disappears from the Eng. Bible, and the word "inspired" is left in it only once, and then, it let be added, by a distinct and even misleading mistranslation.

For the Gr word in this passage—θεομανος, theoμανοες—very distinctly does not mean "inspired of God." This phrase is rather the rendering of the Lat. divinitus inscripta, restored from the Wydcl ("All Scripture of God inscribed, . . .") and Rheimish ("All Scripture inspired of God is . . .") VSS of the Vulg. does not even mean, as AV t it, "given by inspiration of God," although that rendering (inherited from Tindale: "All Scripture given by inspiration of God . . ." and its successors; of Geneva: "The
whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is . . . ) has at least to say for itself that it is a somewhat clumsy, perhaps, but not misleading, paraphrase of the Gr term in the theological language of the day. The Gr term has, however, no such equivalent, except perhaps in the "breathe" of the Holy Ghost. The word is later used of a "spiring" or "spiriting." What it says of Scripture is, not that it is "breathed into by God" or is the product of the Divine "inbreathing" into its human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, "God-breathed"—that is, the product of the creative breath of God. In a word, what is declared by this fundamental passage is simply that the Scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication of how God has operated in producing them. No term could have been chosen, however, which would have more emphatically asserted the Divine production of Scripture than that which is here employed. The "breath of God" is in Scripture just the symbol of His almighty power, the bearer of His creative word. "By the word of Jehovah," we read in the significant parallel of Ps 33:6, "were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." And it is particularly where the operations of God are energetic that this term (whether דָּמַע, דָּמָא, or דָּמָא, שָׁמַע) is employed: -"the breath of Jehovah" is the irresistible outflow of His power. When Paul declares, then, that "every scripture," or "all scripture," is the product of the Divine breath, "is God-breathed," he asserts with as much energy as he could employ that Scripture is the product of a specifically Divine operation.

In that case, what the apostle asserts is that the Sacred Scriptures, in their every several passage—for it is just their very "passage of Scripture" which makes the distinct "use of God's creative inspiration," of supreme value for all holy purposes. It is to be observed that the apostle does not stop here to tell us either inspiration or translation. He is merely indicating a collection which he calls Sacred Scriptures, or by what precise operations God has produced them. Neither of these subjects entered into the matter he had at the moment in hand. It was the value of the Scriptures, and the source of that value in their Divine origin, which he required at the moment to assert; and these things he asserts, leaving to other occasions any further details which his reader might desire to emphasize. It is also to be observed that the apostle does not tell us here everything for which the Scriptures are profitable, but only what is profitable by their Divine origin. He speaks simply to the point immediately in hand, and reminds Timothy of the value which these Scriptures, 'by virtue of their divine origin, have for the man of God.' Their spiritual, first, that 'every prophecy of scripture . . . occasion here to advert to.' Whatever other qualities may accrue to them from their Divine origin, he leaves to other occasions to speak of.

(2) 2 Pet 1:19-21: What Paul tells us here about the Divine origin of the Scriptures is enforced and extended by a striking passage in 2 Pet (1:19-21). Peter is assuring his readers that what had been made known to them of the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ did not rest on "cunningly devised fables." He offers them the testimony of eyewitnesses of Christ's glory. And then he intimates that they have better testimony than even that of eyewitnesses. "We have, however, of the prophecy word" (EV, unhappily, "the word of prophecy"): and this, he says, is "more sure," and therefore should certainly be heeded. He refers, of course, to the Scriptures. Of what other "prophecy word" could he, over against the testimony of the eyewitnesses of Christ's "excellent glory" (AV) say that "we have" it, that is, it is in our hands? And he proceeds at once to speak of it plainly as "Scriptural prophecy." You do well, he says, to pay heed to the prophetic word, because we know this first, that "every prophecy of scripture . . . ."

It admits of more question, however, whether, however, whether by this phrase he means the whole of Scripture, designated according to its character, as prophetic, that is, of Divine origin; or only that portion of Scripture which we discriminate as particularly prophetic, the immediate revelations contained in Scripture. The former is the more likely view, inasmuch as the entirety of Scripture is elsewhere conceived and spoken of as prophetic. In that case, what Peter has to say of this "every prophecy word" or its exact equivalent, it will be observed, in this case of Paul's "every scripture" (2 Tim 3:16)—applies to the whole of Scripture in all its parts. What he says of it is that it does not come "of private interpretation": that is, it is not the result of human investigation into the nature of things, the product of its writers' own thinking. This is as much as to say it is of Divine gift. Accordingly, he proceeds at once to make this plain in a supporting clause which contains both the negative and the positive declaration: "For no prophecy ever came in [was brought] by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God." 1474

In this singularly precise and pregnant statement there are several things which require to be carefully observed. There is, first of all, the emphatic denial that prophecy—that is to say, on the hypothesis upon which we are working, Scripture—owes its origin to human initiative: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God." In this singularly precise and pregnant statement there are several things which require to be carefully observed. There is, first of all, the emphatic denial that prophecy—that is to say, on the hypothesis upon which we are working, Scripture—owes its origin to human initiative: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God." In this singularly precise and pregnant statement there are several things which require to be carefully observed. There is, first of all, the emphatic denial that prophecy—that is to say, on the hypothesis upon which we are working, Scripture—owes its origin to human initiative: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God."
on it, which tells us how it could be that men, in speaking, should speak not from themselves, but from God: it was "as borne"—it is the same word which was rendered "was brought" above, and might possibly be rendered "brought" here—"by the Holy Spirit" that they spoke. Speaking thus under the determining influence of the Holy Spirit, the things they spoke were not from themselves, but from God.

Here is as direct an assertion of the Divine origin of Scripture as that of 2 Tim 3 16. But there is more here than a simple assertion of the Divine origin. We find in this passage something in our understanding of how God has produced the Scriptures. It was through the instrumentality of men who "spoke from him." More specifically, it was through an operation of the Holy Ghost on those men which is described as "hearing" them. The term here used is a very specific one. It is not to be confounded with guiding, or directing, or controlling, or even leading in the full sense of that word. It goes beyond all such terms, in assigning the direct production of the Spirit. We find in it the notion that it is the Holy Spirit who, in giving, is the cause of the speaking. What is "borne" is taken up by the "bearer," and conveyed by the "bearer's" power, not its own, to the "bearer's" goal, not its own. The men who spoke from God are here declared, therefore, to have been "speakers common to the Holy Ghost by His power to the goal of His choosing." The things which they spoke under this operation of the Spirit were therefore His things, not theirs. And that is the reason which is assigned why "the prophetic word is a lamp unto our feet." Through the instrumentality of men, it is, by virtue of the fact that these men spoke "as borne by the Holy Spirit," an immediately Divine word. It will be observed that the proximate stress is laid here, not on the spiritual value of Scripture (though that, too, is seen in the background), but on the Divine trustworthiness of Scripture. Because this is the way every prophecy of Scripture "has been brought," it affords a more sure basis of confidence than even the testimony of human eyewitnesses. Of course, if we do not understand by "the prophetic word," here the entirety of Scripture described, according to its character, as revelation, but only that element in Scripture which we call specifically prophecy, then the argument fails. We contend, however, that these great declarations are made. In any event, however, they are made of the prophetic element in Scripture as written, which was the only form in which the readers of this Ep. possessed it, and which is the thing specifically intended in the phrase "every prophecy of scripture." These great declarations are made, therefore, at least of large tracts of Scripture; and if the entirety of Scripture is intended by the phrase "the prophetic word," they are made of the whole of Scripture.

(3) Jn 10 34 f.: How far the supreme trustworthiness of Scripture, thus asserted, extends may be conveyed to us by a passage in one of Our Lord's discourses recorded by John (Jn 10 34–35). The Jews, offended by Jesus' speaking of Himself God, were in the act to stone Him, when He defended Himself thus: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and consecrated?" and sent unto the word, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" It may be thought that this defence is inadequate. It certainly is incomplete: Jesus made Himself God (Jn 10 33) in a far higher sense than in the case of the Father (Jn 1 18). Ye are unto whom the word of God came": He had just declared in unmistakable terms, "I and the Father are one." But it was quite sufficient for the immediate end in view—to repel the technical charge of blasphemy based on His using Himself God: it is not blasphemy to call one God in any sense in which he may fitly receive that designation; and certainly if it is not blasphemy to call such men as those spoken of in the passage of Scripture adduced gods, because of their official functions, it cannot be blasphemy to call Him God whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world. The point for us to note, however, is merely that Jesus' defence takes the form of an appeal to Scripture; and it is important to observe how He makes this appeal. In the first place somewhere the Scriptures are quoted: "Is it not written in your law?" He demands. The passage of Scripture which He adduces is not written in that portion of Scripture which was more specifically called "the law," that is to say, the Pent; nor in any portion of Scripture of formally legal contents. It is written in the Book of Ps; and in a particular psalm which is as far as possible from presenting the external characteristics of legal enactment (Ps 82 6). When Jesus adduces this passage in the "law" of the Pentateuch, He does it, not because it stands in this psalm, but because it is a part of Scripture at large. In other words, He here ascribes legal authority to the entirety of Scripture, in accordance with a conception common among the Jews (Jn 10 34), and finding expression in the NT occasionally, both on the lips of Jesus Himself, and in the writings of the apostles. Thus, on a later occasion (Jn 15 25), Jesus declares that it is written in the "law" of the Jews. "Thus the word of the Lord came unto me in the days of Josiah the king of Judah, that he made a additions from the Ps and from Isa to "the Law" (1 Cor 14 21; Rom 3 19), and can write such a sentence as this (Gal 4 21 f.): "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do you not contradict the word of God? For it is written . . . ." quoting from the narrative of Gen. We have seen that the entirety of Scripture was conceived as "prophecy"; we now see that the entirety of Scripture was also conceived as "law": these three terms, the law, prophecy, Scripture, were indeed, materially, strict synonyms, as our present passage itself advises us, by varying the formula of addition in contiguous verses from "the law" to "scripture." And what is thus implied in the manner in which Scripture is immediately afterward spoken out in the most explicit language, because it forms an essential element in Our Lord's defence. It might have been enough to say simply, "Is it not written in your law?" But Our Lord, determined to drive the appeal to Scripture home, sharpens the point to the utmost by adding with the highest emphasis: "and the scripture cannot be broken." This is the reason why it is worth while to appeal to what is "written in the law," because "the scripture cannot be broken." The word "broken" here is the common one for breaking the law, or the Sabbath, or the like (Jn 5 18; 7 23; Mt 5 19), and the meaning of the declaration is that it is impossible for the Scripture to be annulled, its authority to be withheld, denied. The movement of thought is to the effect that, because it is impossible for the Scripture—the term is perfectly general and witnesses to the unitary character of Scripture (it is all, for the purpose in hand, of a piece)—to be broken, denied, the particular this particular Scripture which is cited must be taken as of irrefragable authority. What we have here is, therefore, the strongest possible assertion of the indefectible authority of Scripture; precisely what is true of Scripture is true of it. Now, what is the particular thing in Scripture, for the confirmation of which the indefectible authority of Scripture is thus invoked? It is one of its most causal clauses—more than that,
the very form of its expression in one of its most casual clauses. This means, of course, that in the Saviour’s view the indefectible authority of Scripture attaches to the very form of expression of its most casual clauses. It belongs to Scripture through and through, and to its scriptural minute particulars, that it is of indefectible authority.

It is sometimes suggested, it is true, that Our Lord’s argument here is an argumentum ad hominem, and that His words, therefore, express not His own view of the authority of Scripture, but that of His Jewish opponents. It will scarcely be denied that there is a vein of satire running through Our Lord’s defence: that the Jews so readily allowed that corrupt judges might properly be called “gods,” but could not endure that He whom the Father had consecrated and sent into the world should call Himself Son of God, was a somewhat pungent fact to throw up into such a high light. But the argument from Scripture is not ad hominem but e concesso; Scripture was common ground with Jesus and His opponents. If proof were needed for so obvious a fact, it would be supplied by the circumstance that this is not an isolated but a representative passage. The conception of Scripture thrown up into such clear view here supplies the ground for all the appeal of apostolic authority to every particle of Scripture, to every element in Scripture, to its most incidental clauses as well as to its most fundamental principles, and to the very form of its expression. This attitude toward Scripture as an authoritative document is, if proof were needed, already intimated by their constant designation of it by the name of Scripture, the Scriptures, that is “the Document,” by way of eminence; and by their customary citation of it with the simple formula, “It is written,” the whole which is written in this document admits so little of questioning that its authoritativeateness needed no asserting, but might safely be taken for granted. Both modes of expression belong to the constantly illustrated habits of Our Lord’s speech. The first words He is received as uttering to that manifestation to Israel was an appeal to the unquestionable authority of Scripture; to Satan’s temptations He opposed no other weapon than the final “It is written” (Lk 4 10). Lk 4 44, the last words which He spoke to His disciples before He was received up was a rebuke to them for not understanding that all things “which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and psalms” concerning Him—that is (ver 44) in the entire “Scriptures”—“must needs be” (very emphatic) “fulfilled” (Lk 24 44). “Thus it is written,” says He (ver 46), as rendering all doubt absurd. For, as He had explained earlier upon the same day (Lk 24 25 ff.), it argues only that one is “foolish and slow of heart” if he does not believe “if his faith does not rest securely on, as on a firm foundation” all (without limit of subject-matter here) “that the prophets” (explained in ver 27 as equivalent to “all the scriptures”) “have spoken.”

The necessity of the fulfilment of all that is written in Scripture, which is so strongly asserted in these last instructions to His disciples, is frequently adverted to by Our Lord. He repeatedly explains of occurrences occasionally happening that they point to “pass that the scripture might be fulfilled” (Mt 17 12; cf 12 14; Mk 9 12.13). On the basis of Scriptural declarations, therefore, He announces with confidence that given events will certainly occur: “All ye shall be offended (lit. ‘scandalized’) in me this night: for it is written . . .” (Mt 26 31; Mk 14 27; cf Lk 20 17). Although holding at His command ample means of escape, He bows before on-coming calamities, for, He asks, how otherwise “should come to Him complaint of that thus it must be?” (Mt 26 54). It is not merely the two disciples with whom He talked on the way to Emmaus (Lk 24 25) whom He rebukes for not trusting themselves more perfectly to the teaching of Scripture. “Ye search the scriptures,” He says to the Jews in the classical passage (Jn 6 39), “because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life!” These words surely were spoken more in sorrow than in anger: there is no blame implied either for searching the Scriptures or for thinking that eternal life is to be found in Scripture; approval rather. What the Jews are blamed for is that they read with a veil lying upon their hearts which He would fear take away (2 Cor 3 15 f.). “Ye search the scriptures”—that is right: and “even you” (emphatic) “think to have eternal life in them”—that is right, too. But “it is these very scriptures” (very emphatic) “which are corrupting your souls” (q. e. d. “in a marvel”) “ye will not come to me and have life”—that you may, that is, reach the very end you have so properly in view in searching the Scriptures. Their failure is due, not to the Scriptures but to themselves, who read the Scriptures to such little purpose.

Quite similarly Our Lord often finds occasion to express wonder at the little effect to which Scripture have been read, because He had 5. Christ’s been been looked into too curiously, but Testimony because it had not been looked into That God earnestly enough, with sufficiently Is Author simple and robust trust in its every According to himself, “Have ye read and even this scripture?” He demands, as He adduces Ps 118 to show that the rejection of the Messiah was already intimated in Scripture (Mk 12 10; Mt 21 42 varies the expression to the equivalent: “Did ye never read in the scriptures”) And when the Pharisees had accused Him of having cast out the Hosannas with which the children in the Temple were acclamation Him, and demanding, “Hearkest thou what these are saying?” He met them (Mt 21 16) merely with: “Ye have heard, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfect praise?” The underlying thought of these passages is spoken out when He intimates that the source of all error in Divine things is just ignorance of the Scriptures: “Ye do err,” He declares to His questioners, on an important occasion, “not knowing the scriptures” (Mt 22 29); or, as it is put, perhaps more forcibly, in interrogative form, in its ? in another Gospel: “Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures?” (Mk 12 24).

Clearly, he who rightly knows the Scriptures does not err. The confidence with which Jesus rested on Scripture, in its every declaration, is further illustrated in a passage like Mt 19 4. Certain Pharisees had come to Him with a question on divorce and He met them thus: “Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh?” (see verse 6). He might have joined together, let not man put asunder.” The point to be noted is the explicit reference of Gen 2 24 to God as its author: “He who made them . . . said”; “what therefore God hath joined together.” Yet this passage does not give us a saying of God’s
—
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recorded in Scripture, but just the word of Scripture
itself, and can be treated as a declaration of God's
only on the hypothesis that all Scripture is a declaration of God's. The
in Mk (10 5 ff) just as truly,
though not as exphcitly, assigns the passage to God
as its author, citing it as authoritative law and
speaking of its enactment as an act of God's. And
it is interesting to observe in passing that Paul,
having occasion to quote the same passage (1 Cor
6 16), also explicitly quotes it as a Divine word;
"For, The twain, saith he, shall become one flesh"
the "he" here, in accordance with a usage to be
noted later, meaning just "God."
Thus clear is it that Jesus' occasional adduction
of Scripture as an authoritative document rests on
||

an ascription of it to God as its author. His testimony is that whatever stands written in Scripture
is a word of God.
Nor can we evacuate this testimony of its force on the plea that it represents Jesus
only in the days of His flesh, when He may be supposed to have reflected merely the opinions of His
day and generation. The view of Scripture He
announces was, no doubt, the view of His day and
generation as well as His own view. But there is
no reason to doubt that it was held by Him, not
because it was the current view, but because, in
His Divine-human knowledge. He knew it to be
true; for, even in His humiliation. He is the faithful and true witness.
And in any event we should
bear in mind that this was the view of the resurrected as well as of the humiliated Christ. It was
after He had suffered and had risen again in the
power of His Divine Ufe that He pronounced those
foolish and slow of heart who do not believe all
that stands written in all the Scriptures (Lk 24
and that He laid down the simple "Thus il is
written" as the sufficient ground of confident belief
(Lk 24 46). Nor can we explain away Jesus'
testimony to the Divine trustworthiness of Scripture by interpreting it as not His own, but that of
His followers, placed on His lips in their reports of
His words. Not only is it too constant, minute, intimate and in part incidental, and therefore, as it
were, hidden, to admit of this interpretation; but
it so pervades all our channels of information concerning Jesus' teaching as to make it certain that it
comes actually from Him. It belongs not only to
the Jesus of our evangelical records but as well to
the Jesus of the earlier sources which underlie our
evangelical records, as anyone may assure himself
by observing the instances in which Jesus adduces
the Scriptures as Divinely authoritative that are
recorded in more than one of the Gospels (e.g. "It
is written," Mt 4 4.7.10 [Lk 4 4.8.10]; Mt 11 10;
[Lk 7 27];
Mt 21 13 [Lk 19 46; Mk 11 17];
Mt 26 31 [Mk 14 21]; "the scripture" or "the
scriptures," Mt 19 4 [Mk 10 9]; Mt 21 42 [Mk
12 10;
Lk 20 17]; Mt 22 29 [Mk 12 24; Lk
20 37]; Mt 26 56 [Mk 14 49; Lk 24 44]). These
passages alone would suffice to make clear to us the
testimony of Jesus to Scripture as in all its parts
and declarations Divinely authoritative.
The attempt to attribute the testimony of Jesus
to His followers has in its favor only the undeniable
fact that the testimony of the writers
6. Similar
of the
is to precisely the same
25);

NT

Witness of
Apostles

as His. They, too, cursorily
speak of Scripture by that pregnant
effect

name and adduce

with the simple
"It is. written," with the implication that whatever
stands written in it is Divinely authoritative. As
Jesus' official life begins with this "It is written"
(Mt 4 4), so the evangelical proclamation begins
with an "Even as it is written" (Mk 1 2); and
as Jesus sought the justification of His work in a
solemn "Thus it is written, that the Christ should
suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day"
it

Inspiration

(Lk 24 46 ff), so the apostles solemnly justified the
Gospel which they preached, detail after detail, by
appeal to the Scriptures, "That Christ died for our
sins according to the scriptures" and "That he hath
been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (ICor 15 3.4; cf Acts 8 35; 17 3; 26 22,
and also Rom 1 17; 3 4.10; 4 17; 11 26; 14 11;
I Cor 1 19; 2 9; 3 19;
15 45; Gal 3 10.13; 4
Wherever they carried the gospel it was
22.27).
Scripture
as a gospel resting on
that they proclaimed
it
(Acts 17 2; 18 24.28); and they encouraged
themselves to test its truth by the Scriptures (Acts
17 11). The holiness of life they inculcated, they
based on Scriptural requirement (1 Pet 1 16), and
they commended the royal law of love which they
taught by Scriptural sanction (Jas 2 8). Every
detail of duty was supported by them by an appeal
to Scripture (Acts 23 5; Rom 12 19). The circumstances of their lives and the events occasionally occurring about them are referred to Scripture
for their significance (Rom 2 26; 8 36; 9 33; 11
As Our Lord declared
8; 15 9.21; 2 Cor 4 13).
that whatever was written in Scripture must needs
be fulfilled (Mt 26 54; Lk 22 37; 24 44), so His
followers explained one of the most startling facts
which had occurred in their experience by pointing
out that "it was needful that the scripture should
be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spake before by
the mouth of David" (Acts 1 16). Here the
ground of this constant appeal to Scripture, so that it
is enough that a thing "is contained in scripture"
(1 Pet 2 6) for it to be of indefectible authority,
Scripture must. needs
is plainly enough declared:
be fulfilled, for what is contained in it is the
declaration of the Holy Ghost through the human
author. What Scripture says, God says; and
accordingly we read such remarkable declarations as
"For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For
this very purpose did I raise thee up" (Rom 9 17);
"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would
justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel
beforehand unto Abraham, .... In thee shall
These are
all the nations be blessed" (Gal 3 8).
not instances of simple personification of Scripture,
these:

is itself a sufficiently remarkable usage (Mk
15 28;
Jn 7 38.42; 19 37; Rom 4 3; 10 11;
II 2; Gal 4 30; 1 Tim 5 18; Jas 2 23; 4 5 f),
vocal with the conviction expressed by James (4 5)
that Scripture cannot speak in vain. They indicate a certain confusion in current speech between
"Scripture" and "God," the outgrowth of a deepseated conviction that the word of Scripture is the
word of God. It was not "Scripture" that spoke
to Pharaoh, or gave his great promise to Abraham,
but God. But "Scripture" and "God" lay so close
that
together in the minds of the writers of the
they could naturally speak of "Scripture" doing
doing.
It
was,
what Scripture records God as
however, even more natural to them to speak
casually of God saying what the Scriptures say; and
accordingly we meet with forms of speech such as
these: "Wherefore, even as the Holy Spirit saith.
To-day if ye shall hear His voice," etc (He 3 7,
quoting Ps 95 7); "Thou art God .... who by
the mouth of thy servant David hast said. Why
did the heathen rage," etc (Acts 4 25 AV, quoting
Ps 2 1); "He that raised him from the dead
hath spoken on this wise, I will give
you .... because he saith also in another [place]
." (Acts 13 34, quoting Isa 55 3 and Ps 16
The words put into God's mouth
10), and the like.
in each case are not words of God recorded in the
Scriptures, but just Scripture words in themselves.
When we take the two classes of passages together,
in the one of which the Scriptures are spoken of as
God, while in the other God is spoken of as if He
were the Scriptures, we may perceive how close

which
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the identification of the two is in the minds of the writers of the NT.

This identification is strikingly observable in certain catenae of quotations, in which there are brought together a number of passages of Scripture closely connected with one another. The first chapter of the God and Ep. to the Heb supplies an example.

7. Identification of Scripture We may begin with ver 5: "For unto which of the angels said he"—the subject being necessarily "God"—at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."—the citation being from Ps 2 7 and very appropriate in the mouth of God—"and again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?"—from 2 8 7 14, again a declaration of God's own—"And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him"—from Dt 22 43, LXX, or Ps 97 7, in neither of which is God the speaker—"And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire"—from Ps 104 4, where again God is not the speaker but is spoken of in the third person—"but of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, etc,"—from Ps 45 6.7 where again God is not the speaker, but is addressed—"And, Thou hast begotten him, the begotten one, from Ps 25 27, where again God is not the speaker but is addressed—"But of which of the angels hath he said at any time, Sit thou on my right hand?" etc—from Ps 110 1, in which God is the speaker. Here when he brings the passages where passages in which God is not the speaker, but is addressed or spoken of, indiscriminately assigned to God, because they all have it in common that they are words of Scripture, and as words of Scripture, in the immediate sense, are the words of God. The NT, when we have a series of citations the first of which is introduced by "as it is written," and the next two by "again he saith," and "again, and the last by "and again, Isaiah saith," the first being from Ps 18 49; the second from Dt 32 43; the third from Ps 117 1; and the last from Isa 11 10. Only the last (the only one here assigned to the human author) is a word of God in the text of the OT.

This view of the Scriptures as a compact mass of words of God, enables the formation of a designation for them by which their peculiar divine character is, in a sense, expressed. This designation is the sacred oracles, and the oracles of God in Philo, who very commonly refers to Scripture as the sacred oracles and cites its several passages as each an oracle. Sharing, as they do, Philo's conception of the Scriptures as, in all their parts, a word of God, the NT writers naturally also speak of them under this designation. The classical passage is Rom 3 2 (of He 5 12; Acts 7 38). Here Paul begins an enumeration of the advantages which belonged to the chosen people above other nations, and, after declaring these advantages to have been great and numerous, he places first among them all their possession of the Scriptures: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what is the profit of circumcision? Much every way: first of all, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God." That by "the oracles of God" here are meant just the Holy Scriptures in their entirety, conceived as a direct Divine revelation, and not any portions of them, or elements in them more esp. thought of as resting primarily on the Divine inspiration of words "spoken," attest primarily its indestructible authority; the designation of it as oracles, and the addition of it by the formula, "It says," attest primarily its immediate divinity. Its authority rests on its divinity and its divinity expresses itself in its trustworthy and the NT writers in the use of them declare them to be a God-breathed document, which, because God-breathed, is through and through trustworthy in all its assertions, authoritative in all its declarations, and down to its last particular, the very word of God, His oracles.

nation, Scripture is thought of as the living voice of God speaking in all its parts directly to the reader; and, accordingly, it is cited by some such formula as "it is said," and this mode of citing Scripture duly occurs as an alternative to "it is written" (Lk 4 12; replacing "it is written in Mi; He 3 15; of Rom 4 18). It is due also to this point of view that Scripture is cited, not as what God or the Holy Spirit "said," but what He "says," the present tense emphasizing the living voice of God speaking in Scriptures to the individuals to which the writings are addressed, in the NT, to require stating; for who could be the speaker of the words of Scripture but God only (Rom 15 10; 1 Cor 15 16; 2 Cor 6 16; Gal 3 16; Eph 4 8; 5 14)? The analogies of this pregnant subjectless 'saith' are very widespread. It was with it that the ancient Pythagoreans, Plato, and the mediaeval Aristotelians adduced each their master's teaching; it was with it, in certain circles, the judgments of Hadrian's great jurist Salvius Julianus were cited; African stylists who attempted to refer by oracle to the ancient model. There is a tendency, cropping out occasionally, in the OT, to omit the name of God as superfluous, when He, as the great logical subject always in mind, would be easily understood (of Job 20 23 is the speaking voice of God). So, too, when the NT writers quoted Scripture there was no need to say whose word it was: that lay beyond question in every mind. This usage, accordingly, is a specially striking intimation of the divine and sacred character of the spoken word of the Divinity, and of the origin of the Scriptures, and means that in citing them they were acutely conscious that they were citing immediate words of God. How completely the Scriptures were to them just the word of God may be illustrated by a passage like Gal 6:16: He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thine seed, which is Christ. We have seen Our Lord hanging an argument on the very words of Scripture (Jn 10 34); elsewhere this reasoning depends on the particular example of the divinity of the word (Mt 22 33). The word (Mt 22 43) used in Scripture. Here Paul's argument rests similarly on a grammatical form. No doubt it is the grammatical form of the word that God is referred to by speaking to Abraham that is in question. But Paul knew what a grammatical form God employed in speaking to Abraham only as the Scriptures have transmitted it to him; and, as we have seen, in citing the words of God and the words of Scripture He was not accustomed to make any distinction between them. It is probably the Scriptural word as a Scriptural word, therefore, which he has here in mind: though, of course, it is possible that what he here witnesses to is rather the detailed trustworthy transmission of the Scriptural record than its direct divinity if we can separate two things which apparently were not separated in Paul's mind. This much we can at least say without straining, that the designation of Scripture as scripture and its citation by the, as it is written, attest primarily its indestructible authority; the designation of it as oracles and the addition of it by the formula, "It says," attest primarily its immediate divinity. Its authority rests on its divinity and its divinity expresses itself in its trustworthy and the NT writers in the use of them declare them to be a God-breathed document, which, because God-breathed, is through and through trustworthy in all its assertions, authoritative in all its declarations, and down to its last particular, the very word of God, His oracles.
That the Scriptures are throughout a Divine book, created by the Divine energy and speaking in their every part with Divine authority directly to the heart of the readers, is fundamental fact concerning Scripture them which is witnessed by Christ and the sacred writers to whom we owe the NT. But the strength and constancy with which they bear witness to this primary fact do not prevent their recognizing by the side of it that the Scriptures have come into being by the agency of men. It would be a strange coincidence if they recognized a human element in Scripture: they do not parcel Scripture out, assigning portions of it, or elements in it, respectively to God and man. In their view the whole of Scripture in all its parts and in all its elements, down to the least minutiae, in form of expression as well as in substance of teaching, is from God; but the whole of it has been given by God through the instrumentality of men. There is, therefore, in their view, not, indeed, a human element or ingredient in Scripture, and must less human instrumentality, but a human side or aspect to Scripture; and they do not fail to give full recognition to this human side or aspect. In one of the primary passages which has already been before us, their conception is that the Holy Spirit is the “prophecy” (2 Pet 1 21), “ever came by the will of man; but as borne by the Holy Ghost, men spake from God.” Here the whole initiative is assigned to God, and such complete control of the human agent that the product is truly God’s work. The men who speak in this “prophecy of scripture” speak not of themselves or out of themselves, but from “God”: they speak only as they are “borne by the Holy Ghost.” But that is not all. The Holy Spirit is the product of man, but only of man speaking from God and under such a control of the Holy Spirit as that in their speaking they are “borne” by Him. The conception obviously is that the Scriptures have been given by the instrumentality of men; and this conception finds repeated incidental expression throughout the NT.

It is this conception, for example, which is expressed when Our Lord, quoting Ps 110 1, speaks of the Lord speaking “in the Holy Spirit” (Mk 16 26). There is a certain emphasis here on the words being David’s own words, which is due to the requirements of the argument Our Lord was conducting, but which none the less certainly recognizes the human element in their origin. They are David’s own words which we find in Ps 110, therefore; but they are David’s own words, spoken not of his own motion merely, but “in the Holy Spirit,” that is to say—could not better paraphrase it—“as borne by the Holy Spirit.” In other words, they are “God-breathed,” words and therefore authoritative in a sense above what any words of David, not spoken in the Holy Spirit, could possibly be. Generalizing the matter, we may say that the words of Scripture are conceived by Our Lord and the NT writers as the words of their human authors when speaking “in the Holy Spirit,” that is to say, by His initiative and under His controlling direction. The conception finds even more precise expression, perhaps in such a statement as we find—it is Peter who is speaking and it is again a psalm which is cited—in Acts 1 16, “The Holy Spirit spake by the mouth of David.” Here the Holy Spirit is adduced, of course, as the real author of what is said and not of the psalm which is said will be fulfilled); but David’s mouth is expressly designated as the instrument (it is the instrumental preposition that is used) by means of which the Holy Spirit spake the Scripture in question. He does not speak save through David’s mouth. Accordingly, in Acts 4 25, “the Lord that made the heaven and earth,” acting by His Holy Spirit, is declared to have spoken another psalm “through the mouth of . . . David,” His “servant”; and in Mt 13 35 still another psalm is adduced as “spoken through the prophet” (of Mt 2 5). In the very act of energetically asserting the Divine origin of Scripture the human instrumentality through which it is given is constantly recognized. The NT writers have, therefore, no difficulty in assigning Scripture to its human authors, or in discovering in Scripture traits due to its human authorship. They freely quote it by such simple formulae as these: “Moses saith” (Rom 10 19); “Moses said” (Mt 22 24; Mk 7 10; Acts 3 22); “Moses wrote” (Rom 10 5); “Moses wrote” (Mk 12 19; Lk 20 28); “Isaiah ... saith” (Rom 10 20); “Isaiah said” (Jn 12 39); “Isaiah crieth” (Rom 9 27); “Isaiah hath said before” (Rom 9 29); “said Isaiah the prophet” (Jn 1 23); “said Isaiah prophesies” (Mk 7 16); “David saith” (Lk 20 42; Acts 2 25; Rom 11 9); “David said” (Mk 12 36). It is to be noted that when thus Scripture is adduced by the names of its human authors, it is a matter of complete indifference whether the words adduced are comments or portions of whole settings of Scripture, or is merely the word of the prophet, or his emotions, or his thoughts. It makes no difference. As the plainest words of the human authors are assigned to God as their real author, so the most exact words of God, repeated by the NT, are cited by the names of these human writers (Mt 15 7; Mk 7 6; Rom 10 19 20; cf Mk 7 10 from the Decalogue). To say that “Moses” or “David says,” is evidently thus only a way of saying that “Scripture says,” which is the same as to say that “God says.” The material of citing Scripture, accordingly, carry us little beyond merely connecting the name, or perhaps we may say the individuality, of the several writers with the portions of Scripture given through each. How it was given through them is left meanwhile, if not without suggestion, yet without specific explanation. We seem safe only in inferring much: that the gift of Scripture through its human authors took place by a process much more intimate than can be expressed, declare it would, that it took place in a process in which the control of the Holy Spirit was too complete and pervasive to permit the human qualities of the secondary authors in any way to condition the purity of the product as the word of God. The Scriptures, in other words, are conceived by the NT as an agent of the Holy Spirit, as through and through God’s book, in every part expressive of His mind, given through men after a fashion which does no violence to their nature as men, and we, the book also men’s book as well as God’s, in every part expressive of the mind of its human authors.

If we attempt to get behind this broad statement and to obtain a more detailed conception of the activities by which God has given the Scriptures, we are thrown back upon somewhat general representations, supported by the analogy of the modes of God’s operation. It is very desirable that we should free ourselves at the outset from influences arising from the current employment of the term “inspiration” to designate this process. This term is not a Bib. term and its etymological implications are not perfectly accordant with the Bib. conception of the mind of God in giving the Scriptures. The Bib. writers do not conceive of the Scriptures as a human product breathed into by the Divine Spirit, and thus heightened in its qualities or endowed with new qualities; but as a
Divine product produced through the instrumentality of men. They do not conceive of these men, by whose instrumentality Scripture is produced, as working upon their own initiative, though energized by God to greater effect and higher achievement, but as moved by the Divine initiative and borne by the irresistible power of the Spirit of God along ways of His choosing to ends of His appointment. The difference between the two conceptions may not appear great when the mind is fixed exclusively upon the nature of the resulting product. But they are differing conceptions, and look at the production of Scripture from distinct points of view—the human and the Divine; and the involved mental attitudes toward the origin of Scripture are very diverse. The terming of this is too firmly fixed, in both theological and popular usage, as the technical designation of the action of God in giving the Scriptures, to be replaced; and we may be thankful that its native implications lie as close as it does. But it may be justly insisted that it shall receive its definition from the representations of Scripture, and not be permitted to impose upon our thought ideas of the origin of Scripture derived exclusively from the nature of its own production. The Scriptural conception of the relationship of the Divine Spirit to the human authors in the production of Scripture is better expressed by the figure of “breathing” than by the figure of “writing”: and since the terming of the action of the Spirit of God in this relation as a breathing, they represent it as a “breathing out” of the Scriptures by the Spirit, and not as a “breathing into” the Scriptures by Him. The difference of a very marked and significant kind. No one can ever endeavor to form for ourselves a clear conception of the precise nature of the Divine action in this 11. General “breathing out” of the Scriptures—Prolegomena of the Origin of the Scriptures to their appointed god of God’s Part the production of a book of Divine trustworthiness and indefectible authority—we become acutely aware of a more deeply lying and more frequent problem, apart from which this one of inspiration, technically so called, cannot be profitably considered. This is the general problem of the origin of the Scriptures and the part of God in all that complex of processes by the interaction of these two, which we call sacred Scriptures, with all their peculiarities, and all their qualities of whatever sort, have been brought into being. For, of course, these books were not produced suddenly, by some miraculous act—hadn’t come out of heaven, as the phrase goes; but, like all other products of time, are the ultimate effect of many processes cooperating through long periods. There is to be considered, for instance, the preparation of the material which forms the subject-matter of these books: in a sacred history, say, for example, to be narrated; or in a religious experience which may serve as a norm for record; or in a logical elaboration of the contents of revelation which may be placed at the service of God’s people; or in the progressive revelation of Divine truth itself, supplying their culminating contents. And there is the preparation of the men to write these books to be considered, a preparation physical, intellectual, spiritual, which must have attended them throughout their whole lives, and, indeed, must have had its basis in the history of their ancestors, and the effect of which was to bring the right men to the right places at the right times, with the right endowments, impulses, acquitments, to write just the books which were designed for them. When “inspiration,” technically so called, is superimposed on lines of preparation like these, it takes on quite a different aspect from that which it bears when it is thought of as an isolated action of the Divine Spirit operating out of all relation to historical processes. Representations are sometimes made as if, when God wished to produce sacred books which carried the message of God, He was reduced to the necessity of going down to earth and painfully scrutinizing the men He found there, seeking anxiously for the one who, on the whole, promised best for His purpose; and then violently forcing the material He wished expressed through him, against his natural bent, and with as little loss from his recalcitrant characteristics as possible. Of course, nothing of the sort took place. If God wished to give His people a series of letters like Paul’s, He prepared a Paul to write them, and the Paul He brought to the task was a Paul who spontaneously would write just such letters.

If we bear this in mind, we shall know what estimate to place upon the common representation to the effect that the human characteristics of the writers must, and in point of Human of fact do, condition and qualify the Qualities: writings produced by them, the implication of which is that the human Preparatory get from man a pure word of God. As light that passes through the colored glass of a cathedral window, we are told, is light from heaven, but is stained by the tints of the glass through which it is passed. And which is stained, which is passed through the mind and soul of a man must come out discolored by the personality through which it is given, and just to that degree ceases to be the pure word of God. But what if this personality has itself been formed by God into precisely the personality it is, for the express purpose of communicating to the world through it the light that floods the cathedral precisely the tone and quality it receives from them? What if the word of God that comes to His people is framed by God into the word of God it is, precisely by means of the qualities of the man formed by Him for His purpose, through which it is given? When we think of God the Lord giving by His Spirit a body of authoritative Scriptures to His people, we must remember that He is the God of providence and of grace as well as of revelation, and so arranged that He holds all the lines of preparation as fully under His direction as He does the specific operation which we call technically, in the narrow sense, by the name of “inspiration.” The production of the Scriptures is, in point of fact, a long process, in the course of which numerous and very varied Divine activities are involved, providential, gracious, miraculous, all of which must be taken into account in any attempt to explain the relation of God to the production of Scripture. When they are all taken into account we can no longer wonder that the resultant Scriptures are constantly spoken of as the pure word of God. We wonder, rather, that an additional operation of God—what we call specifically “inspiration,” in its technical sense—was thought necessary. Consider, for example, how a piece of sacred history—say the Book of Ch, or the great historical work, Gospel and Acts, of Luke—is brought to the writing. There is first of all the preparation the human author must have: God the Lord leads the sequence of occurrences through the development He has designed for them that they may convey their lessons to His people: a “teleological” or “setiological” character is inherent in the course of events. Then He prepares a man, by birth, training, experience, gifts
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of grace, and, if need be, of revelation, capable of appreciating this historical development and eager to search it out, thrilling in all his being with its lessons and bent upon making them clear and effectually apparent. When, then, by His providence, God sets this man to work on the writing of this history, will there not be spontaneously written by him the history which it was Divinely intended should be written? Or consider how a psalmist would be prepared to put into moving verse a piece of normative religious experience: how he would be born with just the right quality of religious sensibility, of parents through whom he should receive just the right hereditary bent, and from whom he should get precisely the right religious example and training, in circumstances of life in which his religious tendencies should be developed precisely on right lines; how he would be brought through just the right experiences to quicken in him the precise emotions he would be called upon to express, and finally would be placed in precisely the exigencies which would call out their expression. Or consider the providential preparation of a writer of a didactic epistle—by means of which he should be given the intellectual breadth and acuteness, and be trained in handling, and prepared in the situations which would call out precisely the argumentative presentation of Christian truth which was required of him. When we give due place in our thoughts to the universality of the providential government of God to the minuteness and completeness of its way, and to its invisible efficacy, we may be inclined to ask what is needed beyond this mere providential government to secure the production of sacred books which should be in every detail absolutely accordant with the Divinity.

The answer is, Nothing is needed beyond mere providence to secure such books—provided only that it does not lie in the Divine purpose that these books should possess qualities which rise above the powers of men to produce, even under the most complete Divine guidance. For providence is guidance; and guidance can bring one only so far as his own power can carry him. It is impossible for the integral elements to be scaled above man's native power to achieve, something more than guidance, however effective, is necessary. This is the reason for the superinduction, at the end of the long process of the production of the Scriptures, of the addition of the special parts which we call technically "inspiration." By it, the Spirit of God, flowing confluent in with the providentially and graciously determined work of men, spontaneously producing under the Divine directions the writings appointed to them, gives the product a Divine quality unattainable by human powers alone. Thus these books become not merely the word of godly men, but the immediate word of God Himself, speaking directly as such to the minds and hearts of every reader. The true一架 virtue of "inspiration" emerges, thus, as twofold. It gives to the books written under its "bearing"—a quality which is truly superhuman; a trustworthiness, an authority, a searchingness, a profundity, a profitableness which is altogether Divine. And it speaks this Divine word immediately to each reader's heart and conscience; so that he does not require to make his way to God, painfully, perhaps even uncertainly, through the words of His servants, the human instruments in writing the Scriptures, but can listen directly to the Divine word and place hearing immediately in the Scriptural word to him.

That the writers of the NT themselves conceive the Scriptures to have been produced thus by Divine operations extending through the increasing ages and involving a multitude of varied activities, can be made clear by simply attending to the occasional references they make to this or that step in the process. It lies, for example, on the face of their expositions, that they looked upon the Bib. history as teleologically ordered. When, e.g. Rom 16:4; cf Romans 4:23.24;) to the course of the historical events themselves as guided for our benefit: "Now these things happened unto them by way of example"—in a typical fashion, in such a way that, as they occurred, a typical character, or predictive reference impressed itself upon them; that is to say, briefly, the history occurred as it did in order to bear a message to us—"and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (1 Cor 10:11; cf verse 6). Accordingly, it has become a commonplace of Bib. exposition that "the history of redemption itself is a typically progressive one" (Küper), and is in a manner impregnated with the prophetic element, so as to form a "part of a great plan which stretches from the fall of man to the redemption of all things in glory; and, in so far as it reveals the ultimate plan of God toward man, carries a respect to the future not less than to the present" (P. Fairbairn). It lies equally on the face of the NT allusions to the subject that its writer understood that the preparation of men to become vehicles of God's message to men was not of yesterday, but had its beginnings in the very origin of their being. The call by which Paul, for example, was made an apostle of Jesus Christ, was suddenly willed, but apparently with a predestination; but it is precisely this Paul who reckons this call as only one step in a long process, the beginnings of which antedated his own existence: "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (Gal 1:15-16; cf Jer 1:5; Isa 49:1.5). The recognition by the writers of the NT of the experiences of God's grace, which had been vouchsafed to them as an integral element fitting them to be the bearers of His gospel to others, finds such pervasive expression that the only difficulty is to select from the mass the most illustrative passages. Such a statement as Paul gives in the opening verses of 2 Cor is thoroughly in accordance with this: "he who has been afflicted and comforted to the end that he might "be able to comfort them that are in any affliction, through the comfort wherewith" he had himself been "comforted of God." For, he explains, "Whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient endur-
which takes effect at the very point of the writing of Scripture—understanding the term "writing" here as inclusive of all the processes of the actual composition of Scripture, the investigation of documents, the collection of facts, the exegesis of conclusions, and the adaptation of them to ends and the like—with the effect of giving to the resultant Scripture a specifically supernatural character, and constituting it a Divine, as well as human, book. Obviously the mode of operation of this Divine activity governing to this result is conceived, in full accord with the analogy of the Divine operations in other spheres of its activity, in providence and in grace alike, as conform with the human activities operative in the case; as, in a word, the nature of what has come to be known as "immanent action."

It will not escape observation that thus "inspiration" is made a mode of "revelation." We are often exhorted, to be sure, to distinguish sharply between "inspiration" and "revelation"; and the exhortation is "revelation" just when "revelation" is taken in one of its narrower senses, of, say, an external manifestation of God, or of an immediate communication to the soul, to the mind, of the Word. But "inspiration" does not differ from "revelation" in these narrow senses as genus from genus, but as a species of one genus differs from another. That operation of God which we call "inspiration," that is, the operation of the Spirit of God by which He "bears" men in the process of composing Scripture, so that they write, not of themselves, but "from God," is one of the modes in which God makes known to men His being, His will, His operations, His purposes. It is as distinctly a mode of revelation as any mode of revelation can be, and therefore it performs the same office where all revelation performs, that is to say, in the express words of Paul, it makes men wise, and makes them wise unto salvation. All "spiritual" or "supernatural" revelation (which is redemptive in its very idea, and occupies a place as a substantial element in God's redemptive processes) has precisely this for its end; and Scripture, as a mode of the redemptive revelation, finds its particular function just in this: if the "inspiration" by which Scripture is produced renders it trustworthy and authoritative, it renders it trustworthy and authoritative only that it may the better serve to make men wise unto salvation. Scripture is its purpose. It is as distinctly a mode of revelation as any mode of revelation can be, and therefore it performs the same office where all revelation performs, that is to say, in the express words of Paul, it makes men wise, and makes them wise unto salvation. All "spiritual" or "supernatural" revelation (which is redemptive in its very idea, and occupies a place as a substantial element in God's redemptive processes) has precisely this for its end; and Scripture, as a mode of the redemptive revelation, finds its particular function just in this: if the "inspiration" by which Scripture is produced renders it trustworthy and authoritative, it renders it trustworthy and authoritative only that it may the better serve to make men wise unto salvation. Here Scripture is its purpose. It is as distinctly a mode of revelation as any mode of revelation can be, and therefore it performs the same office where all revelation performs, that is to say, in the express words of Paul, it makes men wise, and makes them wise unto salvation.

15. "Inspiration" and "revelation"; and the exhortation is "revelation" just when "revelation" is taken in one of its narrower senses, of, say, an external manifestation of God, or of an immediate communication to the soul, to the mind, of the Word. But "inspiration" does not differ from "revelation" in these narrow senses as genus from genus, but as a species of one genus differs from another. That operation of God which we call "inspiration," that is, the operation of the Spirit of God by which He "bears" men in the process of composing Scripture, so that they write, not of themselves, but "from God," is one of the modes in which God makes known to men His being, His will, His operations, His purposes. It is as distinctly a mode of revelation as any mode of revelation can be, and therefore it performs the same office where all revelation performs, that is to say, in the express words of Paul, it makes men wise, and makes them wise unto salvation. All "spiritual" or "supernatural" revelation (which is redemptive in its very idea, and occupies a place as a substantial element in God's redemptive processes) has precisely this for its end; and Scripture, as a mode of the redemptive revelation, finds its particular function just in this: if the "inspiration" by which Scripture is produced renders it trustworthy and authoritative, it renders it trustworthy and authoritative only that it may the better serve to make men wise unto salvation.

16. Scriptures and Divine-human Book?

The Second Testament of the New Testament is the Christian canon of books, which includes the Old Testament. It is divided into two main parts: the Gospels and the New Testament. The Gospels are the first four books of the New Testament and contain the life, teachings, and ministry of Jesus Christ. The New Testament also contains the letters of Paul and other early Christian writers, which are addressed to various churches and individuals. These books form the foundation of Christian faith and practice, and they are widely studied and interpreted by scholars and believers alike.

17. Scripture as inspired?

"Scripture as inspired" refers to the belief that the Bible is a collection of divinely inspired writings. This belief is central to many Christian denominations and is based on the claim that the authors of the Bible were guided by the Holy Spirit during the process of writing. The concept of inspiration is rooted in the idea that God was actively involved in the creation of the biblical text, ensuring its accuracy and relevance for all time. This belief is expressed in various ways across different Christian traditions, from the simple acknowledgment of the divinity of the Bible to the more complex interpretations that seek to elucidate the nature of divine guidance in the writing process.
matter and form of their teaching (1 Cor 2 13). They, therefore, speak with the utmost assurance of their teaching (Gal 1 7 8); and they issue commands with the completest authority (1 Thess 4 214; 2 Thess 3 6 12), making it, indeed, the test of whether one has the Spirit that he should recognize what they demand as commandments of God (1 Cor 14 37). It would be strange, indeed, if these high claims were made for their oral teaching and commandments exclusively. In point of fact, they are made explicitly also for their written injunctions. It was “this Paul writing,” the recognition of which as commands of the Lord, he makes the test of a Spirit-led man (1 Cor 14 37). It is his “word by this epistle,” obedience to which he makes the condition of Christian communion (2 Thess 3 14). There seems involved in such an attitude toward their own teaching, oral and written, a claim on the part of the NT writers to something very much like the “inspiration” which they attribute to the writers of the OT.

And all doubt is dispelled when we observe the NT writers placing the questions of one another in the same category of “Scripture” with the books of the OT. The same Paul who, in 2 Tim 3 16, declared that “every” or “all” Scripture is “profitable” for “teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,” had already written in 1 Tim 5 18: “For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his hire.” The first clause here is derived from Dt and the second from the Gospel of Lk, though both are cited as together constituting, or better, forming part of the “Scripture” which Paul adduces as so authoritative as by its mere citation to end all strife. Who shall say that, in the declaration of the later ep. that “all” or “every” Scripture is God-breathed, they make it seem that they now have no right to judge what whatever other new books he classed with the old under the name of Scripture, in the back of his mind, along with those old books which Timothy had had in his hands from infancy? And the same Peter who declared that every “prophecy of scripture” was the product of men who spoke “from God,” being “borne” by the Holy Ghost (2 Pet 1 21), in this same ep. (3 16), places Paul’s Epp. in the category of Scripture along with whatever other books. For that, says he, were these epp., not out of his own wisdom, but “according to the wisdom given to him,” and though there are some things in them hard to be understood, yet it is only “the ignorant and unstedfast” who weigh these texts as passages—as what else could be expected of men who wrote “also the other Scriptures” (obviously the OT is meant)—“unto their own destruction”? Is it possible to say that Peter could not have had these epp. of Paul also lurking somewhere in the back of his mind, along with “the other scriptures,” when he told his readers that every “prophecy of scripture” owes its origin to the prevailing operation of the Holy Ghost? What must be understood in estimating the testimony of the NT writers to the inspiration of Scripture is that “Scripture” stood in their minds as the title of a unitary body of books, throughout the gift of God through His Spirit to His people; but that this body of writings was at the same time understood to be a growing aggregate, so that what is said of it applies to the new books which were being added to it as the Spirit gave them, as fully as to the old books which had come down to them from their hoary past. It is a mere matter of detail to determine precisely what new books were thus included by that principle. They say to us some of them themselves. Those who received them from their hands tell us of others. And when we put the two bodies of testimony together we find that they constitute just our NT. It is no pressure of the witness of the writers of the NT to the inspiration of the Scripture, therefore, to look up as covering the entire body of “Scriptures,” the new books which they were themselves adding to this aggregate, as well as the old books which they had already received as Scripture for themselves. No one can lay claim by just right to the appellation of “Scripture,” as employed in its eminent sense by those writers, can by the same just right lay claim to the “inspiration” which they ascribe to this “Scripture.”


BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD

INSTANT, instant, INSTANTLY, instant-li; Derivate from Lit instare. Found in Eng. with various meanings from the 15th cent. to the present time.

Instant is used once in Isa 29 5 in the sense of immediate time; elsewhere in the sense of urgent, pressing; Lk 23 23, where “were instant” is the AV tr of the vb, ἐκπέμπει, epistle; Rom 12 12, where it is used in the vb, προσκυνεῖν, epistle, of Acts 6 4. In 2 Tim 4 2 it stands for the expressive vb, τιμοῦν, episte, “stand to.”

Instantly (urgently, atedinantly) is the AV rendering of two different Gr. phrases, ἐκπέμπει, epistle, found in Lk 7 4; and ἐκπέμπει τιμοῦν, epistle, in Acts 26 7. In both cases AV renders “earnestly."

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

INSTRUCTION, in-struk’shun. See CATHECHIST; EDUCATION; SCHOOL.

INSTRUMENT, in-strū-ment (ɪnˈstrə-mənt, ɪnˈstrə-ˈment); in Gr πληκτος, ὁρές, Rom 6 13): The word in the OT and NT is used for utensils for service in the sacred Temple with the sanctuary (cf Ex 25 9; Nu 4 12:26:32; 1 K 19 21; 1 Ch 9 29; 2 Ch 4 10; AV; for weapons of war (1 S 8 12; 1 Ch 12 33:31, etc); notably for musical instruments. See MSRC. The members of the old Hebrew alphabet (Rom 6 13) as “instruments” to be used in the service of righteousness, as before they were in the service of unrighteousness.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA
INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC (טְחַנְּנִים, shāhānīm): Thus RV and AV (1 S 18 6), RVm “triangles” or “three-stringed instruments.” See Music.

INSURRECTION, in-su-rēk’shən: The word in Ps 64 2 AV is changed in RV into “tumult”!; in Ezr 4 19 (vb.) it represents the Aram. נָעָב, nēḇ’āḇ, “to lift up oneself.” In the NT στάσις, stāsis, is rendered “insurrection” in Mk 16 7 AV (where of the vb. “made insurrection”), but in Lk 23 19.25 “insurrection.” RV correctly renders “insurrection” throughout; also in Acts 24 5 “insurrections” for AV “sedition.”

INTEGRITY, in-tēg’ri-tē: The tr of החס, tōm, ״tūm-māh,” the tr of תומ, “sincerity,” “soundness,” “completeness,” rendered also “upright,” “perfection.” Its original sense appears in the phrase וַתְּבִין (1 K 22 34; 2 Ch 18 33), “A certain man drew his bow at a vent,” m “Heb, in his simplicity” (cf 2 S 15 11; “in their simplicity”). It is trd “integrity” (Gen 20 16; 1 K 9 4; Ps 7 14; 26 21; 26 11; 41 12; 78 72; Prov 19 11; 20 7), in all which places it seems to carry the meaning of simplicity, or sincerity of heart and intention, truthfulness, uprightness. In the pl. (תומם) it is an epithet on the breastplate of the high priest (Ex 28 30; Dt 33 8; Ezr 2 63; Neh 7 65), one of the sacred lots, indicating, perhaps, “innocence” or “integrity” (LXX ἀθετεῖα). See עִימָם and תָּהֶם. Another word trd “integrity” is תֹומָמָה, from תֹּמַם, “to be upright,” “perfect,” only in Job 3 9; 27 5; 31 6; Prov 11 3. The word “integrity” does not occur in the NT, but its equivalents may be seen in “sincerity,” “truth,” “the pure heart,” “the single eye,” etc. In the above sense of simplicity of intention it is equivalent to being honest, sincere, upright, and is fundamental to true character.

W. L. WALKER

INTELLIGENCE, in-tel’i-jens (תִּיסְיִר, bōlāh): Occurs only once in AV as the tr of בּוֹלָה, “to discriminate” (frequently trd “to understand”), in Dn 11 30 AV, “[he shall have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant,” RV renders “have regard unto them.” “Intelligence” occurs in 2 Mac 3 9 AV, in the sense of information (so RV).

INTEND, in-tend’, INTENT, in-tent’: Early Eng. words derived from Lat and used in AV, sometimes in RV, to translate a number of different expressions of the original.

Intend is sometimes used in Eng. in the literal sense of Lat intendere, “to stretch,” “but in the Eng. Bible it is used only of the direction of the mind toward an object. Sometimes it is used of mere design (μυϊδερ, mēlidēr), Acts 5 33 AV; 20 13; or of desired action (ἐξαναδείκνυμι, thēna dēnūmī), Lk 14 28 AV; again of a fixed purpose (βολομένος, boλoλoμēnōs), Acts 5 12; 22 4; or, finally, of a declared intention (ἐμφανίζω, emphānīzō), Josh 22 33 AV; 2 Ch 23 13 AV.

Intend is used only of purpose, and is the tr sometimes of a conjunction (καθότι, kathōtī), 2 S 17 14; (καθὼς’ an), 2 K 10 19; (ἐκ, hīnā), Eph 3 10; sometimes of an infinitive of purpose, 1 Cor 10 6; or of a preposition with pronoun (ἐξ ὅστις, ἐκ τούτων), Acts 9 21; and sometimes of a sub. (ἐκτῶν, λόγοί), Acts 10 20. This variety of original expressions is rendered in the Eng. by single terms is an interesting illustration of the extent of interpretation embodied in our Eng. Bible.

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

INTERCESSION, in-tér-sesh’un (גיְדר, nāgāh, “to make intercession”; originally “to strike upon,” or “against”); then in a good sense, “to assail anyone with petitions,” “to urge,” and when on behalf of another, “to intercede” (Ruth 1 16; Jer 7 16; 27 18; Job 21 15; Gen 33 8; Isa 55 12; Jer 36 25). A similar idea is found in bietet, used in the NT “intercession.” The Eng. word is derived from Lat intercedere, “to come between,” which strangely has the somewhat opposed meanings of “obstruct” and “to interpose on behalf of a person,” and finally “to intercede.” The growth of this word in the various languages is highly suggestive. In the Gr NT we find the word in 1 Tim 2 1; 4 5; ἑντοπία, entepochein, is also found in Rom 8 26-34):

Etymology and Meaning of Term in the OT and NT

I. MAN’S INTERCESSION FOR HIS FELLOW-MAN

1. Patriarchal Examples
2. Intercessions of Moses
3. The Progress of Religion, Seen in Moses’ Intercessions
4. Intercessory Prayer in Israel’s Later History
5. The Rise of Official Intercession
6. Samuel as an Intercessor as Judge, Priest and Prophet
7. Intercession in the Poetic Books
8. The Books of Wisdom
9. The Prophets’ Succession to Moses and Samuel
10. The Priest and Intercession
11. Intercession in the Gospels
12. Intercession in the Epistles
13. Intercession Found in the Epistles

II. INTERCESSION PERFECTIONED IN CHRIST’S OFFICE AND IN THE CHURCH

III. INTERCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The meaning of the word is determined by its use in 1 Tim 2 1, “I exhort, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all and men;” where the different kinds of intercession prayers appear to be distinguished.

Considerable discussion has arisen on the exact meaning of these words. Augustine refers them to the liturgy of the Eucharist. This seems to be importing the significance of the various parts of the ceremony as observed at a time much later than the date of the passage in question. “Supplications” and “prayers” refer generally and specific petitions; “intercessions” will then have the meaning of a request concerning others.

Intercession is prayer on behalf of another, and naturally arises from the instinct of the human heart—not merely prompted by affection and interest, but recognizing that God’s relation to man is not merely individual, but social. Religion thus involves man’s relations to his fellow-man, just as in man’s social position intercession with one on behalf of another is a common incident, becoming, in the development of society, the function of appointed officials; as in legal and courtly procedure, so in religion, the spontaneous and affectionate prayer to God on behalf of another grows into the regular and orderly service of a duly appointed priesthood. Intercession is thus to be regarded:

(1) as the spontaneous act of man for his fellow-man; (2) the official act of developed sacrodotalism; (3) the perfecting of the natural movement of humanity, and the typified function of priesthood in the intercession of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

I. Man’s Intercession for His Fellow-Man

Many such prayers are recorded in Scripture. The sacrificial act of Noah may have been partly of this nature, for it is followed by a promise of God on behalf of the earth and all its creatures (Gen 8 20-22). Such also is Abraham’s prayer for Ishmael (Gen 17 18); Abraham’s prayer for Sodom (Gen 18 23-33); Abraham for Abimelech (Gen 20 17). Jacob’s blessing of Joseph’s sons is of the nature of intercession (Gen 48 8-23). His
dying blessing of his sons is hardly to be regarded as intercessory; it is, rather, declarative, although in the case of Joseph it approaches intercession. The absence of distinct intercessory prayer from Abra-
mam to Moses is to be observed, and shows how intensely personal and individual the religious con-
sciousness was still in its undeveloped quality. In Moses, however, the social element finds a further development, and intercessory prayer for deliverance of the people, through the spirit of the Father of the Faithful. Moses is the creator of the national spirit. He lifts religion from its somewhat selfish character in the patriarchal life to the higher and wider plane of a national and racial fellowship.

The ascensive character of the Divine leading of
man is found thus in the development of the inter-
cessory spirit, e.g. Moses' prayer for the removal of plagues (Ex 16 25 f.); for cessions of water at Rephidim (17 4); for victory over Amaleck (17 8–16); prayer for the people after the golden calf (Ex 32 11–14.21–34; 33 12 f.); after the renewal of the tables of stone (34 9); at the setting forth and stopping of the Ark (Nu 10 35 f.); after the burning at building of Mira-plepsy (12 13); after the return of the spies (14 13–19); after the destruction by serpents (Nu 21 7); for direction in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad (27 5); for a successor (27 15); recital of prayer for the people for their entrance into Canaan (Dt 3 23 f.); recital of his prayer for the people after the worship of the golden calf (9 18 ff.); recital of prayers for the rebellious people (Dt 9 25–29); a command to him who pays his third-year tithes to offer prayer for the nation (26 15); Moses final blessing of the tribes (Dt 33).

This extensive series of the intercessory prayers of Moses forms a striking illustration of the growth of religion, represented by the founder of the national life of Israel. It is also the

3. The Progress of history of an official, but it is also the
Religion history of a leader whose heart was
regard for his fellows. None of these
prayers are perfunctory. They are
expressions of a man full of Divine enthusiasm and
human affection. They are real prayers wrung from
a great and devout soul on occasions of deep and

36 critical importance. Apart from their importance in their

8 themselves they are a notable record of a great leader of
men and servant of God.

In the history of Joshua we find only the prayer for the people after the sin of Achan (Josh 7 6–9), although the communications from God to Joshua are
numerous. A faint intercessory note may be heard in Deborah's song (Jgs 5 31), though it is almost silenced by the stern and

38 warlike tone of the poem. Gideon's prayer seems to reflect something of the words of Moses (Jgs 6 13), and accords with the national and religious spirit of the great leader who helped in the formation of the religious life of his people (see Jgs 6 24), notwithstanding the evident lower plane on which he stood (Jgs 6 27), which may account partially for his delicate

38 intercession. In Jgs 6 28 f. Manoah's prayers (Jgs 13)

19 Taherah (Jgs 13) are noted. The satisfaction of Milcom at securing a priest for his house, and the subsequent story, belong rather to the history of

19 the Israelite priest in high office, than to intercession. As below), as also the Inquiry of the people through Philo and the account of the people's mourning and prayer (Jgs 21 2 f.)

4. Interces-
sory Prayer in Later History of Israel

In Jgs 6 29 we find the first instance of the intercessory prayer of the people. It was for a good cause, and the people's intercession is a

22 occasion for the national song of Jgs 8 21 ff., and the recognition by the people of Samuel's place (1 S 8 1 f.; see also

6 8.21; 10 17–25; 12 19) (for the custom of in-
quiring of the Lord through a seer see 1 S 9 6–10);

Samuel's prayer for Saul (1 S 15 11), although Saul's intercession to secure from Abra-
mam to Moses is to be observed, and shows how intensely personal and individual the religious con-
sciousness was still in its undeveloped quality. In Moses, however, the social element finds a further development, and intercessory prayer for deliverance of the people, through the spirit of the Father of the Faithful. Moses is the creator of the national spirit. He lifts religion from its somewhat selfish character in the patriarchal life to the higher and wider plane of a national and racial fellowship.

The ascensive character of the Divine leading of
man is found thus in the development of the inter-
cessory spirit, e.g. Moses' prayer for the removal of plagues (Ex 16 25 f.); for cessions of water at Rephidim (17 4); for victory over Amaleck (17 8–16); prayer for the people after the golden calf (Ex 32 11–14.21–34; 33 12 f.); after the renewal of the tables of stone (34 9); at the setting forth and stopping of the Ark (Nu 10 35 f.); after the burning at building of Mira-plepsy (12 13); after the return of the spies (14 13–19); after the destruction by serpents (Nu 21 7); for direction in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad (27 5); for a successor (27 15); recital of prayer for the people for their entrance into Canaan (Dt 3 23 f.); recital of his prayer for the people after the worship of the golden calf (9 18 ff.); recital of prayers for the rebellious people (Dt 9 25–29); a command to him who pays his third-year tithes to offer prayer for the nation (26 15); Moses final blessing of the tribes (Dt 33).

This extensive series of the intercessory prayers of Moses forms a striking illustration of the growth of religion, represented by the founder of the national life of Israel. It is also the
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4. Interces-
sory Prayer in Later History of Israel

In Jgs 6 29 we find the first instance of the intercessory prayer of the people. It was for a good cause, and the people's intercession is a

22 occasion for the national song of Jgs 8 21 ff., and the recognition by the people of Samuel's place (1 S 8 1 f.; see also
comparative absence of intercessory prayer from the service-book of Israel, and its collected expressions of spiritual experience, is instructive. We find continued references elsewhere, but the next part of these references are descriptive of their wickedness, or denunciatory of their hostility to the Priest. The Book of Psalms is striking commentary on the ground of Israel’s spiritual life. Intense as it is in its perception of God and His claim on human righteousness, it is one of the highest, if not the highest, in its use of the name of Israel’s intercessors. Thus is found in the experience and expressions of the psions.

In the Wisdom books there is little, if any, reference to intercession. They deal rather with ethical character than moral, and unutilitarian basis. It is noticeable that the only reference to pleading a cause is said by the Lord Himself as against the injustice of man (Prov 22:23): “Jeh will not plead the (the poor’s) cause.” Action on behalf of others does not appear to have been very highly regarded by the current ethics of the Israelite. A kind of negative helpfulness is indicated in Prov 24:28: “Be not a witness against thy neighbor without cause,” and it is significant that the office of advocate was not known among the Jews until they had come under the authority of Rome, when, not knowing the forms of Roman law, they were obliged to secure the aid of a Roman lawyer before the courts. Such practitioners were known as (Clc. 1 Coros a. c. 30); Tertullus (Acts 24:1) was such an advocate.

In the prophetic books the note of intercession reappears. The prophet, though primarily a messenger from God to man, has also something of the character of the intercessor (see Isaiah’s call, Isa 6). Isa 6:1-8 exhibits the intercessory character of Moses and Samuel. The request of Hezekiah for the prayers of Isaiah (Isa 37:4), and the answer of the Lord in the form of the letter penned in ch. 26, recall the constantly recurring sense of Moses’ message to the people. Hezekiah himself is an intercessor (vs 14–21). In Jer 4:10 intercession is mingled with the words of the messenger.

The sin of the people hinders such prayers as were offered on their behalf (Jer 7:16; cf 11:14; 14:11). Intercessory prayers are found in Jer 10:25 ff.; 14:7 ff.19–22. The message of Zephaniah requesting Jeremiah’s help is perhaps an instance of seer-inquiry as much as intercession (Jer 21:1; cf 1 S 9:19). In Jer 42:4, the prophet consents to the request from Johanan to seek the Lord on behalf of the people. The book of Lam is naturally conceived in a more constantly recurring spirit of intercession. In the prophecies of Jeremiah has been the messenger of God to the people. But, after the catastrophe, in whose sorrow he appeals to God for mercy, he turns to the people (Lam 2:20; 5:19). Ezekiel in the same way is rather the seer of visions and the prophet representative of God. Yet at times he appeals to God for the people (Ezk 9:8; 11:13). In Dnl we find the intercession of his three friends sought for in order to secure the revelation of the king’s dream (Dnl 2:17); and Daniel’s prayer for Jesus and her people (Dnl 9:16–19).

In the Minor Prophets intercession rarely appears; even in the graphic pictures of Jonah, though the work itself shows the endee of God’s relation to humanity outside of Israel, the prophet himself exhibits no tenderness and utters no pleas for the city against which he had been sent to prophesy, and receives the implied rebuke from the Lord for his want of sympathy, caring more for the worm than for the vast population of Nineveh, whom the Lord, however, pitied and spared (Jon 4). Even the sublime prayer of Hab 3 has only a suggestion of intercession. Zec 6:13 relieves the general severity of the prophetic message, containing the endearment of a royal priest whose office was partially that of an intercessor, though the picture is darkened by the character of the priesthood and the people, whose services had been selfish, without mercy and compassion (Zec 7:4–7). Now the spirit but for the part held by the gleam of the promise of a royal priest whose office was partially that of an intercessor, though the picture is darkened by the character of the

10. The Priest and offering of the sacrifice even for the Intercession is often mentioned in the context of the national functions, both of the regular and the occasional ceremonies, the priest represented the individual or the community. In Joel 2:17 the priests are distinctly hidden to “weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people. O Jeh. Mal 1:9 appeals to them for intercession to God, and the graphic scene in 1 Mac 7:33–38 shows the priests interceding on behalf of the people against Nicanor.

In the NT, all prayer necessarily takes a new form from its relation to Our Lord, and in this intercessory prayer shares. At the outset, Christ teaches prayer on behalf of intercession in those “which despitefully use you” (Mt 5:44 AV). How does this change the entire spirit of prayer? We breathe a new atmosphere of the higher revelation of love. The Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:9–13) is of this character. Its initial word is social, domestic; prayer is the address of the children to the Father. Even though some of the petitions are not original, yet their place in the prayer, and the general tone of the Master’s teaching, exhibit the social and altruistic spirit, not so pervasive of the older dispensation. It is the kingdom petitions, with its essentially intercessory character. The forgiveness of others, which is the measure and plea of our own forgiveness, brings even those who have wronged us upon the same plane as ourselves, and if the plea be genuine, how can we refuse to pray for them? And if for our enemies, then surely for our friends. In Mt 7 11 f., the good things sought of the Father are to be interpreted as among those that if we desire from others we should do to them, and that intercessory prayer cannot be absent. We find the spirit of intercession in the pleas of those who sought Christ’s help for their friends, which He was always so quick to recognize; the centurion for his servant (Mt 8:13); the friends of the paralytic (Mt 9:2–8), where the miracle was wrought on the ground of the friends’ faith. Of a similar character are the requests of the woman for her child and the Lord’s response (Mt 15:28); the man for his lunatic son (17:14–21). There is the suggestion of the intercessory spirit in the law of trespasses, specifically followed by the promise of the answer to the prayer of the two or three, agreed and in fellowship (Mt 18:15–20), with the immediately attached precepts of forgiveness (v 21–35). A remarkable instance of intercession is recorded in Mt 20:20–26, where the mother of Zedelae’s sons makes a request on behalf of her children; the added expression, “worshipping him,” raises the occasion into one of intercessory prayer. Our Lord’s reproof is not to the prayer, but to its unworthiness.

It is needless to review the cases in the other Gospels. But the statement of Mk 6:5 f. that Christ could not perform mighty works because of unbelieving sheds a flood of light upon one of the important conditions of judgment. Herein is contrasted with the healing conditioned by the faith of others than the healed. One of the most distinct examples of intercessory prayer is that of
the Lord's intercession for Peter (Lk 22:31 f.), and for those who crucified Him (Lk 23:34). The place of intercession in the work of Christ is seen clearly in Our Lord's intercessory prayer (see INTERCESSION OF CHRIST), where it is commanded by definite precept and promise of acceptance. The promise of the answer to prayer in the name of Christ is very definite (Jn 16:24); Christ's high-priestly prayer is the sublimest height of prayer to God and is intercessory throughout (Jn 17); Jn 16:26 does not, as some have held, deny His intercession for His disciples, though it only throws open the approach to God Himself.

Acts introduces us to the working of the fresh elements which Christ gave to life. Hence the prayers of the church become Christian prayers, involving the wider outlook on others and the world at large which Christianity has bestowed on men. The prayer of the assembled believers upon the name the liberation of the apostles breathes this spirit (Acts 4:23-30). The consecrating prayer of the seven for the Holy Intercessory (Acts 6:6; cf. Acts 1:24). How pathetic is the plea of Stephen for his murderers (Acts 7:60)! How natural is intercession (Acts 2:42) Peter at Joppa (Acts 9:40); the church praying without ceasing for Peter (Acts 12:5). Barnabas and Saul at Antioch (Acts 13:3); Paul and Barnabas praying for the churches (Acts 14:23); the church at Antioch commending Paul and Silas to the grace of God (Acts 15:40); Paul and the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20:36), are all examples, more or less defined, of intercessory prayer.

In the Epp. we may expect to find intercession more distinctly filled with the relation of prayer through Christ. Paul gives us many examples in his Epp.: for the Romans (Rom 1:9); the Spirit's interceding (5:27); Paul's prayer for his race (10:1); his request for prayers (15:30); the help that he found from his friends (2 Cor 1:11): prayer for the Corinthian church (2 Cor 13:7); for the Ephesians (Eph 1:16-20); Eph 2:14-21; see also Eph 6:18; Phil 1:3-11,19; Col 1:9-10; 3:1; Acts 12:2); a definite command that intercession be made for all men and for kings and those in authority (1 Tim 2:2); his prayer for Timothy (2 Tim 1:3); for Philemon (vers 4); and prayer to be by the elders of the church. (Jas 5:14-18: see also He 13:14-21; 1 Jn 5:14,17).

II. Intercession Perfected in Christ's Office and in the Church.—This review of the intercession of the Scriptures prepares us for the development of a specific office of intercession, perfectly realized in Christ. We have seen that the people's request to represent them before God. In a large and generous spirit the leader of Israel intercedes with God for his nation. It was natural that this striking example of intercessory prayer should be followed by other leaders, and that the gradually developed system of religious worship should furnish the conception of the priest, and esp. the high priest, as the intercessor for those who came to the sacrifice. This was particularly the significance of the Day of Atonement, when after offering for himself, the high priest offered the sacrifice for the whole people. This official act, however, does not do away with the intercessory character of prayer as offered by men. We have seen how it runs through the whole history of Israel. But it lives and much more distinctly in the Christian life and apparently in the practice of the Christian assembly itself. Paul continually refers to his own intercessory prayers, and seeks for a similar service on his own behalf from those to whom he writes based upon the natural tendency of the heart filled by love and a deep sympathetic sense of relation to others. Christ's intercessory prayer is the highest example and pattern of this form of prayer. His intercessions for His disciples, for His crucifiers, are recorded, and the sacred record rises to the supreme height in the prayer of Jn 17. In this prayer the following characteristics are to be found: (1) It is based upon the intimate relation of Jesus to the Father. This gives to such a prayer its singular definiteness; may it be, its right. (2) It follows the complete fulfillment of duty. It is not the mere expression of desire, even for others. It is the crown of effort on their behalf. He has revealed God to His disciples. He has given them to God's world. This is the prayer for them (Jn 17:6-7). (3) It recognizes the Divine, unbroken relation to the object of the prayer: "I am no more in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep," etc (ver 11). (4) The supreme end of the prayer is salvation from the evil of the world (ver 15). (5) The wide sweep of the prayer and its chief objects—unity with God, and the presence with Christ, and the indwelling of the Divine love. The prayer is a model for all intercessory prayer. See, further, INTERCESSION OF CHRIST; PRAYERS OF CHRIST; OFFICES OF CHRIST.

III. Intercession of the Holy Spirit.—In connection with the subject of intercession, there arises a most interesting question as to whether the Holy Spirit is not the real intercessor. The text in which the doctrine seems to be taught is that of Rom 8:26 f.; "In like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." By far the larger number of expositors have understood by the Spirit, the Holy Spirit. The older commentators, in general, refer to the Holy Spirit. Tholuck, Ewald, Philip Meyer, most of the Amer. theologians and Eng. commentators, as Shedd, Alford, Jewett, Wordsworth, interpret it in the same way. Lange and Olahausen refer it to the human spirit. Undoubtedly the "groanings" have led to the denial of the reference to the Holy Spirit. But the very form of the word "helpeth" indicates cooperation, and this must be of something other than the human spirit itself. The undoubted difficulties of the passage, which are strongly urged by Lange (see Lange's Comm. on Rom 8:26), must be acknowledged. At the same time the statement seems to be very clear and definite. Compiling and looking to the fact that the Holy Spirit is here referred to as dwelling in us, and thus making intercession. The Divine Spirit is said to be a Spirit of supplication (See 12:10). The distinction which is made between the intercession of Christ in heaven in His priestly office and that of the Holy Spirit interceding within the souls of believers, referred to by Shedd (see Comm. on Rom, must be carefully used, for if pressed to its extreme it would lead to the materialization and localization of the Divine nature. Moreover, may not the intercession of Our Lord be regarded as being partially exemplified in that of the Spirit whom He has declared to be His agent and representative? If Christ dwells in believers by His Spirit, His intercession, esp. if subjective in and with their spirits, may properly be described as the intercession of the Holy Ghost.

L. L. DE VAN

INTERCESSION OF CHRIST: The general conception of Our Lord's mediatorial office is specially summed up in His intercession in which He appears in His high-priestly office, and also as interceding with the Father on behalf of that humanity whose cause He had espoused.
The function of priesthood as developed under Judaism involved the position of mediation between man and God. The priest 1. Christ’s represented man, and on man’s behalf Intercession approached God; thus he offered sacrifice, interceded and gave to the father of his people whom he represented the benediction and expression of the Divine accept- ance. (For the various forms of these offerings, see special articles.) As in sacrifice, so in the work of Christ, we find the proprietary rights of the officer in the sacrifice. For man, Christ as one with man, and yet in His own personal right, offers Himself (see Rom 5; and of Gal 4 5 with He 2 11). There was also the transfer of guilt and its conditions, typically by laying the hand on the head of the animal, which then bore the sins of the officer and was presented to God by the priest. The acknowledgment of sin and the surrender to God is completely fulfilled in Christ’s offering of Himself, and His death (cf Lev 3 2 6; 16 21; with Jn 2 22). Our Lord’s intercessory quality in the sacrifice of Himself is not only indicated by the imputation of guilt to Him as representing the sinner, but also in the victory of His life over death, which is then given to man in God’s acceptance of His representative and sub- stitute.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the intercessory character of Our Lord’s high-priestly office is transferred to the heavenly condition and work of Christ, where the relations of His mission are regarded as being still continued in the heavenly place (see He 9 11-28). This entrance into heaven is once for all, and in the person of the high priest the way is open to the very presence of God. Our Lord, as He Himself as our perfectly sinless and obedient servant, of the Lord was concluded and gathered up into His kingly office (vs 13 14-18). But from another point of view, we ourselves are hidden to enter into the Holiest Place; as if in union with Christ we too become a kingly priesthood (He 10 19-22; and cf 1 Pet 2 9).

It must not be forgotten, however, that this right of entrance into the most holy Place is one that depends entirely upon our vital union with Christ, His relation to us and our relation to Him in this sense He fulfills the second duty of His high-priestly office as intercessor, with the added conception drawn from the legal advocacy of the Roman court. The term Advocate in 1 Jn 2 2 is used in the same sense, saying, “He is called Advocate, because He is the one who is to be comforter.” The word is of familiar use in Greek and Latin for the legal advocate or patronus who appeared on behalf of his client. Thus, in the double sense of priestly and legal representative, Our Lord is our intercessor in Heaven.

Of the modes in which Christ carries out His intercessory office, we can have no knowledge except so far as we may fairly deduce them from the phraseology and suggested ideas of Scripture. As high priest, He may surely be right for us to aid our weak faith by assuring ourselves that Our Lord pleads for us, while at the same time we must be careful not to deprave our thought concerning the glorified Lord by the metaphors and analogies of earthly relationship.

The intercessory work of Christ may thus be represented: He represents man before God in His perfect nature, His exalted office and His completed work. The Scripture word for this is (He 9 24) “to appear before the face of God for us.” This is the office of Our Lord as advocate or parakletos. That this conveys some relation to the aid which one who has broken the law receives from an advocate cannot be overlooked, and we find Christ’s intercession in this aspect brought into connection with the texts which refer to justification and its allied ideas (see Rom 8 34; 1 Jn 2 1). In Prayers of Christ (q.v.), the intercessory character of many of Our Lord’s prayers, and esp. that of Jn 17, is considered. It 2. Christ’s has been impossible for Christian Intercity thought to divest itself of the idea Work from that the heavenly intercession of Christ stand- point of Prayer is of the order of prayer. It is im- possible for us to know; and even if Christ now prays to the Father, it can be in no way analogous to earthly prayers. The thought of some portion of Christen- dom distinctly combined prayer in the heavenly work of the Lord. There is danger in extreme views. Scriptural expressions must not be driven too far, and, on the other hand, they must not be emptied of all their contents. Modern Protestant teaching has, in its protest against a merely physical conception of Our Lord’s state and occupation in heaven, almost subdued reality from His intercessory work. In Lutheran teaching the intercession of Our Lord was said to be “vocal,” “verbal” and “oral.” It has been well remarked that such forms of prayer require flesh and blood, and naturally the teachers of the Reformed churches, for the most part, have con- tented themselves (as for example Hodge, Syst. Theo., II, 593) with the declaration that “the intercession of Christ includes: (1) His appearing before God in our behalf, as the sacrifice for our sins, as our high priest on the ground of whose work we receive the remission of our sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and all needed good; (2) defence against the sentence of the law and the charges of Satan, who is the great accuser; (3) His offering Himself as our perfectly sinless and obedient servant, the demands of justice shall be shown to be satisfied, but that His people shall be obedient and faithful; (4) the oblation of the persons of the redeemed, sanctifying their prayers, and all their services, rendering them acceptable to God, through the savour of His own merits.”

Even this expression of the elements which constitute the intercession of the Lord, cautious and spiritual as it is in its application to Christian thought and life, must not be accepted without some criticism from a too complete and materialistic use. With- out care, worship and devout thought may become degraded and fall into the mechanical forms by which Our Lord’s position of intercessor has been little more than a little process, mundane and spectacular or process which goes on in some heavenly place. It must not be forgotten that the metaphorical and symbolic origin of the ideas which constitute Christ’s intercession is always in danger of dominating and materializing the spiritual reality of His intercessional office.

INTEREST, in ter est (יוּמָה, neshekh, נְשֵׁה, mashasha’h; νόμος, lökos): The Heb word neshekh is derived from a root which aid our word “to bite,” thus interest is “something bitten off.” The other word, mashasha’h, means “lending on interest.” The Gr term is from the root tikto, “to produce” or “beget,” hence inter- est is something begotten or produced by money. The Heb words are usually tr2 “usury,” but this meant the same as interest, all interest being reck- oned as usury.

Long before Abraham’s time money had been loaned at a fixed rate of interest in Babylonia and almost certain in Egypt. The CH gives regulations regarding the lending and borrowing of money, the usual interest being 20 per cent. Sometimes it was only 11% and 13%, as shown by contract tab- lets. In one case, if the loan was not paid in two months, 18 per cent interest would be charged.
Corn, dates, onions, etc., were loaned at interest. Thus Moses and Israel would be familiar with commercial loans and interest. In Israel there was no system of credit or commercial loans in Moses' time and after. A poor man borrowed because he was poor. The law of Moses (Ex. 22:25) forbade loaning at interest. There was to be no creditor and no taker of interest among them (Lev. 25:36-37). Dt. permits them to lend on interest to a foreigner (Dt. 23:19.20), but not to a brother Israeli. That this was considered the proper thing in Israel for centuries is seen in Ps 15:5, while Prov. 28:8 implies that it was an unseemly thing, interest being generally exacted and profit made. Ezekiel condemns it as a heinous sin (Ezk 18:13.17) and holds up the ideal of righteousness as not taking interest (22:12). Isa. 24:2 implies that it was a business in that town, the lender and borrower being social types. Jeremiah implies that there was not always the best feeling between lenders and borrowers (16:10). According to Neh. 5:7.10, rich Jews were lending to others and exacting heavy interest. Nehemiah condemns such conduct and forbids the use of interest, citing himself as an example of lending without interest. The lenders restored 1 per cent of that exacted.

In the NT, references to interest occur in the parable of the Pounds (Lk. 19:23) and of the Talents (Mt. 25:27). Here the master expected to put their master's money out at interest, and condemnation followed the failure to do so. Thus the principle of receiving interest is not condemned in the OT, only it was not to be taken from a brother Israeli. In the NT it is diametrically opposed. See also USBY.

J. J. REEVE

INTERMEDDLING, in-tér-med′i-lng, "to mix up [self] with something," "mingle in," "share," "take interest in:" The word occurs only once (Prov. 14:10) in a passage descriptive of "the ultimate solitude of each man's soul at all times." "The heart knoweth its own bitterness." "Nor even the tenderest heart, and next our own. Knows half the reasons why we smile and sigh." (Cf 1 K 8:38.) Something there is in every sorrow which no one else can share. "And a stranger doth not intermeddle with its joy," not necessarily in an interfering or any offensive way, but simply does not share or take any interest in the other's joy. For "intermeddled with:" (Prov. 18:1 AV), RV gives "rageth against" (in "quarrelleth with"). MRS. J. EVANS

INTERMEDIATE, in-tér-mēd′i-ät, STATE. See EeScHEMToLOGY of the NT.

INTERPRETATION, in-tér-prē-tā-shun: Is a generic term and may refer to any work of literature. Referred specifically to the sacred:

1. General Scriptures, the science of interpretation of the principles of this science is exegesis. In nearly all cases, interpretation has in mind the thoughts of another, and then, further, these thoughts expressed in another language than that of the interpreter. In this sense it is used in Bib. research. A person has interpreted the thoughts of another when he has in his own mind a correct representation or phra-

2. Special Principles: Just where the line is to be drawn between the human and the Divine factors in the production of the sacred Scriptures materially affects the principles of interpreting these writings (see INSPIRATION). That the human factor was sufficiently potent to shape the form of thought in the Scriptures is evident on all hands. Paul does not write as Peter does, nor John as James; the individuality of the writer of the different books appears not only in the style, choice of words, etc, but in the whole theological conception. There are such things as a Pauline, a Johannine and a Petrine type of Christian thought, although there is only one body of Christian truth underlying all types. In so far as the Bible is exactly like other books, it must be interpreted as were other works of literature. The Scriptures are written in Heb and in Gr, and the principles of forms and of syntax that would apply to the explanation of other works written in these languages and under these circumstances must be applied to the OT and NT also. Again, the Bible is written for men, and its thoughts are those of mankind and not of angels or creatures of a different or higher spiritual or intellectual character; and accordingly there is no specifically Bib. logic, rhetoric, or grammar. The laws of thought and of the interpretation of thought in these matters pertain to the Bible as they do to other writings.

But in regard to the material contents of the Scriptures, matters are different and the principles of interpretation must be different. God is the author of the Scriptures which He has given through human agencies. Hence the contents of the Scriptures, to a great extent, must be far above the ordinary concepts of the human mind. When John declared that "Jesus whom He loved...died...He gave His only begotten Son to redeem it," the interpreter does not do justice to the writer if he finds in the word "God" only the general philosophical
conception of the Deity and not that God who is our Father through Christ; for it was the latter thought that was in the mind of the writer when he penned these words. Thus, too, it is a false interpretation to find in "Our Father" anything but this specifically Bib. conception of God, nor is it possible for anybody but a believing Christian to utter this prayer (Mt. 6 9) in the sense which Christ, who taught it to His disciples, intended.

Again, the example of Christ and His disciples in their treatment of the OT teaches the principle that the phrase διηκόνια of a Scriptural passage is to be interpreted as decisive as to its meaning. In the about 400 citations from the OT to its meaning, there is not one in which the mere "It is written" is not regarded as settling its meaning. Whatever may be a Bible student's theory of inspiration, his teachings and the examples of interpretation found in the Scriptures are in perfect harmony in this matter.

These latter facts, too, show that in the interpretation of the Scriptures principles must be applied that are not applicable in the explanation of other books. As God is the author of the Scriptures He may have had, and, as a matter of fact, in certain cases did have in mind more than the human audience whom He spoke did themselves understand. The fact that, in the NT, persons like Aaron and David, institutions like the law, the sacrificial system, the priesthood and the like, are interpreted as typical of persons and things understood by the OT Covenant shows that the true significance, e.g. of the Levitical system, can be found only when studied in the light of the NT fulfillment.

Again, the principle of parallelism, not for illustration of the interpretative purposes, is a rule that can, in the nature of the case, be applied to the interpretation of the Scriptures alone and not elsewhere. As the Scriptures represent one body of truth, though in a kaleidoscopic variety of forms, a statement on a particular subject in one place can be accepted as in harmony with a statement on the same subject elsewhere. In short, in all of these characteristics in which the Scriptures are unlike other literary productions, the principles of the Scriptures must also be unlike those employed in other cases.

Owing chiefly to the dogmatical basis of hermeneutics as a science, there has been a great divergence of views in the history of the church as to the proper methods of interpretation. It is one of the characteristic and instructive features of the NT writers that they absolutely refrain from the allegorical method of interpretation current in those times, particularly in the writings of Philo. Not even Gal 4 22, correctly understood, is an exception, since this, if an allegorical interpretation at all, is an argummentum ad hominem. The sober and grammatical method of interpretation in the NT writers stands out, too, in bold and creditable contrast to that of the early Christian exegetes, even of Origen. Only the Syrian fathers seemed to be an exception to the fantasies of the allegorical methods. The Middle Ages produced nothing new in this sphere; but the Reformation, with its formal principle that the Bible and the Bible alone is the rule of faith and life, made the correct grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures practically a matter of necessity. In modern times, not at all prolific in scientific discussions of hermeneutics principles and practices, the exegetical methods of different interpreters are chiefly controlled by their views as to the origin and character of the Scriptural books, particularly in regard to their inspiration.

INTREAT, in-tret', INTREATY, in-tret'i (EN-TREAT): The two forms are derived from the same vb. In 1611 the spelling was indifferently "entreat" or "entreaty." In editions of 1676 "intreat" is used in the sense of "to beg;" "entreat" in the sense of "deed with." As examples of "intreat" see Ex 8 8, "Intreat the Lord" (דָּאָשׁ); Ruth 1 16, "Intreat me not to leave thee" (דָּאָשׁ); Cor 8 4, "praying us with much intreaty" (ῥαπτός, παρθένεσις). In Gen 26 21 "intreat" is used to indicate the success of a petition. For entreat see Gen 12 16, "He entreated Abraham well"; Acts 27 8, "And Julius courteously entreated Paul" (μετεχθεὶς, φιλοθεμῶν, φιλανθρό- πος χρείανεμοι, lit. "to use in a philanthropic way"); cf also Jas 3 17, where εὐλογητός, εὐπληθής, lit. "easily persuaded," is tr"t easy to be entreated. RV changes all passages of AV where "intreat" is found to "entreat," with the exception of those mentioned below. The meaning of "entreat" is "to ask," "to beseech," "to supplicate": Job 19 17 reads "and my supplication to the children" (תינוקה), AV "though I intreated for the children," RV "I make supplication". Jer 44 11 reads, "I will cause the enemy to make supplication" (היפָּחֵל), instead, AV "I will cause the enemy to entreat" (RvM "I will intercede for thee with the enemy"). 1 Tim 6 1 changes AV "entreat to "exhort." Phil 4 3 renders AV "entreaters, AV "be- seech." 

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

INWARD, in'ward, MAN: A Pauline term, nearly identical with the "hidden man of the heart" (1 Pet 3 4). The Gr. original, ἴδωρ (also ἴδωρος ὁ ἅγιος ἐστήθεν ἄνθρωπος (Rom 7 22) is lexicographically defined "the internal man," i.e. "soul," "conscience.") It is the immaterial part of man—mind, spirit—in distinction from the "outerward man" which "perisheth" (2 Cor 4 16 AV). As the seat of spiritual influences it is the sphere in which the Holy Spirit does His renewing and saving work (Eph 3 16). The term "inward man" cannot be used interchangeably with "the new man," for it may still be "corrupt," and subject to "vanity" and "alienated from the life of God." Briefly stated, it is mind, soul, spirit—God's image in man's higher nature, intellectual, moral, and spiritual.

Dwight M. PRATT

INWARD PART: A symbolic expression in the OT represented by three Heb words: הַיּוֹר, hide, "chamber," hence inmost bowels or breast; יָקוּם, the reins; כּוֹבֶּד, krébb, "middle," "middle," hence heart. Once in the NT (ἐσκεύας, ἐσκέθθη, "from within," Lk 11 39). The viscéra (heart,
liver, kidneys) were supposed to be the seat of the mind, feelings, affections: the highest organs of the psyche, "the soul." The term includes the intellect ("wisdom in the inward parts," Job 38:39); the moral nature ("inward part is very wickedness," Ps 5:9); the spiritual ("my law in their inward parts," Jer 17:9). Its adverbial equivalent in Bib. use is "inwardly," INWARD MAN (q.v.) is identical in meaning.

Dwight M. Pratt

Iob, yôb (יֹבּ, yôb); AV Job): Third son of Issachar (Gen 46:10). | p | passages (N u 26:24; 1 Ch 7 1) the name is Jasheb (יָשֵׁב, yâsheb), which the VSS in Gen also support as the correct form.

Iphdeiah, if'de'ya (יִפְדֶּחַ, yifhd'éyâh; "Jeh reedens"); AV Iphdeiah: A descendant of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 25).

Iphthah, i'fthâ (יִפְתַּח, yifhthâh; AV Jiphthah): An unidentified town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Libnah, Ether and Ashan (Josh 15 43).

Iphthah-el, i'fthâ-el (יִפְתַּח-אֵל, yifhth'ēl; AV Jiphthah-el): The valley of Iphthah-el lay on the N. border of Zebulun (Josh 19:14). N.W. of the plain of el-Bata'afu stands a steep hill, connected only by a low saddle with the hills on the N. The name Tell Jifât suggests the Jotapata of Jos (BJ, III, vi; vii, i, etc), and the place answers well to his description. It probably corresponds to the ancient Iphthah-iel. In that case the valley is most probably that which begins at Tell Jifât, passes round the S. of Jebel Kaukab, and, as Wady Abellin, opens on the plain of Acre. W. Ewing

IR, ir (יִרְר, "ir"): A descendant of Benjamin (1 Ch 7 12), called Iri in ver 7.

Ira, i'ra (יִרְא, "ira"); Eipes, Eireas): (1) A person referred to in 2 S 20:26 as "priest" (so RV correctly; AV "chief ruler," ARV "chief minister") unto David. The tr. of RV is the only possible one; but, according to the text, Ira was a "Jairite," and thus the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 32:41) and not eligible to the priesthood. On the basis of the Pesh some would correct "Jairite" to 2 S 20:26 into "Jattirite," referring to Jattir, a priestly city within the territory of Judah (Josh 21:10). Others, however, would maintain that "Jairite" is the only correct form and that David's sons were priests, as an indication that in David's time some non-Levites were permitted to serve—in some sense—as priests.

(2) An "Ithrite," or (with a different point of the text) a "Jattirite," one of David's "thirty" (2 S 23:38; 1 Ch 11 40), possibly identical with (1).

(3) Another of David's "thirty," son of Ikkeš of Tekoa (2 S 23:26; 1 Ch 11 28), and a captain of the temple guard (1 Ch 27:9). F. R. Fann

Irád, i rád (יִרָד, ’irâd; LXX Taśâs, Gai'dâd): Grandson of Cain and son of Enoch (Gen 4 18).

Iram, i rám (יִרָם; "irám; LXX variously in Gen): A "chief" of Edom (Gen 36 43; 1 Ch 1 54).

Ir-ha-heres, ir-hâ-hé'res (יִרְ-הָהֵ֫רֶס, "ir-hâ-hé'res; "Ir-ha-heres"): according to the MT, Ag, Theodotion, LXX, AV and RV; according to some Heb MSS, Symmachus, and the Vulg, קָ֫רָה (qârâh), "Ir-ha-hères"); A city of Egypt referred to in Isa 19:18. Jewish quarrels concerning the temple which Onias built in Egypt have most probably been responsible for the altering of the texts of some of the early MSS, and it is not now possible to determine absolutely which have been altered and which accord with the original. This difference in MSS gives rise to different opinions among authorities here to be noted. Most of the discussion of this name arises from this uncertainty and is hence rather profitless. The starting-point of any proper discussion of Ir-ha-hês is that the words are by Isaiah and that they are prophecy, predictive prophecy. They belong to that portion of the prophecies of Isa which by nearly all critics is allowed to the great prophet. Nothing but unfounded speculation or an unwillingness to admit that there is any prophecy in this passage can call in question Isaiah's authorship of these words. Then the sense of the passage in which these words occur imperatively demands that they be accounted predictive prophecy. Isaiah plainly refers to the future, "shall be called"; and makes a definite statement concerning what shall take place in the future (19 18-24). The reality of predictive prophecy may be discussed by those so inclined, but that the intention of the author here was to utter predictive prophecy does not seem to be open to question. For the verification of this prediction by its fulfilment in history we shall inquire concerning: (1) the times intended: "that day"; (2) the "five cities"; (3) "Ir-ha-hês.

The prophet gives a fairly specific description of "that day." It was at least to begin when there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Jeh of hosts (ver 18), and which accord with the prophecy: (1) "that day"; (2) the "five cities"; (3) "Ir-ha-hês.

The first historical fulfilment of the words is found at the period when Onias built his imitations of the Temple of Jerusalem at the place called by the Greeks Leontopolis (Tell el-äh-hê'theb), and the worship of Cities Jeh was set up at Elephantine, and the Jews a great part of the population there, and at Taḫانâs. While any of these latter three might have contained the "pillar," the "altar" would thus be either at Leontopolis or the other one of the "five cities" which cannot be named with much probability. The great delver of the future would seem to be Alexander. Some think that the conversion of the Egyptians indicated in vs 21:22 is furthered, though still not completed, in the Christian invasion of the 1st cent., and again in the success of modern Christian missions in Egypt. It will be seen that it does not follow from what has been said that Leontopolis was Ir-ha-hês as some seem to think. It is not said by the prophet that the place where the altar was called Ir-ha-hês, even if it were certain that the altar was at Leontopolis. Nevertheless, Leontopolis may be Ir-ha-hês. The problem is not in the first place the identification of the name, but the determination of which one of the "five cities" was destroyed. The expression "shall be called the city of destruction" seems clearly to indicate that Ir-ha-hês is not a name at all, but merely a descriptive appellation of that city which should "be destroyed." It still remains to inquire whether or not there is an independent appellation, or whether, more probably, it bore some relation to the name of that city at the time at which the prophet wrote, a play upon the sound, or the significance of the name or both of these,
either through resemblance or contrast. If Gesenius is right, as he seems to be, in the opinion that "in the idiom of Isa Ir-ha-h is explained 'the city that shall be destroyed,'" then the original problem of finding which one of the cities was destroyed seems to be the whole problem. Still, in the highly wrought language of Isaiah and according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, there is probably a play upon words. It is here that the consideration of the name itself properly comes in and probably guides us rightly. Speculation, by Gesenius, Duhm, Cheyne and others, has proposed various different readings of this name, some of them two or three changes in the text to bring it to its present state. Speculation can always propose readings. On was sometimes called "Heres" and meant "house of the sun," which would be both tr and transfigured into Heb ha-heres and might have tr ("city") prefixed. Naville, through his study of the great Harris papyrus, believed that the old Egypt city which later was called Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh) was immediately connected with On and called "House of th3 Sun," also "House of the Sun." Thus this name might be both transfigured and tr into the Heb ha-heres and have tr prefixed. The difference between this expression and "Ir-ha-h" which Isaiah used is only the difference between h and b. So that Ir-ha-h is most probably a corruption of prophecy concerning the disaster that was to overtake one of the "five cities," with a play upon the name of the city, and that city is either On, the later Helopolis, or the ancient sacred city about 4 miles N of On, which Nebuchadnezzar was to build his temple and which later became Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh). No more positive identification of Ir-ha-h is yet possible.

M. G. KYLE

IRI, iri (ْيَرِيَ, ْيَرِىَ). See IR; URAS.

IRJAH, ir'i-ja (إِرْيِّاجَ), yir'yah ("Jeh sees"): A captain at the gate of Benjamin in Judas, who accosted the prophet on suspicion of intending to desert to the Chaldaeans (Jer 37 13,14).

IR-NAHASH, ur-nahash, ir-nahash ():

'ur nabhash: A town of Judah of which Tehinnah is said to be the "father," probably meaning "founder" (1 Ch 4 12). EVM suggests the tr "city of Nahash."

IRON, i'orn (يَرْنَ, bāzel, ṣī̂npe, šī̂dēros): It is generally believed that the art of separating iron from its ores and making it into useful form was not known much earlier than 1000 BC, and that the making of brass (bronze) antedates it by many centuries, in spite of the frequent Bib. references where brass and iron occur together. This conjecture is based upon the fact that no specimen of worked iron has been found whose antiquity can be vouched for. The want of such instruments, however, can be attributed to the ease with which iron corrodes. Evidence that iron was used is found, for example, in the hieroglyphs of the tomb of Rameses III, where the blades of some of the weapons are painted blue while others are painted red, a distinction believed to be due to the fact that some were made of iron or steel and some of brass. No satisfactory proof has yet been presented that the marvelous sculpturing on the hard Egyp granite was done with tempered bronze. It seems more likely that steel tools were used. After the discovery of iron, it was evidently a long time in replacing bronze, and this seems probably due to the difficulties in smelting it. An old mountaineer once described to the writer the process of iron smelting as it was carried on in Mt. Lebanon in past centuries. As a boy he had watched his father, who was a smelter, operate one of the last furnaces to be fired. For each firing, many cords of wood, esp. green oak brakely "the city that shall be destroyed," the original problem of finding which one of the cities was destroyed seems to be the whole problem. Still, in the highly wrought language of Isaiah and according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, there is probably a play upon words. It is here that the consideration of the name itself properly comes in and probably guides us rightly. Speculation, by Gesenius, Duhm, Cheyne and others, has proposed various different readings of this name, some of them two or three changes in the text to bring it to its present state. Speculation can always propose readings. On was sometimes called "Heres" and meant "house of the sun," which would be both tr and transfigured into Heb ha-heres and might have tr ("city") prefixed. Naville, through his study of the great Harris papyrus, believed that the old Egypt city which later was called Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh) was immediately connected with On and called "House of the Sun," also "House of the Sun." Thus this name might be both transfigured and tr into the Heb ha-heres and have tr prefixed. The difference between this expression and "Ir-ha-h" which Isaiah used is only the difference between h and b. So that Ir-ha-h is most probably a corruption of prophecy concerning the disaster that was to overtake one of the "five cities," with a play upon the name of the city, and that city is either On, the later Helopolis, or the ancient sacred city about 4 miles N of On, which Nebuchadnezzar was to build his temple and which later became Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh). No more positive identification of Ir-ha-h is yet possible.

M. G. KYLE

IRI, iri (ْيَرِيَ, ْيَرِىَ). See IR; URAS.

IRJAH, ir'i-ja (إِرْيِّاجَ), yir'yah ("Jeh sees"): A captain at the gate of Benjamin in Judas, who accosted the prophet on suspicion of intending to desert to the Chaldaeans (Jer 37 13,14).

IR-NAHASH, ur-nahash, ir-nahash (:

'ur nabhash: A town of Judah of which Tehinnah is said to be the "father," probably meaning "founder" (1 Ch 4 12). EVM suggests the tr "city of Nahash."

IRON, i'orn (يَرْنَ, bāzel, ṣī̂npe, šī̂dēros): It is generally believed that the art of separating iron from its ores and making it into useful form was not known much earlier than 1000 BC, and that the making of brass (bronze) antedates it by many centuries, in spite of the frequent Bib. references where brass and iron occur together. This conjecture is based upon the fact that no specimen of worked iron has been found whose antiquity can be vouched for. The want of such instruments, however, can be attributed to the ease with which iron corrodes. Evidence that iron was used is found, for example, in the hieroglyphs of the tomb of Rameses III, where the blades of some of the weapons are painted blue while others are painted red, a distinction believed to be due to the fact that some were made of iron or steel and some of brass. No satisfactory proof has yet been presented that the marvelous sculpturing on the hard Egyp granite was done with tempered bronze. It seems more likely that steel tools were used. After the discovery of iron, it was evidently a long time in replacing bronze, and this seems probably due to the difficulties in smelting it. An old mountaineer once described to the writer the process of iron smelting as it was carried on in Mt. Lebanon in past centuries. As a boy he had watched his father, who was
familiar with the methods of irrigation practised in Pal, Syria and Egypt, the passage, "where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs" (Dt 11:10), is easily explained. The water is brought in channels to the gardens, where it is distributed in turn to the different square plots bounded by banks of earth, or along the rows of growing vegetables planted on the sides of the trenches. In stony soil the breach in the canal leading to a particular plot is opened and closed with a hoe. Any obstruction in the trench is similarly removed, while in the soft, loamy soil of the coastal plain or in the Nile valley these operations can be done with the foot, a practice still commonly seen.

The remains of the great irrigation works of the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians leave no doubt as to the extent to which they used water to redeem the deserts. In Pal and Syria there was less need (Dt 10:7; 11:11) for irrigation. Here there is an annual fall of from 30 to 40 in., coming principally during the winter. This is sufficient for the main crops. The summer supply of vegetables, as well as the fruit and mulberry trees, requires irrigation. Hardly a drop of many mountain streams is allowed to reach the sea, but is used to water the gardens of the mountain terraces and plains. This supply is now being supplemented by the introduction of thousands of pumps and oil engines for raising the water of the wells sufficiently to run it through the irrigation canals. Where a spring is small, its supply is gathered into a birken, or cistern, and then drawn off through a large outlet into the trenches, sometimes several days being required to fill the cistern. In Ecc 2:6, Solomon is made to say, "I made me pools of water, to water therefrom the forest." This passage helps to explain the uses of the so-called Pools of Solomon, S. of Jerusalem. In this same district are traces of the ancient terraces which were probably watered from these pools. See Agriculture; Garden. James A. Patch

IR-SHEMESH, ēr-shemesh, ēr-shē'mesh (יִרְשֶׁם, 'Iršemesh, "city of the sun"). See Beth-sheimesh; HERBS.

IRU, t'ró: (יַרְוָא, 'Irō): Eldest son of Caleb (1 Ch 4:15); probably to be read Ir, the syllable -u being the conjunction "and" belonging to the following word.

ISAAC, ī'sāk:

I. NAME
1. Root, Forms, Analogues
2. Implication

II. FAMILY AND KINDRED
1. Birth and Place in the Family
2. Relation to the Religious Birthright
3. Significance of Marriage

III. STORY OF LIFE
1. Previous to Marriage
2. Subsequent to Marriage

IV. BIBLICAL REFERENCES
1. In the OT
2. In the NT

V. VIEWS OTHER THAN THE HISTORICAL

I. Name.—This name has the double spelling, PTT, yichāb and PTT, yichāb (Isaac, Isak), corresponding to the two forms in which appears the root meaning "to forms and laugh."—a root that runs through nearly Analogues all the Sem languages. In Heb both gāḇak and sāḇak have their cognate nouns, and, signifying, in the simple stem, "to laugh," in the intensive stem, "to jest, play, dance, fondle," and the like. The noun yichār, meaning "fresh oil," from a root ẓāhar ("to be bright, conspicuous"), proves that nouns can be built on precisely the model of yichāb, which would in that case signify "the laughing one," or something similar. Yet Barth (Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen, § 154, b and c) maintains that all proper names beginning with yēḏ prefixed to the root are really pure imperfects, i.e. verbal forms with some subject to be understood if not actually present. Hence Isaac would mean "laughs!": either indefinite, "one laughs," or "he laughs," viz. the one understood as the subject. There are some 50 Heb names that have a similar form with no accompanying subject. Of these sometimes the meaning of the root is quite obscure, sometimes it is appropriate to any susceptible subject. Each is a problem by itself; for the interpretation of any one of them there is little help to be gained from a comparison with the others.

What subject, then, is to be understood with this imperfect vb. yichāb? Or is no definite subject to be supplied? (1) 'El, God, may be supplied: "God laughs," such an expression might be understood of the Divine benevolence, or of the fear of the laughter of scorn for His enemies (Ps 2:4), or euphemistically, of the Divine wrath, the "terrible glance," as of Moloch, etc. (so Meyer, Israeliten und ihre Nachbardämme, 255). (2) Some human person: "he laughs." So, for example, he himself, viz. the child who receives the name; or, the father; or, the brother (not the mother, which would require ticāḇā). In the light now of these possibilities we turn to the narratives of Isaac's birth and career and find the following subjects are suggested: (a) Abraham, Gen 17:17; (b) indefinite, "one laughs!" (not "she laughs," see above), Gen 18:12-15; 21:6; (c) brother, Gen 21:9; (d) himself, Gen 26:8. Of these passages the last two show the vb. in the intensive stem in the significations of (c) "mock?" (d) and (d) "dally." We find this same vb. in these senses in Gen 19:14 and 39:14,17, in the stories of Lot and of Joseph, and it is possible that here also in the story of Isaac it has no more connection with the name Isaac than it has there with the names Lot and Joseph. However this may be, there is obviously one interpretation of the name Isaac, which, required in two of the passages, is equally appropriate in them all, viz. the with the indefinite subject, "one laughs." Consideration of the sources to which these passages are respectively assigned by the documentary hypothesis tends only to confirm this result.

II. FAMILY AND KINDRED.—The two things in Isaac's life that are deemed worthy of extensive treatment in the sacred narrative are his birth and his marriage. His significance, in fact, centers in his transmission of what went before him to what came after him. Hence, his position in his father's family, his relation to its greatest treasure, the religious birthright, and his marriage with Rebekah are the subjects that require special notice in this connection.
The birth of Isaac is represented as peculiar in these respects: the age of his parents, the purity of his lineage, the special Divine promises accompanying. What in Abraham's life is signalized by the Divine "call" from his father's house, and what in Jacob's life is brought about by a series of providential dispositions, seems in Isaac's case to become by his birth. His mother, who is not merely of the same stock as Abraham but actually his half-sister, is the legal wife. As her issue Isaac was qualified by the law of inheritance recognized in traditional lands to become his father's heir. But Ishmael, according to those laws, has a similarly valid claim (see Abraham, IV, 2), and it is only by express command that Abraham is led to abandon what was apparently both custom and personal preference — "cast out the bondwoman and her son," and to acquiesce in the arrangement that "Isaac shall thy seed be called."

But the birthright of Isaac was of infinitely more importance than the birthright in the family of Abraham, and this, more than anything else related of him, makes him an attractive figure on the pages of Gen. 19. The raising up of a "seed" to be the bearers of these promises was the prime concern of Isaac's life. Not by inheritance of wealth or of land, but by marriage with one of his own people, in whom as much as in himself should be visibly embodied the separateness of that chosen family of God, was Isaac to pass on to a generation as pure as his own the heritage of the Divine blessing. Rebeckah enters the tent of Isaac as truly the chosen of God as was Abraham himself.

1. Previous relations, a welcome and honored member to Marriage of the patriarchal household. The care and affection shown for the child (which Isaac was the first to receive at the prescribed age of 8 days), the great feast at his weaning, and the disinheretance of Ishmael in his favor, are all of them indications of the unique position that this child held, and prepare the reader to appreciate the depth of feeling involved in the sacrifice of Isaac, the story of which follows thereupon. The age of Isaac at the time of this event is not stated, but the fact that he is able to carry the wood of the offering shows that he had probably attained his full growth. The single question he asks his father and his otherwise unbroken silence combine to exhibit him in a favorable light, as thoughtful, docile and trustful. The Divine interposition to save the lad thus devoted to God constitutes the covenant-promise antithesis, and justifies its explicit renewal on this occasion. From this point onward the biographer of Isaac evidently has his marriage in view, for the two items that preceded the long 24th ch, in which Rebekah's choice and coming are rehearsed, are, first, the brief genealogical paraphrase that informs the reader of the development of Nahor's family just as far as to Rebekah, and second, the ch that tells of Sarah's death and burial — an event clearly associated in the minds of all with the marriage of Isaac (see 24 3.36.f.). Divine interest in the choice of her who should be the mother of the promised seed is evident in every line of the ch that dramatizes the betrothal of Isaac and Rebekah. Their first meeting is described at its close with the tender interest in such a scene natural to every descendant of the pair, and Isaac is seen as a man of a meditative turn (ver 63) and an affectionate heart (ver 67).

The dismissal of the sons of Abraham's concubines to the "East-country" is associated with the statement that Isaac inherited all that Abraham had; yet it has been requested that, besides supplying them Marriage with gifts, Abraham was doing them a further kindness in thus emancipating them from continued subjection to Isaac, the future head of the clan. After Abraham's death we are expressly informed that God "blessed Isaac his son" in fulfilment of previous promise. The section entitled "the biblical [generations] of Isaac" extends from Gen 19 26 to 36 29, in the sense of following his fathers Abraham and Nahor. Isaac's life merges at Beer-lahai-roi (25 11), then at Gerar (26 1 b) and "the valley of Gerar" (26 17), then at Beer-sheba (26 23; 28 10), all localities in the Negeb or "South-country." But after the long narrative of the fortunes of Jacob and his family for many years, we find Isaac at his close living where his father Abraham had lived, at Hebron.

For 20 years Isaac and Rebekah remained childless; it was only upon the entreaty of Isaac that God granted them their wish. Isaac, the son of the promise, was to become his father's heir. The usual signal for migration to Egypt (of Gen 12 10; 42 2); and Isaac also appears to have been on his way thither for the same cause, when, at Gerar, he is forbidden by God to proceed, and occasion is found therein to renew to him the covenant-promise of his inheritance: land, posterity, honor and the Divine presence (26 1–4).

But Isaac had also received from his father traditions of another sort; he too did not hesitate to say to the men of Gerar that his wife was his sister, and that he meant the same thing to save his own life, but without the same justification in fact, as in the case of Abraham's earlier stratagem. Yet even the discovery by the king of Gerar of this duplicity, and the repeated quarrelling with his wife in regard thereto, did not suffice to endanger Isaac's status with the settled inhabitants, for his large household and great resources made him a valuable friend and a dangerous enemy.

The favoritism which Isaac showed for one son and Rebekah for the other culminated in the painful scene when the paternal blessing was given obtained for Jacob, and in the subsequent enforced absence of Jacob from his paternal home. Esau, too, afforded rebuke to his father and mother, and ere long he also withdrew from his father's clan. The subsequent conciliation of the brothers permitted them to unite at length in paying the last honors to Isaac on his decease. Isaac was buried at Hebron where his parents had been buried (Gen 49 31), and where his place of sepulture is still honored.

IV. Biblical References. — There is a great contrast between Abraham and Jacob on the one hand, and Isaac on the other. The bearing of the covenant-promise is more evident in the lit. of the nation that traced to them its descent. To be sure, when the patriarchs as a group are to be named, Isaac takes his place in the stereotyped formula of "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," or "Israel" (so 25 t. in the OT, 7 t. in the NT).
But apart from this formula Isaac is referred to in the OT only as follows. During the lifetime of Jacob the names of Abraham and Isaac are repeatedly linked in the same way as are all three subsequently: they form for that age the dynasty of the covenant. From then on Isaac, God (or, the Fear; see infra) of Isaac, because Isaac is his own immediate predecessor in this chain of the faithful. Isaac is called the "gift" of God to Abraham, in the farewell address of Joshua, just as Isaac's father promised God's "gifts" to Abraham (Josh 24:3f; cf Koran, Surah 6:84). The "house of Isaac" is used by Amos as a "expression for "Israel," and the "high places of Isaac" for "the sanctuaries of Israel" (Am 7:16,8), in the same way as "Jacob" is often used elsewhere (LXX in ver 18 reads "Jacob"). Other references to Isaac are simply as to his father's son or his children's father.

He fares better in the NT. For, besides the genealogical references, Isaac's significance as the first to receive circumcision on the 8th day is remembered (Acts 7:5); his position as first of the elect seed is set forth (Rom 9:7); his begetting of two sons so unlike in their relation to the promise were Esau and Jacob is remarked (Rom 9:10); the facts of his being heir to the promise of old age, and, though but one, the father of an innumerable progeny, are emphasized in He 11 (vs 9–12), which also discovers the deeper significance of his sacrifice and restoration to his father (vs 17–19; cf Jas 2:21); and in the same context is noticed the faith in God implied in Isaac's blessing of his sons. But Isaac receives more attention than anywhere else in that famous passage in Gal (4:21–31), in which Paul uses Isaac and his mother as allegorical representations justified by faith in the promise of God, and are the free-born heirs of all the spiritual inheritance implied in that promise. Even Isaac's persecution by Ishmael has its counterpart in the attitude of the enemies of Paul's gospel toward him and his doctrines and converts.

V. Views Other than the Historical.—Philo, the chief allegoriser of OT narratives, has little to say of Isaac, whom he calls "the self-instructed nature." But mediating his views were by presenting him as the personification of an ethnic group, "All Israel," writes Weilhame (Prol., 6th ed, 316), "is grouped with the people of old under the name of Isaac (Am 7:10), and the material here is not myth but national, but national, and religious Israel plus Edom had little or no significance in national customs or political events, when compared on the one hand with the prominence of the same Edom plus Moab and Ammon (= Abraham) on the other hand; so likewise the figure of Isaac is colorless and his story brief, as compared with the striking figures of Jacob on the one hand and of Abraham on the other hand, and the circumstantial stories of their lives.

Other scholars will have none of this national view, because they believe Isaac to be the name of an ancient deity, the local name of Baalsheba, Sefor, whom others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.
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The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen and the Gr. others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.

The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen and the Gr. others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.

The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen and the Gr. others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.

The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen and the Gr. others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.

The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen and the Gr. others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase "the Fear of Isaac" in Gen 31:42,43 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above 1. 1. 1. 1. Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacredness of Isaac ("the only seed of which Isaac plays an independent role") with the Gr myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod. EURIPIDES, etc), in which the name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death. 
the only explicit "vision" Isaiah saw, yet his entire book, from first to last, is, as the title (1:1) suggests, a "vision." His horizon, both political and spiritual, was practically unbounded. In a very true sense, as Delitzsch says, he was "the universal prophet of Israel.

For versatility of expression and brilliancy of imagery Isaiah had no superior, not even a rival. His style marks the climax of Hebrew

4. Literary

Art. Both his periods and his nations are

Genesis and

Romans

in

Style

and metaphors, particularly of flood, storm and sound (1:13; 4:15; 5:18-25; 6:9; 7:15-25; 7:28-30; 8:9-10), prophetic 5

as a whole, is characterized by the characteristic of his entire book. Epigrams and alliteration (6:8; 10:8.9), antithesis and alliteration (1:18; 3:24; 17:10.12), hyperbole and parable (2:7, 5:1-7; 25:23-29), even paranoia, or play upon words (5:7; 7:9), characterize Isaiah's book as the great masterpiece of Hebrew literature. He is also famous for his richness of vocabulary and synonyms. For example, Ezekiel uses 1,555 words; Jeremiah, 1,653; the Psalms 2,170; while Isaiah uses 2,156. Isaiah was also the most prolific prophet in number and diversity of his messages: a poet: he frequently elaborates his messages in rhythmic or poetic style (12:1-6; 25:1-5; 36:1-12; 38:10-20; 42:1-4; 49:1-9; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12; 60:62; 66:5-24); and in several instances alliteration is in evidence. In Isaiah, for example, in 37:22-29, there is a fine taunting poem on Sennacherib, and in 14:4-23 another on the king of Babylon. As Driver observes, "Isaiah's poetical genius is superb."

5. Tradi-

tions concerning His

Martyrdom

Nothing definite or historical is known concerning the prophet's end; the current tradition, however, there was a tradition to the effect that he suffered martyrdom in the course of his work, which occurred under King Manasseh, because of certain incriminating passages in the Book of the Prophets. But the legend is barely possible in that there is an allusion to his martyrdom in He 11:37, which reads, "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, or killed by the sword, or died of other deaths." In any case Isaiah probably survived the great catastrophe of the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 B.C. He died in 699 B.C. for in 2 Ch 32:32 it is stated that Isaiah wrote a biography of King Hezekiah. If Isaiah's activity extended over a period of more than 40 years. Dr. G. A. Smith extends it to "more than 50." (Jerusalem: 150; of Whitehouse, "Isaiah," New Cent. Bible, 1:72).

According to the title of his book (1:1), Isaiah prophesied during the reigns of Uzziah, Zedekiah, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.

6. Period

He dates his inaugural vision (6:1) in "the fifth year of the reign of Uzziah," which was approximately 740 B.C. This marks, therefore, the beginning of his prophetic ministry. And we know that he was still active as late as the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 B.C. Hence the minimum period of his activity was 25 years, as 740 to 701 B.C. A young man Isaiah witnessed the rapid development of Judah into a strong commercial and military state; for under Uzziah Judah attained a degree of prosperity and strength never before enjoyed since the days of Solomon. With his wealth, Judah's population increased, and with it also the size of the army, a port for commerce on the Red Sea, increased inland trade, tribute from the Ammonites, success in war with the Philis and the Arabinians—all these became Judah's during Uzziah's long and prosperous reign of 52 years. But along with power and wealth came also avarice, oppression, religious formalism and corruption. The temple revenues indeed were greatly increased, but religion and life were too commonly, if not altogether material. During the reign of Joatham (740-736 B.C.), who for several years was associated with his father as co-regent, a new power began to appear over the eastern horizon. The Assyrians, with whom Ahah had come in contact at the battle of Karkar in 854 B.C., and to whom Jehu had paid tribute in 842 B.C., began to manifest their characteristic lust of conquest. Tiglath-pileser III, who is called "Pul" in 2 K 15:19 and reigned over Assyria from 745 to 727 B.C., turned his attention westward, and in 735 B.C. reduced Arpad, Calno, Carchemish, Hamath and Damascus. Hence his presence in the West led Pekah, king of North Israel, and Rezin, king of Damascus, to form an alliance in order to resist further encroachment on the part of Assyria. When Ahaz refused to join their confederacy they resolved to dethrone him and set in his stead the son of Tabeel on the throne of David (2 K 16:5; Is 7:6). The struggle which ensued is commonly known as the Syro-Ephraimite war (744 B.C.), one of the great conflicts in Isaiah's Dnerosthetes. Isaiah was bare of life impatiently to manifest Sennacherib's panic sent to Tiglath-pileser for help (2 K 16:7), who of course responded with alacrity. The result was that the great Assyrian warrior sacked Gaza and carried all of Galilee and Gilead into captivity (734 B.C.); and finally took Damascus (732 B.C.). Ahaz was forced to pay dearly for his protection, and Judah was brought very low (2 K 15:29; 16:7-9; 2 Ch 28:19; Is 7:1). The religious as well as the political effect of Ahaz' policy was deplorably baneful. Tiglath-pileser sent to Damascus to join in the celebration of his victories, and while there saw a Syrian altar, a pattern of which he sent to Jerusalem and had a copy set up in the temple in place of the brazen altar of Solomon. Thus Ahaz, with all the influence of a king, introduced idolatry into Jerusalem, even causing his sons to pass through the fire (2 K 16:10-16; 2 Ch 28:3).

Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz, beginning to rule at the age of 25 years and reigning about 272-209 B.C. Isaiah was at least 15 years his senior. The young king inherited from his father a heavy burden. The splendor of Uzziah's and Joatham's reigns was rapidly fading before the ever-menacing and avaricious Assyrians. Possibly also the death of Hezekiah in 699 B.C. for in 2 Ch 32:32 it is stated that Isaiah wrote a biography of King Hezekiah. If Isaiah's activity extended over a period of more than 40 years. Dr. G. A. Smith extends it to "more than 50." (Jerusalem: 150; of Whitehouse, "Isaiah," New Cent. Bible, 1:72). He was a visionary seer, and his prophecies were written in a manner that made them easily understood and remembered. He was a great orator: he might say, "Isaiah's prophecies are products of his oratorical genius."

Isaiah's prophecies are divided into three main sections: the first, comprising chapters 1-35, deals with the world situation and the fall of the nations; the second, chapters 36-66, deals with Judah and Jerusalem; the third, chapters 67-66, deals with the future Messianic kingdom. The first section is the longest and most detailed, and it is clear that the purpose of Isaiah's prophecy was not only to comfort the people of Judah but also to warn them of the impending doom of the nations. The second section is shorter and more concise, and it is evident that the purpose of this section was to encourage the people of Judah to prepare for the coming of the Messiah. The third section is the shortest and most abstract, and it is apparent that the purpose of this section was to describe the glory of the future kingdom of God.
assured death in 714 BC. Being childless, he was seriously concerned for the future of the Davidic dynasty. He resorted to prayer, however, and God graciously extended his life 15 years (2 K 20; Isa 36). His illness occurred during the period of Babylonic independence under Merodach-baladan, an ever-ambitious, irresistible and uncompromising enemy of Assyria, who for 12 years (721–709 BC) maintained independent supremacy over Babylon. Taking advantage of Hezekiah’s wonderful cure, Merodach-baladan seized the opportunity of sending an embassy to Jerusalem to congratulate him on his recovery (712 BC), and at the same time probably sought to form an alliance with Judah to resist Assyrian supremacy (2 K 20 12 ff; Isa 36). Nothing, however, came of the alliance, for the following year Sargon’s army reappeared in Philistia in order to discipline Ashdod for conspiracy with the king of Egypt (711 BC). The greatest crisis was yet to come. Its story is as follows: Judah and her neighbors groaned more and more under the heavy exactions of Assyria. Accordingly, when Sargon was assassinated and Sennacherib came to the throne in 705 BC, rebellion broke out on all sides. Merodach-baladan, who had been expelled by Sargon in 709 BC, again took Babylon and held it for a time, before Sennacherib. Sennacherib, who was encouraged by Egypt and all Philistia, except Padi of Ekron, the puppet-king of Sargon, refused longer to pay Assyrian tribute (2 K 18 7). Meanwhile a strong pro-Egypt party had sprung up in Jerusalem. In view too, of these circumstances, King Hezekiah was panic stricken and hastened to bring rich tribute, stripping even the temple and the palace of their treasures to do so (2 K 18 16–18). But Sennacherib was not satisfied. He overran Judah, capturing, as he tells us in his inscription, 46 walled towns and smaller villages without number, carrying 200,150 of Judah’s population into captivity to Assyria, and demanding as tribute 800 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold, in all over $1,500,000; he also exacted the claims, Hezekiah’s and palace women, seized his male and female singers, and carried away enormous spoil. But the end was not yet. Sennacherib himself, with the bulk of the army, halted in Philistia to reduce Lachish; the king’s own demands and the commander-in-chief, the Rabshakeh, to besiege Jerusalem (2 K 18 17–19 8; Isa 36 2–37 8). As he describes this blockade in his own inscription: “I shut up Hezekiah in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage.” The Rabshakeh, however, failed to capture the city and returned to Sennacherib, who meanwhile had completely conquered Lachish, and was now warring against Libnah. A second expedition against Jerusalem was planned, but hearing that Tirsakah (at that time the commander-in-chief of Sennacherib’s forces) and only afterward “king of Ethiopia”) was approaching, Sennacherib was forced to content himself with sending messengers with a letter to Hezekiah, demanding immediate surrender of the city (2 K 18 9 9; Isa 37 9 9). Hezekiah, however, through Isaiah’s influence held out; and in due time, though Sennacherib disposed of Tirhakah’s army without difficulty, his immense host in some mysterious way—by plague or otherwise—was suddenly smitten and the great army was driven back to Nisibis; possibly because Merodach-baladan had again appeared in Babylonia. Sennacherib never again returned to Pal, so far as we know, during the subsequent 20 years of his reign, though he did make an independent expedition into North Arabia (691–689 BC). This invasion of Judah by Sennacherib in 701 BC was the great political event in Isaiah’s ministry. Had it not been for the prophet’s statesmanship, Judah might have capitulated. As it was, only a small, insignificant city of Lachish, under assault escaped. Isaiah had at this time been preaching 40 years. How much longer he labored is not known.

There are six general divisions of the book: (1) chs 1–12, prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem, bearing witness with promises of restoration. (2) chs 13–20, oracles of judgment and salvation. (3) chs 21–23, a plea for the community to confess its sin and seek repentance. (4) chs 24–27, the concluding book: “songs of thanksgiving.” (5) chs 28–33, a cycle of prophetic warnings against alliance with Egypt, culminating in the prophecy concerning Edom and a promise of Israel’s ransom; (6) chs 34–39, history, prophecy and song intermingled; serving both as an appendix to chs 1–35, and as an introduction to chs 40–66; (6) chs 40–66, prophecies of comfort and salvation, and also of the future glory awaiting Israel. By examining in detail these several divisions we can trace better the prophet’s thought. Thus, chs 1–12 unfold Judah’s social sins (chs 1–6), and her political entanglements (chs 7–12); ch 1 is an introduction, in which the prophet strikes the chief notes of his entire book: viz. thoughtlessness (vs 2–9), formalism in worship (vs 10–17), cursed (vs 18–23) and judgment (vs 24–31). Chs 2–4 contain three distinct pictures of Zion: (a) her exaltation (2 3–4), (b) her present idolatry (2 5–4 1), and (c) her eternal vindication (2 13–23). Chs 5–13 contains an arraignment of Judah and Jerusalem, composed of three parts: (a) a parable of Jeh’s vineyard (vs 1–7); (b) a series of six woes pronounced against insatiable greed (vs 8–10), dissipation (vs 11–17), daring defiance against God (vs 18–19), confusion of moral distinctions (vs 20), political self-conceit (vs 21), and misdirected heroism (vs 22–23); and (c) an announcement of imminent judgment. The Assyrian is on the way and there will be no escape (vs 24–30). From chs 14–20, the 64 writers andSennacherib, who meanwhile had completely conquered Lachish, and was now warring against Libnah. A second expedition against Jerusalem was planned, but hearing that Tirsakah (at that time the commander-in-chief of Sennacherib’s forces) and only afterward “king of Ethiopia”) was approaching, Sennacherib was forced to content himself with sending messengers with a letter to Hezekiah, demanding immediate surrender of the city (2 K 18 9 9; Isa 37 9 9). Hezekiah, however, through Isaiah’s influence held out; and in due time, though Sennacherib disposed of Tirhakah’s army without difficulty, his immense host in some mysterious way—by plague or otherwise—was suddenly smitten and the great army was driven back to Nisibis; possibly because Merodach-baladan had again appeared in Babylonia. Sennacherib never again returned to Pal, so far as we know, during the subsequent 20 years of his reign, though he did make an independent expedition into North Arabia (691–689 BC). This invasion of Judah by Sennacherib in 701 BC was the great political event in Isaiah’s ministry. Had it not been for the prophet’s statesmanship, Judah might have capitulated. As it was, only a small, insignificant city of Lachish, under assault escaped. Isaiah had at this time been preaching 40 years. How much longer he labored is not known.
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The section 9 8–10 contains an announcement to North Israel of accumulated wrath and impending ruin, with a refrain (9 12.17.21; 10 4). Here, in an artistic poem composed of four strophes, the prophet describes the great calamities which Jeh has sent down upon North Israel but which have gone unheeded: foreign invasion (9 8–12), defeat in battle (9 13–17), anarchy (9 18–21), and impending captivity (10 1–4). Yet Jeh’s judgments have gone unheeded: “For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still.” Divine discipline has failed; only judgment remains.

In 10 5–34, Assyria is declared to be an instrument of Jeh, the rod of Jeh’s anger. Chs 11–12 predict Israel’s return from exile, including a vision of the Messiah’s reign of ideal peace. For Isaiah’s vision of Israel’s future was far beyond mere exile. To him the downfall of Assyria was the signal for the commencement of a new era in Israel’s history. Assyria has no future, her downfall is fatal; Judah has a future, her calamities are only disciplinary. An Ideal Prince, whose advent all Nature will rejoice, even dumb animals (11 1–10). A second great exodus will take place, for the Lord will set His hand again “the second time” to recover the remnant of His people “from the four corners of the earth” (11 11.12). In that day, “Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim” (11 13). On the contrary, the reunited nation, redeemed and occupying their rightful territory (11 14–16), shall sing a hymn of thanksgiving, proclaiming the salvation of Jeh to all the earth (ch 12).

Chs 13–23 contain oracles of judgment and salvation, for the most part concerning those foreign nations whose fortunes affected Judah and Jerusalem. Though the two parts of each oracle are closely balanced, the foreign oracles are in Jer 46–51 and Ezek 25–32.

Isaiah’s horizon was world-wide. First among the foreign prophecies stands the oracle concerning Babylon (13 1–20), in which he predicts the utter destruction of the city, a dirge or taunt-song over her fallen king (14 4–23). The king alluded to is almost beyond doubt an Assy (not a Bab) monarch of the 5th cent.; the brief prophecy immediately following in 14 24–27 concerning Assyria tacitly confirms this interpretation. Another brief oracle concerning Babylon (21 1–10) describes the city’s fall as imminent. Both oracles stand or fall together as genuine prophecies of Isaiah. Both seem to have been written in Jerus (12 2; 21 9.10). It cannot be said that either is absolutely unrelated in thought and language to Isaiah’s age (14 13; 21 2); each foretells the doom to fall on Babylon (13 19; 21 9) at the hands of Medes (13 17; 21 2); and each describes the Israelites as already in exile—but not necessarily all Israel.

The section 14 24–27 tells of the certain destruction of the Assyrian.

The passage 14 28–32 is an oracle concerning Pharaoh.

Chs 15–16 are ancient oracles against Moab, whose dirigible meter resembles that of chs 13–14. It is composed of two separate prophecies belonging to two different periods in Isaiah’s ministry (16 13.14). The three points of particular interest in the oracle are: (1) the prophet’s tender sympathy for Moab in her affliction (15 5; 16 11). Isaiah minglest his own tears with those of the Moabites. As Delitzsch says, “There is no prophecy in the Book of Isa in which the heart of the prophet is so powerfully moved by what he holds to be a failure of God’s purposes as (2) Moab’s. The prophet’s pathetic appeal for shelter from her foes; particularly the ground on which she urges it, namely, the Messiah’s hope that the Davidic dynasty shall always stand and be able to repulse its foes (16 6). The prophecy is an echo of 9 5–7. (3) The prophecy that a remnant of Moab, though small, shall be saved (16 14). Wareied of prayer to Chemosh in his high places, the prophet predicts that Moab will seek the living God (16 12).

The passage 17 1–11 is an oracle concerning Damascus and North Israel, in which Isaiah predicts the fate of the two allies—Syria and Ephraim—in the Syro-Aphramitic war of 734 BC, with a promise that only a scanty remnant will survive (17 6). In 17 12–14, the prophet boldly announces the complete annihilation of Judah’s unnamed foes—the Assyrians.

Ch 18 describes Ethiopia as in great excitement, sending ambassadors hither and thither—possibly a device all the way led far beyond mere exile. To him the downfall of Assyria was the signal for the commencement of a new era in Israel’s history. Assyria has no future, her downfall is fatal; Judah has a future, her calamities are only disciplinary. An Ideal Prince, whose advent all nature will rejoice, even dumb animals (11 1–10). A second great exodus will take place, for the Lord will set His hand again “the second time” to recover the remnant of His people “from the four corners of the earth” (11 11.12). In that day, “Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim” (11 13). On the contrary, the reunited nation, redeemed and occupying their rightful territory (11 14–16), shall sing a hymn of thanksgiving, proclaiming the salvation of Jeh to all the earth (ch 12).

Chs 19, which is an oracle concerning Egypt, contains both a threat (vs 1–17) and a promise (vs 18–25), and is one of Isaiah’s most remarkable foreign messages. Egypt is smitten and thereby led to abandon her idols for the worship of Jeh (vs 19–22). Still more remarkable, it is prophesied that in that day Egypt and Assyria will join with Judah in a triple alliance of common worship to Jeh and of blessing to others (vs 23–25). Isaiah’s missionary outlook here is nothing short of wonderful!

Ch 20 describes Sargon’s march against Egypt and Ethiopia, containing a brief symbolic prediction of Assyria’s victory over Egypt and Ethiopia. By donning a captive’s garb for three years, Isaiah attempts to teach, and ethos is that a siege of Ashdod was but a means to an end in Sargon’s plan of campaign, and that it was sheer folly for the Egypt party in Jerusalem, who were ever urging reliance upon Egypt, to look in that direction for help. 21 11.12 is a brief oracle concerning Seir or Edom, “the only gentle utterance in the OT upon Israel’s hereditary foe.” Edom is in great anxiety. The prophet’s answer is disappointing, though its tone is sympathetic. 21 13 ff is a brief oracle concerning Arabia. It contains a sympathetic appeal to the Temanites to give bread and water to the caravans of Dedan, who have been driven by war from their usual route of travel.

Ch 22 is concerning the foreign temperament within the theocracy. It is composed of two parts: (1) an oracle “of the valley of vision,” i.e. Jerus (vs 1–14); and (2) a philippic against Shebna, the comptroller of the palace. Isaiah pauses, as it were, in his series of warnings to foreign nations to rebuke the foreign temper of the frivolous inhabitants of Jerus, and in particularly seeking a high official in the government. The reckless and God-ignoring citizens of the capital are pictured as indulging themselves in hilarious eating and drinking, when the enemy is at that very moment standing before the gates of the city. Shebna, on the other
hand, seems to have been an ostentatious foreigner, perhaps a Syrian by birth, quite possibly one of the Egypt party, whose policy was antagonistic to that of Isaiah and the king. Isaiah's prediction of Shemhen's fall was evidently fulfilled (36 3; 37 2). With this in mind, the Assyr.-ian prophet predicts that Tyre shall be laid waste (ver 1), her commercial glory humbled (ver 9), her colonies become independent of her (ver 10), and she herself forgotten for "seventy years" (ver 15); but "after the end of seventy years," her trade will revive, her business prosperity will return, and she will dedi-
cate her gains in merchandise as holy to Jeh (ver 18).

The third great section of the Book of Isa embraces chs 24-27, which tell of Jeh's world-judgment, issuing in the redemption of Israel. These prophecy
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chapter, 24-27, is the same as that of 2 2-4 and chs 13-23. Yet the prophet not infrequently throws himself forward into the remote future, oscillating back and forth between his own times and those of Israel's restoration. It is even noteworthy how he sustains himself in a long and continued transportation of himself to the period of Israel's redemption. He even studies to identify himself with the new Israel which will emerge out of the present chaos of political events. His visions predict his redemption carry him in ecstasy far away into the remote future, to a time when the nations' sufferings are all over; so that when he writes down what he saw in vision he describes it as a discipline that is past. When he looks back into the past from the standpoint of the redeemed in the last days, and Jeh纵向longing waited for the manifestation of God's righteousness which has now taken place, while in 27 7-9 he places himself in the midst of the nation's sufferings, in full view of their glorious future, and portrays how Jeh's dealings with them have not been the punishment of wrath, but the discipline of love. This kind of apocalypse, or prophecy, indeed, was to be expected from the very beginning of the group of prophecies, which are introduced with the words, "prophesy." Such a manner of introduction is peculiar to Isaiah, and of itself leads us to expect a message which is unique.

The practical religious value of these prophecies to Isaiah's own age would be very great. In a period of foreign invasion, while but few men were left in the land (24 6.13; 26 13), and Judah's cities were laid waste and desolate (24 10.12; 25 2; 26 5; 27 10), and music and gladness were wanting (24 8), when the nation still clung to their idols (27 9) and the Assyrians' work of destruction was still incomplete, other calamities being sure to follow (24 16), it would certainly be comforting to know that forgiveness was still possible (27 9), that Jeh was still the keeper of His vineyard (27 3.4), that His judgments were to last, but for a little moment (26 20), and that though His people should be scattered, He would soon carefully gather them "one by one" (27 12.13), and that in company with other nations they would feast together on Mt. Zion as Jeh's guests (26 6.10), and that Jeh should henceforth become the center of life and religion to all nations (24 23; 25 6; 27 13). Such faith in Jeh, such exhortations and such songs and confessions of the redeemed, seen in vision, would be a source of rich spiritual comfort to the few surviving units in Jeh's land, and to Judah, and a guiding star to the faithful disciples of the prophet's most inner circle.

chs 28-35 contain a cycle of prophetic warnings against alliance with Egypt, closing with a prophecy.
concerning Edom and a promise of Israel’s ransom. As in 5 8–28, the prophet indulges in a series of six woes:

(1) Woe to drunken, scoffing politicians (ch 28). This is one of the great chapters of Isaiah’s book. In the opening section (vs 1–6) the prophet points in warning to the proud drunkards of Ephraim whose crown (Samaria) is rapidly fading. He next turns to the scoffing politicians of Jerus, rebuking esp. the hubristic princes who presume in judgment, and the staggering prophets who err in vision (vs 7–22); closing with a more instructive parable from agriculture, teaching that God’s judgments are not arbitrary; that as the husbandman does not plow and harrow his fields the whole year round, so God will not punish His people forever; and as the husbandman does not thresh all kinds of grain with equal severity, no more will God discipline His people beyond their deserts (vs 23–28).

(2) Woe to formalists in religion (29 1–14). Isaiah’s second woe is pronounced upon Ariel, the altar-hearth of God, i.e. Jerus, the sacrificial center of Israel’s worship. David had first inaugurated the true worship of Jeh in Zion. But now Zion’s worship is to some extent transferred to Jerus, and therefore insincere; it is learned by rote (ver 18; of 1 10–15; Mic 6 6–8). Therefore, says Isaiah, Jeh is forced to do an extraordinary work among them, in order to bring them back to a true knowledge of Himself (ver 14).

(3) Woe to those who hide their plans from God (29 15–24). What their plans are, which they are deeming in secret, the prophet does not yet disclose; but he doubtless alludes to their intrigues with the Egyptians, and perhaps to their secret friendship with the Assyrians, to whom they were bound by treaty to pay annual tribute. Isaiah bravely remonstrates with them for supposing that any policy will succeed, which excludes the counsel and wisdom of the Holy One. They are but clay; He is the potter. At this point, though somewhat abruptly, Isaiah turns his face toward the Messianic future. In a very little while, he says, Lebanon, which is now overshadowed by Alexanders, shall become a fruitful field, and the blind and deaf and spiritually weak shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel.

(4) Woe to the pro-Egypt party (ch 30). Isaiah’s fourth woe is directed against the rebellious political party of parrholists, who advocate making a league with Egypt. They have at length succeeded apparently in winning over the king to their side, and an embassy is already on its way to Egypt, bearing across the desert of the exodus rich treasures with which to purchase the friendship of their former oppressors. Isaiah now condemns what he can no longer prevent. Egypt is a Rahab “sit-still,” i.e. a mythological sea-monster, menacing in men in buxom and aggrandization. When the crisis comes, they will sit still, causing Israel only shame and confusion.

(5) Woe to those who trust in horses and chariots (chs 31–32). Isaiah’s fifth woe is a still more vehement denunciation of those who trust in Egypt’s horses and chariots, and rely upon the Holy One of Israel. Those who do so forget that the Egyptians are but men and their horses flesh, and that mere flesh cannot avail in a conflict with spirit. Eventually Jeh means to deliver Jerus, if the children of Is rael will but turn to that prophet in that day, Assyria will be vanquished. A new era will dawn upon Judah. Society will be regenerated. The renovation will begin at the top. Conscience also will be sharpened, and moral distinctions will no longer be confused (32 1–8). As a result, “The curse of death and all wealth will be replaced by an aristocracy of character.” The careless and indifferent women, too, in that day will no longer menace the social welfare of the state (32 9–14); with the outpouring of Jeh’s spirit an ideal commonwealth will emerge, in which social righteousness, peace, plenty and security will abound (32 15–20).

(6) Woe to the Assyry destroyer (ch 33). Isaiah’s last woe is directed against the treacherous spoiler himself, who has already laid waste the cities of Judah, and is now beginning to lay siege to Jerus (701 BC). The prophet prays, and while he prays, behold! the mighty hosts of the Assyrians are routed and the long-sighed but now triumphant inhabitants of Judas rush out like locusts upon the spoil which the vanishing adversary has been forced to leave behind. The destroyer’s plan to reduce Jerus has come to naught. The whole earth beholds the spectacle of Assyria’s defeat and is filled with awe and amazement at the mighty work of Jeh. Only the righteous may henceforth dwell in Jerus. Their eyes shall behold the Messiah-king in His beauty, reigning no longer like Hezekiah over a limited and restricted territory, but over a land unbounded, whose inhabitants enjoy Jeh’s peace and protection, and are free from all sin, and therefore from all blindness, too and behold, a beautiful picture of the Messianic future, the prophet’s woes find an appropriate conclusion. Isaiah never pronounced a woe without adding a corresponding promise.

In chs 34–35, the prophet utters a fierce cry for justice against “all the nations,” but against Edom in particular. His tone is that of judgment. Edom is guilty of high crimes against Zion (34 8 f), therefore she is doomed to destruction. On the other hand, the scattered tribes of Israel are to be “enlarged” (34 12), and to “obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away” (ch 35).

Chs 36–39 contain history, prophecy and song intermingled. These chapters serve both as an appendix to chs 1–35 and as an introduction to chs 40–66. In them three important historical events are narrated, in which Isaiah was a prominent factor: (1) the double attempt of Sennacherib to obtain possession of Jerus (chs 36–37); (2) Hezekiah’s sickness and recovery (ch 38); (3) the embassy of Merodach-baladan (ch 39). With certain important omissions and insertions these chapters are duplicated almost verbatim in 2 K 18 13—20 19. They supply, above all, the chronological note, “Now it came to pass in the fourth year of king Hezekiah.” Various attempts have been made to solve the mystery of this date; for, if the author is alluding to the siege of 701 BC, difficulty arises, because the first occurrence in this ch of Hezekiah’s “14th” but 26th year, according to the Bib. chronology of his life; or, if with some we date Hezekiah’s accession to the throne of Judah as 720 BC, then the siege of 701 BC occurred, as is evident, in Hezekiah’s 19th year. It is barely possible of course that “the 14th year of king Hezekiah” was the 14th of the “15 years” which were added to his life, but more probably it alludes to the 14th of his reign. On the whole it is better to take the chronological caption for the entire section, with special reference to ch 38, which tells of Hezekiah’s sickness, which actually fell in his 14th year (714 BC), and which, coupled with Sargon’s expected presence at Ashdod, was the great personal and national crisis of the king’s life.

Sennacherib made two attempts in 701 BC to reduce Jerus: one from Lachish with an army headed by the Rabshakeh (36 2–37 8), and another from Libnah with a threat conveyed by messengers (37 9 f). The brief section contained in 2 K 18 14–16 is omitted, but the contents of some 8 of Is 36, because it was not the prophet’s aim at this time to recount the nation’s humiliation.
Isaiah's last "word" concerning Assyria (37 21-35) is one of the prophet's grandest prophecions. It is composed of three parts: (1) a taunt-song, in elegiac rhythm, on the inevitable humiliation of Sennacherib (vs 22-29); (2) a short poem in different rhythm, directed to Hezekiah, in order to encourage his faith (vs 30-32); (3) a definite prediction, in less elevated style, of the sure deliverance of Israel (vs 33-35). Isaiah's prediction was literally fulfilled.

The section 38 9-20 contains Hezekiah's Song of Thanksgiving, in which he celebrates his recovery from some mortal sickness. It is a beautiful funeral praise, and one of the most moving passages in the Bible. Hezekiah was sick in 714 BC. Two years later Merodach-baladan, the veteran arch-enemy of Assyria, having heard of his wonderful recovery, sent letters and a present to congratulate him. Doubtless, also, political motives prompted the recalcitrant Babylonian. But be that as it may, Hezekiah was greatly flattered by the visit of Merodach-baladan's envoys, and, in a moment of weakness, showed them all his royal treasure. This was a fatal blunder, as the sight of his many precious possessions would naturally excite Bab cupiditv to possess Jerus. Isaiah not only solemnly condemned the king's conduct, but he announced with more than ordinary solemnity and energy that all the accumulated resources of Jerus would be carried away to Babylon (39 3-6; cf Mic 4 10).

This final prediction of judgment is the most marvelous of all Isaiah's minatory utterances, because he seems to assume that Jerus was then at the height of its power, but the Babylonians, shall be the instruments of the Divine vengeance in consummating the destruction of Jerus. There is absolutely no reason for doubting that the prophet's words were not more than a prophecy that would be fulfilled. Of course, he predicted that the Babylonians would carry away all the accumulated resources of Jerus (vs 5-6, which follow).

Coming now to chs 40-66, we have prophecies of comfort, salvation, and of the future glory awaiting Israel. These chapters naturally fall into three sections: (1) chs 40-48, announcing deliverance from captivity through Cyrus; (2) chs 49-57, describing the sufferings of the "Servant" of Jehovah, this section ending like the former with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (56 2); (3) chs 58-66, containing the final abolition of all national distinctions and the future glory of the people of God. Ch 60 is the characteristic chapter of this section, as ch 53 is of the second, and ch 40 of the first.

Coming now to chs 40-48, we have the first prophecies of comfort, salvation, and of the future glory awaiting Israel. These chapters naturally fall into three sections: (1) chs 40-48, announcing deliverance from captivity through Cyrus; (2) chs 49-57, describing the sufferings of the "Servant" of Jehovah, this section ending like the former with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (56 2); (3) chs 58-66, containing the final abolition of all national distinctions and the future glory of the people of God. Ch 60 is the characteristic chapter of this section, as ch 53 is of the second, and ch 40 of the first.

Coming now to chs 40-48, we have the first prophecies of comfort, salvation, and of the future glory awaiting Israel. These chapters naturally fall into three sections: (1) chs 40-48, announcing deliverance from captivity through Cyrus; (2) chs 49-57, describing the sufferings of the "Servant" of Jehovah, this section ending like the former with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (56 2); (3) chs 58-66, containing the final abolition of all national distinctions and the future glory of the people of God. Ch 60 is the characteristic chapter of this section, as ch 53 is of the second, and ch 40 of the first.

Coming now to chs 40-48, we have the first prophecies of comfort, salvation, and of the future glory awaiting Israel. These chapters naturally fall into three sections: (1) chs 40-48, announcing deliverance from captivity through Cyrus; (2) chs 49-57, describing the sufferings of the "Servant" of Jehovah, this section ending like the former with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (56 2); (3) chs 58-66, containing the final abolition of all national distinctions and the future glory of the people of God. Ch 60 is the characteristic chapter of this section, as ch 53 is of the second, and ch 40 of the first.
victories, the conquered nations renouncing their idols, and attracted to Jeh as the Saviour of all mankind (45 22). On any theory of origin, the predictive element in these prophecies is written large.

Chs 46-47 describe further the distinctive work of Cyrus, though Cyrus himself is but once referred to. Particular emphasis is laid on the complete collapse of the Bab religion; the prophet being apparently more concerned with the humiliation of Babylon's idols than with the fall of the city itself. Of course the destruction of the city would imply the defeat of her gods, as also the emancipation of Israel. But here again all is in the future; in fact Jeh's incomparable superiority and unique deity are proven by His power to predict "the end from the beginning" and bring His prediction to pass (46 10 11).

Ch 47 is a dirge over the downfall of the imperial city, strongly resembling the taunt-song over the king of Babylon in 14 4-21.

Ch 48 is a hortatory summary and recapitulation of the argument contained in chs 46-47, the prophet again emphasizing the following points: (1) Jeh's unique power to predict; (2) that salvation is of grace; (3) that Cyrus' advent will be the crowning proof of Jeh's abiding presence among His people; (4) the limitation of Cyrus' ministry; and (5) that even now there is hope, if they will but accept of Jeh's proffered salvation. Alas! that there is no peace or salvation for the godless (48 20-22). Thus ends the first division of Isaiah's remnant prophecy, Israel's deliverance from captivity through Cyrus.

The second section (chs 49-57) deals with the spiritual agent of salvation, Jeh's suffering "Servant. With ch 49 the prophet leaves off attempt ing to further explain the larger ideas contained in the means of prediction, and drops entirely his description of Cyrus' victories and the overthrow of Babylon, in order to set forth in greater detail the character and mission of the suffering "Servant" of Jeh. Already, in chs 46-48, he had alluded several times to this unique and somewhat enigmatical personage, speaking of him both collectively and as an individual (41 8-10; 42 1-9. 18-22; 43 10; 44 1-5. 21-28; 45 4; 46 20-22); but now he defines with greater precision his dual character, his functions, his equipment for his task, his sufferings and humiliation, and also his final exaltation. Altogether in these prophecies he mentions the "Serv ant" three times; but there are also a number of "Servant-Songs" in which the prophet seems to rise above the collective masses of all Israel to at least a personification of the pious within Israel, or better, to a unique Person embodying within himself all that is best in the Israel within Israel. They are the following: (1) 42 1-9, a poem descriptive of the Servant's gentle manner and world-wide mission; (2) 49 1-13, describing the Servant's mission and spiritual success; (3) 50 4-11, the Servant's soliloquy on the cost of his work; and (4) 52 13-53 12, the Serv ant's vicarious suffering and ultimate exaltation. In this last of the four "Servant-Songs" we reach the climax of the prophet's inspired sympathy, the aim of Heb Messianic hope: the only discreet thoughts in the OT revelation are to be found in this section. It is a vindication of the "Servant," so clear and so true, and wrought out with such pathos and potency, that it holds its first place among Messianic predictions. Polycarp called it "the golden portion of the OT." It has been realized in Jesus Christ.

Chs 58-66 describe the future glory of the people of God. Having described in chs 40-48 the temporal agent of Israel's salvation, Cyrus, and in chs 49-57 the spiritual agent of their salvation, the "Servant" of Jeh, the prophet proceeds in this last section to define the conditions on which salvation may be enjoyed. He begins, as before, with a double imperative, "Cry aloud, spare not" (cf 40 1; 49 1).

In ch 58 he discusses true fasting and faithful Sabbath observance.

In ch 59 he beseeches Israel to forsake their sins. It is their sins, he urges, which have hidden Jeh's face and retarded the nation's salvation. In vs 9 ff the prophet identifies himself with the people and leads them in their devotions. Jeh is grieved over Israel's forlorn condition, and, seeing their helplessness, He arms himself like a warrior to interfere judicially (vs 15-19). Israel shall be redeemed. With them as the nucleus of a new nation, Jeh will enter anew into covenant relation, and put His Spirit upon them, which will abide with them henceforth and forever (vs 20-21).

Chs 60-61 describe the future blessedness of Zion. The long-looked-for "light" (of 59 9) begins to dawn: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of Jeh is risen upon thee" (60 1). The prophet pauses at this point to paint a picture of the redeemed community. As in 2 3.4, the Gentiles are seen flocking to Zion, which becomes the mistress of the earth. God will once more build His walls, and her gates are kept open continually without fear of siege. The Gentiles acknowledge that Zion is the spiritual center of the world. Even Israel's oppressors regard her as "the city of Jeh," as "an eternal excellency." In which Jeh sits as its everlasting light (60 10-22).

In ch 61, which Drummond has called "the program of Christianity," the "Servant" of Jeh is again introduced, though anonymously, as the herald of salvation (vs 1-6). Of the prophet's argument (cf 40-41) "Servant" is followed by a promise of the restoration and blessedness of Israel (vs 4-11). Thus the prophecy moves steadily forward toward its goal in Jesus Christ (cf Lk 4 18-21).

In 62 1-63 6 Zion's salvation is described as drawing near. The nations will be spectators of the great event. A new name which will better symbolize her true character shall be given to Zion, namely, Hephzibah, "My delight is in her"; for Jeh shall Neal and prosperity to her (vs 2 3); but on the other hand, Zion's enemies will all be vanquished. In a brief poem of peculiar dramatic beauty (63 1-6), the prophet portrays Jeh's vengeance, as a vengeful, victorious warrior, upon all those who retard Israel's deliverance. Edom in particular is described as Gehenna, "a satiate foe. Hence the prophet represents Jeh's judgment of the nations as taking place on Edom's unhallowed soil. Jeh, whose mighty arm has wrought salvation, returns as victor, having slain all of Israel's foes.

In 63 7-64 12, Jeh's "servants" resort to prayer. They appeal to Jeh as the Begetter and Father of the nations (63 16; 64 8). With this thought of the fatherhood of God imbedded in his language, Isaiah had opened his very first oracle to Judah and Jerusalem (cf 1 2). As the prayer proceeds, the language becomes increasingly tumultuous. The people are thrown into despair because Jeh seems to have abandoned them altogether (63 19). They recognize that the condition of Jeh is desperate. "Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire; and all our pleasant places are laid waste" (64 11). Such language, however, is the language of fervent prayer and must not be taken with rigid literalness, as 63 18 and 3 8 plainly show.

Finally, in chs 65-66, Jeh answers His people's supplications, distinguishing sharply between His own "servants" and Israel's apostates. Only His chosen "seed" shall be delivered (65 9). Those
who have obdurately provoked Jeh by sacrificing in gardens (66 3; 66 17), offering libations to Fortuna and Destiny (66 11), sitting among the graves to obtain oracles from the dead, and, like the Egyptians, eating swine's flesh and broth of abominable things which were supposed to possess magical properties, lodging in vaults or crypts in which heathen mysteries were celebrated (66 4), and at the same time fancying that by celebrating such heathen mysteries they are holier than others and thereby disqualified to discharge the ordinary duties of life (66 5)—such Jeh designs to punish, more than to punish those who have been destroying them utterly with the sword (66 7.12). On the other hand, the "servants" of Jeh shall inherit His holy mountains. They shall rejoice and sing for joy of heart, and bless themselves in the God of Amen, i.e. in the God of Truth (66 9.14.16). Jeh will create new heavens and a new earth, men will live and grow old like the patriarchs; they will possess houses and vineyards and enjoy them; for an era of idyllic peace will be ushered in with the coming of the Messianic age, in which even the nature of wild animals will be changed and the most rapacious of wild animals will live together in harmony (65 17–25). Religion will become spiritual and decentralized, mystic cults will disappear, incredulous scoffers will be silenced. Zion's populace will be comforted and rejoiced (66 1–14). Furthermore, all nations will flock to Zion to behold Jeh's glory, and from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh will come up to worship (66 15–23).

It is evident that the Book of Isa closes, practically as it begins, with a polemic against false worship, and the alternate reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked. The only essential difference between the prophet's earlier and later oracles is this: Isaiah, in his riper years, on the basis of nearly half a century's experience as a preacher, paints a much brighter eschatological picture than was possible in his early ministry. His picture of the Messianic age not only transcends those of his contemporaries in the 8th cent. BC, but he penetrates regions beyond the spiritual horizon of any and all OT seers. Such language as that contained in 66 1.2, in particular, anticipates the great principle stated by Isaiah in Jr 4.4, namely, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." To attempt to date such oracles as these on the basis of internal evidence is an absolute impossibility. Humanly speaking, one age could have produced such revelations quite as easily as another. But no age could have produced them apart from the Divine spirit.

The editorial arrangement of Isaiah's prophecies is very suggestive. In the main they stand in chronological order. That is to say, 8. Isaiah's all the dates mentioned in are strict Prophetic historical sequence; e.g. 6.1, "In the Chronologi- year that king Uzziah died" (740 BC); cally Ar- ranged BC); 7.1, "In the days of Ahaz" (736 ff cally Ar- ranged BC); 14.28, "In the year that king Jahdiah died" (727 BC); 20.1, "In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him" (711 BC); 36.1, "In the 14th year of king Hezekiah" (701 BC). These passages are all in strict chronological order. In groups, also, Isaiah's great individual messages are likewise arranged in true historical sequence; thus, chs 1–6 for the most part belong to the last years of Jotham's reign (740–736 BC); chs 7–12, to the reign of Ahaz (736–716 BC); chs 13–23, to the reign of Hezekiah (716–698 BC); chs 20, to the year of Sargon's siege of Ashdod (711 BC); chs 28–32, to the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib (701 BC); while thedistinctively promis-
Or again, if Isaiah the son of Amoz could comfort Judas with promises of protection when the Assyrian (784-768 B.C.) was preparing to sack Jerusalem (8:9-10; 10:24-25), and conceive a beautiful parable of comfort like that contained in 28:23-29; and insert among his warnings and exhortations of the gloomy year 702 BC so many precious promises of a brighter future which was sure to follow Sennacherib's invasion (29:17-24; 30:29-33; 31:8-9), and, in the very midst of the siege of 701 BC, conceive of such marvelous Messianic visions as those in 33:17-24 with which to dispel the dismay of his compatriots, surely to be the work of one who was absolutely convinced of the possibility of seeing the comfort that Jews found in Zion who survived the great catastrophe of 701 BC. The prophet who had done the one was prepared to do the other.

There was one circumstance of the prophet's position after 701 BC which was new, and which is too often overlooked, a circumstance which he could not have employed to anything like the same degree as an argument in enforcing his message prior to the Assyrian's overthrow and the deliverance of Jerusalem. It was this: the fulfillment of former predictions as proof of Jah's deity. From such passages we obtain an idea of the prophet's true historical position (42:9; 44:8; 45:21; 46:10; 48:3).

Of the same authorship were also (6:11-15; 29:8; 30:31; 31:8; 37:7-30), on the basis of which the prophet ventures to predict new and even more astounding things concerning the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus, and Israel's deliverance through him. As the results of investigation and study show, Isaiah's book is signal full of predictions (7:8.10 ft.; 8:4.8; 9:12.11; 10:26 ft.; 14:24-27; 16:14; 17:9.12-14; 20:4-6; 21:16; 22:19 ft.; 23:15; 38.5), some of which, written down and sealed, were evidently committed by him to his disciples to be used and verified by them in subsequent crises (8:16). Failure to recognize this element in Isaiah's book is fatal to a true interpretation of the prophet's real message.

"For about twenty-five centuries," as A. B. Davidson observes (O'P Prophecy, 1903, 244), "no one dreamt of doubting that Isaiah the son of Amoz was the author of every part of the book that goes under his name; and those who still maintain that the unity of authorship are accustomed to point, with satisfaction, to the uniqueness of the Christian church on the matter, till a few German scholars arose, about a century ago, and called in question the unity of this book. This tradition is unanimous in favor of the unity of the book.

(1) The history of criticism.—The critical disintegration of the book began with Koppe, who in 1780 first doubted the genuineness of ch 66. Nine years later Doederlein suspected the whole of chs 40-66. He was followed by Rosenmuller, who was the first to deny to Isaiah the prophecy against Babylon in 13 1—14 23. Eichhorn, at the beginning of the last century, further eliminated the oracles against Tyre in ch 28, and he, with Gesenius and Ewald, also denied the Isaianic origin of chs 24-27. Gesenius also ascribed to some unknown prophet chs 16 and 16. Rosenmuller then went farther, and pronounced against chs 34 and 35, and not long afterward (1840) Ewald questioned chs 12 and 33. Thus by the middle of the 19th cent., some 37 or 38 chapters were rejected as no part of Isaiah's actual writings. In 1879-80, the celebrated Leipzig professor, Franz Delitzsch, who for years previous had defended the genuineness of the entire book, finally yielded to the modern critical position, and in the new edition of his commentary published in 1889, interpreted chs 40-66, though with considerable hesitation, as coming from the close of the period of Bab exile. About the same time (1888-90), Drs. Driver and G. A. Smith also made Bab exile views in Great Britain. Since 1890, the criticism of Isa has been even more trenchant and microscopic than before. Duhm, Stade, Guthe, Hackmann, Cornill and Marti on the Continent, and Cheyne, Whitehouse, Box, Gatebrook, Kennett, Gray, Fease, and others in Great Britain and America have questioned portions which hitherto were supposed to be genuine.

(2) The disintegration of "Deutero-Isaiah."—Even the unity of chs 40-66, which were supposed to be the work of Isaiah himself, "Deutero-Isaiah," is now given up. What prior to 1890 was supposed to be the unique product of some celebrated but anonymous seer who lived in Babylonia about 550 BC is today commonly divided and subdivided, and in large part distributed among various books from Cyrus to Simon (538-164 BC). At first it was thought sufficient to separate chs 63-66 as a later addition to "Deutero-Isaiah's" prophecies; but more recently it has become the fashion to distinguish between chs 40-66, which have been said to have been written by "Deutero-Isaiah" in Babylonia about 549-538 BC, and chs 56-66, which are now allegedly to have been composed by a "Trito-Isaiah" about 400-445 BC.

(3) Recent titles.—Among the latest to investigate the problem is Professor R. H. Kennett of Cambridge, Eng., who, in his Schweich Lectures (The Composition of the Book of Isa in the Light of Hist and Archaeology, 1910, 84 ff.), sums up the results of investigation as follows: chs 3, 5, 6, 7, 20, and 31, and large portions of chs 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 22, and 23, may be assigned to Isaiah, the son of Amoz; (b) all of chs 13, 40, and 47, and large portions of chs 14, 21, 41, 43, 45, 46, and 48, may be assigned to the latter part of the 7th cent. (e) portions of chs 15, 36, 37, and 39, and portions of chs 18 and 38, may be assigned to the period between Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the Great, but cannot be dated precisely; (d) the passages may be assigned to the time of Alexander the Great; (e) all of chs 11, 12, 19, 24-27, 29, 30, 32-35, 42, 49-66, and portions of chs 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 23, 41, 44, 45, 48 may be assigned to the 2nd cent. BC (167-140 BC).

Professor C. F. Kent, also (Serm. Epis. and Apocryphal Introductions to the Hebrew Bible, 1874), following critical observations on chs 40-66. He says: The prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah are so far from being some of the best for the study of the difficult problems presented by 1sa 40-66. . . . Chs 56-66 were generally read by the Jews as post-Bab exile, but since the 17th cent. and the following chapters there are repeated references to the temple and its services, indicating that it had already been restored. Moreover, these references are not confined to the latter part of the book. . . . The fact, on the one hand, that there are few, if any, allusions to contemporary events in these chapters, and on the other hand, that little or nothing is known of the condition and hopes of the Jews during this period (the closing years of the Bab exile) makes the dating of these prophecies possible, although not certain. Also, the assumption that the author of these chapters lived in the Bab exile is not supported by the disintegration of the prophecies themselves. Possibly their author was one of the few who, like Zerubbabel, had been born in Babylonia and later returned to Pal. He was also dealing with such broad and universal problems that he gives few indications of his geographical and place of abode; but all the evidence that is found points to Jerusalem as the place where he lived and wrote... The prophet's interest and point of view center throughout in Israel, and he shows himself far more familiar with conditions in Pal than in distant Babylonia. Most of his illustrations are drawn from the agricultural life. His vocabulary is also that of a man dwelling in Pal, and in this respect is in marked contrast to the synonyms employed by Ezekiel, the prophet of the Bab exile.

That is to say, two of the most recent investigators of the Book of Isa reach conclusions quite at variance with the opinions advocated in 1890, when Delitzsch so reluctantly allowed that chs 40-
66 may have sprung from the period of Bab exile. Now, it is found that these last 27 chs were written after Isaiah's death, probably in Palestine, rather than in Babylonia as originally claimed, and are no longer considered as primarily to the suffering exiles in captivity as was formerly urged.

(4) The present state of the question.—The present state of the Isa-question is, to say the least, confusing. Those who deny the integrity of the book may be divided into two groups, which we may call moderates and radicals. Among the moderates may be included Drs. Driver, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Kirkpatrick, Koenig, A. B. Davidson, Barnes and Whitehouse. The former, in his criticism of the text, has, it is felt, quite truthfully and logically stated that the following chs and vs are not Isaiah's: 11–16; 12; 13–14 23; 15 1–16 12; 21 1–10; 24–27; 34–35; 36–39; 40–66. That is to say, some 44 chs out of the whole number, 66, were not written by Isaiah; or, approximately 800 out of 1,292 vs are not genuine. Among the radicals are Drs. Cheyne, Duhm, Hackmann, Guthrie, Marti, Kennett and Gray. These all reject approximately 1,030 vs out of the total 1,292, retaining the following only as the genuine product of Isaiah and his age: 1:2–9; 29–31; 2 6–19; 3:15.8.9.17–18; 4 7; 5 1–14.17–29; 6:7–1.22; 9 8–10 9; 10 13.14.27–32; 17:1–14; 18; 20; 22 1–22; 28:1–4.7.22; 29:1–6.9.10.13–15; 30:1–17; 31:1–4. That is, only about 263 vs out of the 1,292 which the Chronicler (1168) used. This is, we believe, a fair statement of the Isa-question as it exists in the hands of divisive critics today.

On the other hand we have those who have defended and who still defend the essential unity of the book. Among whom lived, and that a definite historical situation shall be pointed out for each prophecy. This fundamental postulate, which, on the whole is reasonable and perfectly legitimate if not overworked, underlies all modern criticism of OT prophecy. It is not possible, however, always to trace a mere mark which has been developed from its context. Moreover, the prophets often spoke consciously, not only to their own generation, but also to the generations to come. Isaiah in particular commanded, “Bind thou up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples” (8 16); that is, preserve my teachings for the future. Again in 30 8, he says, “Now go, . . . inscribe it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever. And also in 42 23, “Who is there among you that will give ear to this? that will hearken and hear for the time to come?”

Certain false presuppositions often govern critics in their disintegration of the book. Only a few examples need be given by way of illustration: (a) According to some, “the conversion of the heathen” lay quite beyond the horizon of any 8th. cent. prophet; consequently, Isa 2 2–4 and all similar passages which foretell the conversion of those outside the chosen people are to be relegated to an age subsequent to Isaiah. (b) To others, it is the symptom of late date, and therefore this section and all kindred ones must be deleted. (c) To others, the thought of “universal judgment” upon “the whole earth” in 14 26 and elsewhere quite transcends Isaiah’s time. Disagreement on this point still, the apocalyptic character of the chs 24–27 represents a phase of Heb thought which prevailed in Israel only after Ezechiel. (e) Even to those who are considered moderates “the poetic character” of a passage like ch 12, and the references to a “return” from captivity, as it appears to us, are no longer considered as primarily to the suffering exiles in captivity as was formerly urged.

As a last resort, certain critics have appealed to 2 Ch 36.22–23 as external evidence that chs 40–55 existed as a separate collection in the Chronicler’s age. But the evidence obtained from this source is so doubtful that it is well-nigh valueless. For it is not the prediction of Isa concerning Cyrus to which he referred, but the prediction of the Chronicler. This is, we believe, a fair statement of the Isa-question as it exists in the hands of divisive critics today.
through imitation: 1 4; 6 19,24; 10 20; 12 6; 17 7; 20 14; 50 7,12.13; 1 37; 22; also 41 14.16.20; 43 3.14; 46 11; 47 4; 48 17; 49 7; 54 5; 55 5; 60 9.14; elsewhere, only in 2 K 19 22; Ps 71 22; 78 41; 89 18; Jer 50 29; 51 5).

Another unique idea which occurs with considerable repetition in the Book of Isa. is the thought of a “highway” (of 11 16; 35 8; 40 3; 43 8; 49 9; 51 4; 66 3; 1.10.17.18; 42 14; 54 1; 66 7). These, and many others less distinctive, stamp the book with an individuality which it is difficult to account for, if it be broken up into countless fragments and distributed over the centuries.

(b) The literary style: As negative evidence, literary style is not a very safe argument; for, as Professor McCurdy says, “In the case of a writer of Isaiah’s standing, literary style is not a sure criterion of authorship” (History, Prophecy and the Monuments, II, 317 n.). Yet it is certainly remarkable that the clause “for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it” should be found 3 times in the Book of Isa.; and nowhere else in the O.T. (of 1 30; 40 5; 58 14). And it is noteworthy that the phrase, “streams of water,” should occur twice in Isa. and nowhere else (cf. 30 25; 44 4 in the Heb.). And very peculiar is the tendency on the prophet’s part to emphatic repetition of 7 7; 8 9; 16 12.13; 40 1; 43 11.25; 48 15; 51 12; 59 19; 62 10). In fact, it is not extravagant to say that Isaiah’s style differs widely from that of every other OT prophet, and is as far removed as possible from that of Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets (of 13 8; 21 3; 22 17.18; 1.14; 54 1; 66 7).

(c) Historical references: Take, for example, first, the prophet’s constant reference to Judah and Jerusalem, his country and its capital (1 7–9; 3 8; 24 19; 26 2; 40 2.9; 62 4); likewise, to the temple and its sacrifices. In 1 11 it is evident when all was prosperous, the prophet complained that the people were profuse and formal in their ceremonies and sacrifices; in 43 23.24, on the contrary, when the country had been overrun by the Assyrians, the prophet reminded them that they had not brought to Jehovah their burnt offerings, nor honored Him with their sacrifices; while in 66 1–3.20, not only is the existence of the Temple and the observance of the ritual presupposed, but those who were sentenced who place their trust in the material temple, and the outward ceremonies of temple-worship. As for the “exile,” the prophet’s attitude to it is throughout that of both anticipation and realization. Thus in 67 1 the judgment is threatened, not yet inflicted: “The righteous is taken away from the evil to come.” That is to say, the exile is described as still future. On the other hand, in 3 8, “Jerusalem is fallen, and Judah is broken up.” which seems to describe the exile as in the past; yet, as everybody admits, these are the words of Isaiah the 8th cent. In 11 11.12, the prophet says, “The Lord will set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people. . . . from the four corners of the earth. . . .” Still, literally and metaphorically without regard to 8th-cent. conditions, or to Isaiah’s manifest attitude to the exile, leads to confusion. No prophet realized so keenly or described so vividly the destiny of the Hebrews.

e) The predictive element: This is the strongest proof of the unity of the Book of Is. Prediction is the very essence of prophecy (cf.Dt 18 22); Isaiah was predominantly a prophet of the future. With unparalleled suddenness, he repeatedly leaps from despair to hope, from threat to promise, and from the actual to the ideal. With such familiar phrases of “Daybreak” and “Deutero-Isaiah” may with equal justice be said of Isaiah himself: “While in touch with his own age, the great unknown prophet lives in the atmosphere of the past and the future” (R. W. Connop, The Life and Teach., 89). Isaiah spoke to his own age, but he also addressed himself to the ages to follow. His verb tenses are characteristically futures and prophetic perfects. Of his book A. B. Davidson’s words are particularly true: “If any prophetic book be examined . . . it will appear that the ethical and religious teaching is always secondary, and that the essential thing in the book or discourse is the prophet’s outlook into the future” (HDB, art. “Prophecy and Prophets,” IV, 119).

Isaiah was exceptionally given to predicting: thus (a) before the Syro-Ephraimitic war (734 BC), he predicted that within 65 years Ephraim should be broken to pieces (cf. 7 7); and that before the captivity should have knowledge to cry, “My father,” or “My mother,” the rich men of Damascus should be carried away (8 4; and 7 16). These, however, are but two of numerous predictions, as shown above, among his earlier prophecies (cf. 1 27; 2 2–4; 6 13; 10 20–23; 11 6–16; 17 14).

(b) Shortly before the downfall of Samaria in 722 BC, Isaiah predicted that we should be forgotten 70 years, and that after the end of 70 years her merchandise should be holiness to Jehovah 33 (18). (c) In like manner prior to the siege of Ashdod in 711 BC, he proclaimed that within 3 years Moab should be brought into contempt within a year all the glory of Cedar should fall 31 (16).

(d) And not long prior to the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC, he predicted that suddenly, a multitude of Jerusalem’s foes should be as dust (29 8); that yet a very little while and Lebanon should be turned into a fruitful field (29 17); and that Assyria should be dismayed and fall by the sword, but not of men (30 17.31; 31 8). And more, that for decades beyond a year, the careless women of Jerusalem should be troubled 33 (10.16–20); and that the righteous in Zion should see Jehovah a quiet habitation, and return and come with singing (33 17 f.; 36 4.10); but that Sennacherib, on the contrary, should be torn down without shooting an arrow into the city (37 7.26–29; 33–35).

In like manner, also, after the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC was over, the prophet seems to have continued to predict; and, in order to the suffering and unbelieving remnant about him the remembrance of Jehovah and the folly of the enemies predictions which he had already made in the earlier years of his ministry, and to the fact that they had been fulfilled. Thus, he says, “Woe to them that would make the beginning, that we may know. . . before the end, that we may say, His right is right” (41 21–23.26); “Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I will tell you of them” (42 9.25); “Who among them can declare this, and show us former things? (i.e. things to come in the immediate future)? I have declared, and I have saved, and I have showed” (43 9.12); “Who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it? . . . And the things that are coming, and that shall come, shall not be forgotten; neither shall the words thereof be destroyed, . . . Have I not declared unto thee of old, and showed it? . . .” (44 7.8.27.28); “It is I, Jehovah, who calleth thee by thy name.” (cf. even the God of Israel, . . . I have called thee by thy name: I have named thee, thou art called. . .”); “Ask me of the things that are to come, and I shall show thee things unknown; Jehovah, the God of Israel, will show thee things unknown, and things forgotten.” (cf. 44 7; 45 8; 32.13.11.13); “Declaring the end from the beginning, and from things that are not yet done; . . . a ravenous bird from Cyprus from the coasts of Ethiopia shall spread its wings over a far country; yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it, and it shall come . . . have declared the former things from of old, . . . and I showed, and they came to pass . . . have declared, . . . from of old; before I formed thee I knew thee” (46 10.11); “I have declared the former things from of old, . . . and I showed, and they came to pass . . . have declared, . . . from of old; before I formed thee I knew thee” (46 3.5); “I have showed thee new things from
this time, even hidden things... Yea, from of old thine ear was not opened... Who among them hath declared these things?... I, even I, have spoken; yea, I have declared from ancient times that which is not; I have shown from and as a future thing that which is not in secret... (48:8–9, 14–16). Such predictions are explicit and emphatic.

(c) Cyrus a subject of prediction: From all the above-mentioned explicit and oft-repeated predictions of the future things to happen, it is obvious, namely, that great emphasis is laid by the prophet on prediction throughout the entire Book of Is. And it must be further allowed that “Cyrus” is represented by the author as predicted, from any point of view. The one issue is the fact, the emphasized fact, that he himself is predicting the coming of Cyrus, or that former predictions concerning Cyrus are now, as the prophet writes, coming to pass before his readers’ eyes! Canoche’s remark upon this point is instructive. He says: “The editor, who doubtless held the last Jewish theory of prophecy, may have inferred from a number of passages, esp. 41:26; 48:3–6.14, that the first appearance of Cyrus had been predicted by an ancient prophet, and observed certain Isianic elements in the phraseology of these chapters. And finding the prophet with Isaiah” (Intro to the Book of Is, 235).

Dr. G. A. Smith likewise allows that Cyrus is the fulfilment of former predictions.

It is quite possible to argue, as some have tried to do, that the prophet is predicting these things as they had already happened. For as part of an argument for the unique divinity of the God of Israel, Cyrus, “alive and irresistible,” and already accredited with success, is pointed out as the unmistakable proof that former prophecies of a deliverance for Israel are already coming to pass. It is not, of course, as a prediction, but as a proof that a prediction is being fulfilled. (HDB, art. “Isaiah,” 493). And further, he says, therefore, that the chief claim, which the 40th makes for the God of Israel is His power to direct the events in accordance to a long-predicted and faithfully followed purpose. This claim starts from the proof that Jeh has long before predicted events now happening or about to happen, with Cyrus as their center. But this is much more than a proof of isolated predictions, though it may imply one. It is a declaration of the unity of history sweeping to the high ends which have been already revealed to Israel—an exposition, in short, of the Omniscience, Consistency, and Faithfulness of the Providence of the one true God! (ib, 496).

It is obvious, therefore, in any case, whether these changes can or can’t be made, that Cyrus is the subject of prediction. It really makes little difference at which end of history one takes his stand, whether in the 8th cent. BC with Isaiah, or in the 6th cent. BC with “Deutero-Isaiah.” Cyrus, to the author of these chs, is the subject of prediction. In other words, whether indeed the author is really predicting Cyrus in advance of all apparent fulfilment, or Cyrus is the fulfilment of some ancient prediction by another, does not alter the fact that Cyrus was the subject of prediction on the part of somebody. Accordingly, as far as the account at the context, the whole question is, which does the prophet emphasize, (a) the fact that he himself is predicting? or, (b) that former predictions by someone else are now before his eyes coming to pass? The truth is, the prophet seems to have the atmosphere opened before him in advance as well as in the present, all of which are equally vivid to his prophetic mind. This is a peculiar characteristic of Isaiah. It is seen in the account he gives of his inaugural vision (ch 6), of which he attaches remarks that it is “like a prediction in the process of being fulfilled.” The same is true of chs 24–27. There the prophet repeatedly projects himself into the future, and speaks from the standpoint of the fulfilment of his predictions. It is clear, too, of chs 40–48. Cyrus, in the present context, the whole emphasis is on the fact that he is predicting, and a little later he describes his predictions as coming to pass. When, accordingly, a decision is made as to when the author predicted Cyrus, it is more natural to suppose that he was doing so long before Cyrus’ actual appearance. This, in fact, is in keeping with the test of true prophecy, that contained in 15:18: “When a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken; the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Besides, there is a similar explicit prediction in the OT, namely, that of King Josiah, who was foretold by name two centuries before he came (1 K 13:2; cf 2 K 23:15–16).

Dr. W. H. Chubb, in the Journal of Bib. Literature and Exegesis, 1911, 79, pleaded for a “ shrimp-locked Cyrus,” because Cyrus figures only in chs 40–48, and is then dismissed. Dr. Thirlte, on the other hand, argues that the name “Cyrus” is a mere appellative, being originally not Kūresh (Cyrus), but hūrēsh (“workman,” “artisan,” “image-breaker”), and that 44:27–28 is a gloss (cf OT Problems, 244–64). But in opposition to these views the present writer prefers to write Cyrus large, and to allow frankly that he is the subject of extraordinary prediction. For the very point of the author’s argument is, that he is predicting events which Jeh alone is capable of foretelling or bringing to pass; in other words, that presence is the proof of Jeh’s deity. Isaiah lived in an age when Jeh’s prophecies were first revealed and验证sentants of the prophets (cf Am 3:7). Political conditions were unsettled and kaleidoscopic, and there was every incentive to predict. That Isaiah actually uttered wonderful predictions is attested, furthermore, both by his statements of the prophetic inspiration and by his reasoning on the utterances of his co-brethren (ch 13) and in his own words, for instance, that the future shall be as the past “in a few years” (Isa 24:8). The chronological arrangement of the poem assigns the Restoration and Cyrus to the future. The perspective of the poet, together with the abrupt change in the poem about ch 60, argues that the future is a remote future. And finally the carefully constructed double climax attaches a significance to the definiteness of the utterance which is most easily accounted for if this future was so remote that a definite disclosure concerning it would be of extraordinary importance.

And he further alleges that “it is impossible, if justice is done to the plain declarations of Scripture, to limit the prophetic horizon of the prophet Isaiah to the pretellie period and that... when the form of the poem is recognized, there is every reason to assign it to a preëxilic prophet, to Isaiah, since the form of the poem is admirably calculated to emphasize the fact that Cyrus and the Restoration belong to a distant future, and to make it clear that it is just because of this fact that the definiteness of the prophecy, the mention of Cyrus by name, is so remarkable and of such unique significance” (Bib. and Theol. Studies, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, Centennial vol, 1912, 629–29).

After all, why should men object to prediction on so large a scale? Unless there is definiteness about any given prediction, and unless it transcends ordinary prophecy, there is no special value in it. Should it be objected, however, that prediction of so minute a character is “abhorrent to reason,” the answer is already at hand; it may
be abhorrent to reason, but it is a handmaid to faith. For it is but the future, even as prediction has to do with the future; and the OT is preeminently a book which encourages faith. There is really no valid objection to the prediction of Cyrus. For the one outstanding differentiating characteristic of Israel's religion is predictive prophecy. The Hebrews were the only people of antiquity whose "Golden Age" lay in the future rather than in the past. Accordingly, to predict the coming of a Cyrus as the human agent of Israel's salvation is but a conservative interpretation of the picture of the Divine agent, namely, the obedient, Suffering Servant of Jehovah, who would redeem Israel from its sin. Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the prediction concerning Cyrus, and it is but logical to go farther and to deny to him the Messianic hope which is usually associated with his name. Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the predictions concerning a return from captivity, and the prophecies of his book are robbed of their essential character and their meaning. Enumerate those portions of the Book of Isaiah which unveil the future, and they are reduced to a mere sactimium ex eventu, and their religious value as Divine oracles is largely lost.


GEORGE L. ROBINSON

ISAIAH, ASCENSION OF. See Apocalyptic Literature.

ISCHAIAH, is'ka, is'ka (יִשׁיאֵל, yish'ael): Daughter of Haran and sister of Milcah the wife of Nahor (Gen 11:29). Tradition identifies her with Sarah, Abram's wife; but without sufficient reason.

ISCARIOT, is'kar-i-ot. See Judas Iscariot.

ISDAEL, is'da-el (יִשׁדֶּאֵל, Isdæl): In I Esd 5 33; called "Giddel" in Ezr 2 56.

ISH (יִשׁ, 'ish): In the following Heb proper names, a prefix meaning "man of," or, collectively, "men of": Ish-bosheth, Ishhod, Ish-tob (but RV correctly "men of Tob"). See also Ishbaal, Ishshan, Iscariot.

ISHBAAL, ish'ba-al. See Ish-bosheth.

ISHBAH, ish'ba (יִשְׁבָּה, yishbâh): A member of the tribe of Judah, father of Eshemoa (1 Ch 4 17).

ISHBAK, ish'bak (יִשְׁבעָך, yishbâch) A name in the list of sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25 2; 1 Ch 1 32). These names probably represent tribes; the tribe of Ishshah has not been certainly identified.

ISHBI-BENOB, ish-bi-benob (ишִׁבְיָ בֵּנֹב, yishbi-venob): One of the four "born to the giant in Gath" who were slain by David and his men (2 S 21 15–22). Ishbi-benob was slain by Abishai, and David's life was saved by the act (vs 16-17).

ISH-BOSHETH, ish-bosheth (יִשְׁבֹּ֫שְֹתֶ, Ish-bosheth, "man of shame"; יִשְׁבֹּ֫שְֹתֶ, Ishshotheh): Called Ish-bosheth (ם inexplicable), "man of Baal" (1 Ch 8 33), and יִשְׁבֹּ֫שְֹתֶ, yishbôth, "man of Jeh"(?), perhaps for יִשְׁבֹּ֫שְֹתֶ, yishbôth (1 S 14 49). Cf. Eshbaal and Ishvi (AV "Ishshu"). We probably have the right meaning of the name in Eshbaal and Ishvi, the words Baal and Jeh being frequently interchanged. The change to Ish-bosheth, "man of shame," in 2 S, where the story of his shameful murder is related, may be better explained as reference to this face of Merobalba, whose name was also used of Merib-baal (for similar reasons), than to find here a suggestion of Baal-worship, but see HPN, 121, where the change is explained as a correction of the scribes, in consequence of prophetic protests. Actually, one of the synonyms of יִשְׁבֹּ֫שְֹתֶ, yishbôth (1 S 14 49) who, when his father and brothers were slain in the battle of Gilboa (1 S 31 1 ff.), was proclaimed king over Israel by Abner, the captain of Saul's host, at Mahanaim (2 S 2 8 ff.). Ishbosheth was 40 years old at this time and reigned over Israel 2 years (2 S 2 10). Judah, however, proclaimed David king. The consequence was war (2 S 2 12 ff.). The house of David prevailed against the house of Saul (2 S 3 1), but the war did not come to a close until Abner, angry on account of the rebuke he suffered from I., for his unlawful intimacy with Rizpah, Saul's concubine, joined David (2 S 3 6 ff.). David's condition to return to him Micah, his wife, before peace could be made, was fulfilled by I. (2 S 3 14 f.), but it was not until after Abner's death that I. seems to have given up hopes of retaining his power (2 S 4 1 f.). The shameful murder of I. by his own captains is recorded in 2 S 4 5 ff. David punished the murderers who had expected reward and buried I. in the grave of Abner at Hebron (2 S 4 12 ff.).

ARTHUR L. BRESLICH

ISHHOD, ish'hood (ישָׁחוֹד, yish'hadh), "man of majesty": A man of the tribe of Manassesh (1 Ch 7 18, AV "Ishhod").
ISHI, ish'î (יִשְׂח, yish'âh, “salutary”): 
(1) A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2:31); the genealogy may denote his membership by blood, or only by adoption, in the house of Judah. 
(2) A Judahite (1 Ch 4:20). 
(3) A Simeonite, whose sons led 500 of their tribe against the Amalekites in Mt. Seir (1 Ch 4:42). 
(4) One of the chiefs of Manasseh E. of the Jordan (1 Ch 6:24).

ISHI, ish’î, t’shî (יִשְׂח, yish’âh, “my husband”;
LXX ἀνήρ ἱμαρν, ho andor mou): The name symbolic of Jeh’s relation to Israel which Hosea (2:16) declared shall proceed, with “my lord,” has become hateful on account of its associations with the worship of the Baals.

ISHIAH, i-sh’îyâ. See ISSIAH.

ISHJAH, i-sh’îyâ. See ISSIAH.

ISHMA, ish’ma (ישׁמואל, yishma’el), from the root yâsham, “to live;” therefore meaning “desolate”): A brother of Joram and Idash, “the sons of the father of Etam” (1 Ch 4:3). They were brothers of Hazzeleponi.

ISHMAEL, ish’mâ-el (ישׁמואל, yishma’el’), “God heareth,” or “God may,” “shall hear”; Ἰσμαὴλ, Ismael): 
(1) The son of Abraham by Hagar, the Egyptian slave of his wife Sarah. The circumstances connected with his birth reveal what seems to us to be a very strange practice. It was customary among ancient peoples to correct the natural defect of barrenness by substituting a slave woman. In our narrative, this is shown to be authorized and brought about by the legitimate wife with the understanding that the offspring of such a union should be regarded as her own: “It may be that I shall obtain children by her,” lit. “that I shall be built by her” (Gen 16:2).

The hopes of Sarah were realized, for Hagar gave birth to a son, and yet the outcome was not fully pleasing to Abraham’s wife; there was one serious drawback. As soon as Hagar “saw that she had conceived,” her behavior toward her mistress underwent a radical change; she was “despised in her eyes.” But for the intervention of the angel of Jehovah, the boy might have been born in Egypt. For, being dealt with hardly (or humbly) by Sarah, the handmaid fled toward that country. On her way she was told by the angel to return to her mistress and submit herself “under her hands.” She obeyed, and the child which was to be “a wild ass among men” was born when his father was 86 years old (Gen 16:7-16).

At the age of 13 years the boy was circumcised (Gen 17:25) in accordance with the Divine command received by Abraham: “Every male among you shall be circumcised” (Gen 17:10). Thus young Ishmael was made a party to the covenant into which God had entered with the lad’s father. The fact that both Abraham and his son were circumcised the same day (Gen 17:26) undoubtedly adds to the importance of Ishmael’s partaking of the holy rite. He was certainly made to understand how much his father loved him and how deep his wishes about his son’s welfare. We may even assume that there was a time when Abraham looked upon Ishmael as the promised seed. His error was made clear to him when God promised him the birth of a son by Sarah. At first this seemed to be a contradiction of the promise of a child of Sarah and herself old and Sarah 90. And yet, how could he disbelieve the word of God? His cherished, though mistaken, belief about Ishmael, his doubts regarding the possibility of Sarah’s motherhood, and the first faint glimmer of the real meaning of God’s promise, all these thoughts found their expression in the fervid wish: “O that Ishmael might live before thee!” (Gen 17:18). Gradually the truth dawned upon the patriarch that God’s thoughts are not the thoughts of men, neither their ways. But we have no reason to believe that this entire change of the mental attitude of Abraham toward Ishmael reacted unfavorably on his future treatment of this son “born of the flesh” (Gen 21:11). If there were troubles in store for the boy likened by the angel of Jehovah to a wild ass, it was, in the main, the youngster’s own fault.

When Isaac was weaned, Ishmael was about 16 years of age. The weaning was made an occasion for great celebration. But it seems that the pleasure of the day was marred by the objectionable behavior of Ishmael.

“And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian . . . mocking” (Gen 21:9). Her jealous motherly love had quickened her sense of observation and her faculty of reading the character of children. We do not know exactly what the word used in the Heb for “mocking” really means. The LXX and the Vulg render the passage: “When Sarah saw the son of Hagar . . . playing with Isaac,” and St. Paul followed a later tradition. He says: “He was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit” (Gal 4:29). Lightfoot (in his notes to the Ep. to the Gal) says: “At all events the word seems to mean mocking, jeering.” At any rate, the fact revealed to Sarah that she had objected to the bringing up of the son of promise together with the “mockers,” and so both mother and son were banished from the tents of Abraham.

Now there came a most critical time in the life of young Ishmael. Only some bread and a bottle of water were “put on the shoulder” of Hagar by Abraham when he expelled her with her son. Aimlessly, as it seems, the two walked about in the wilderness of Beersheba. The water was soon spent, and with it went all hope and energy. The boy, being faint with thirst and tired out by his constant walking in the fierce heat of the sun, seemed to be dying. So his mother put him rapidly down in the shade of some shrub. We do not know the opinion of some writers that the narrative of Gen 21:8ff represented Ishmael as a little boy whom his mother had carried about and finally flung in the shade of some shrub. Even if this passage is taken from a different source, it is certainly not in conflict with the rest as to the age of Ishmael.) After this last act of motherly love—what else could she do to help the boy?—she retired to a place at some distance and resignedly expected the death of her son and permanent separation.

For the 2d time in her life, she had a marvelous experience. “God heard the voice of the lad,” and comforted the unhappy mother most wonderfully. Through His angel He renewed His former promise regarding her son, and then He showed her a well of water. The lad’s life was saved and, growing up, he became in time an archer. He lived in the wilderness of Paran and was married by his mother to an Egyptian wife (Gen 21:21).

When Abraham died, his exiled son returned to assist his brother to bury their father (Gen 25:9).

In the same chapter we find the names

4. His of Ishmael’s 12 sons (vs 12ff) and a Children brief report of his death at the age of 137 years (ver 17). According to Gen 25:9, he 28:9 he also had a daughter, Mahalah, whom Isaac took for his wife; in Gen 36:3 her name is given as Basemat.
The character of Ishmael and his descendants (Arabian nomads or Bedouins) is very accurately and vividly depicted.'

5. Descendants

men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man’s hand against him” (Gen 15:12).

These nomads are, indeed, roaming the wilderness "of their independence, quarrelsome and adventurous. We may well think of their progenitors as of a proud, undaunted and rugged son of the desert, the very counterpart of the poor hoy lying half dead from fever and exposure under the shrub in the wilderness of Beersheba.

6. In the NT

The person and the history of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, “born after the flesh,” is of special interest to the student of the NT because of Paul’s use of him, in the Ep. to the Gal., as a type of those Jews who cling to the paternal religion in such a manner as to be unable to distinguish the character of the OT Institutions, and esp., those of the Mosaic law. By doing so they could not be made to see the true meaning of the law, and instead of embracing the grace of God as the only means of fulfilling the law, they taught the contrary doctrine of Christianity and even persecuted its advocates. Like Ishmael, born of Hagar, the handmaid of Abraham, so they had been slave woman; like him, they were Abraham’s sons only “after the flesh,” and their ultimate fate is foreshadowed in the casting out of Hagar and her son. They could not expect to maintain the connection with the true Israel, and in like manner they should not expect their Messiah, they were not to be the leaders of the church or the exponents of its teachings (Gal 4:21—28).

(2) The son of Nathaniah (Jer 40:8—41:18; cf 2 K 25:29—25). It is a dreary story of jealousy and animosity which Jeremiah records in the 40, 41 of his book. After the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the better class of Jewish citizens, it was necessary to provide for some sort of a government in the depopulated country. Public order had to be restored and maintained; crops of the fields were endangered and had to be taken care of. It was thus only common political prudence that dictated to the king of Babylon the setting up of a governor for the remnant of Judah. He chose Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, for the difficult position. The new officer selected for his place of residence the city of Mizpah, where he was soon joined by Jeremiah. All the captains of the Jewish country forces came to Mizpah with their men, and they made Gedaliah’s residence their headquarters (Jer 40:13). Ishmael the son of Nathaniah, the son of Elishama “of the seed royal” (2 K 25:25) was among their number—all of which must have been rather gratifying to the new governor. But he was destined to be cruelly misunderstood. A traitor was among the captains that had gathered around him. Yet the governor might have prevented his dastardly scheme. Ishmael, the son of Karah, and other loyal captains warned him of the treachery of Ishmael, telling him he was induced by Baalis, the Ammonite king, to assassinate the governor. But the governor’s faith in Ishmael was not to be shaken; he even looked upon Nathaniah’s report as false and calumnious (Jer 40:16). About 2 months after the destruction of Jerusalem Ishmael was ready to strike the mortal blow. With 10 men he came to Mizpah, and there, at a banquet given in his honor, he killed Gedaliah and all the Jews and Chaldaeans that were with him. He succeeded in keeping the matter a secret; for 2 days after the horrible deed, he persuaded a party of 80 pious Jews to enter the city and killed all but 10 of them, throwing their bodies into a pit. These men were coming from the ruins of the Temple with the offerings which they had intended to leave at Jerusalem. Now they had found out, to their great distraction, that the city was laid waste and the Temple destroyed. So they passed by Mizpah, their beards shaven, their clothes rent, and with cuts about their persons (Jer 41:5). We may, indeed, ask indignantly, Why this new atrocity? The answer may be found in the fact that Ishmael did not kill all of the men. He spared 10 of them because they promised him some hidden treasures. This shows his motive. He was a desperate man and just then carrying out a desperate undertaking. He killed those peaceful citizens because of their money, and money he needed to realize his plans. They were those of a traitor to his country, insomuch as he intended to deport the inhabitants of Mizpah to the land of his high confederate, the king of the Ammonites. Among the captives were Jeremiah and the daughters of the Jewish king. But his efforts came to naught. When Johanan and the other captains were told of Ishmael’s unheard-of actions, they immediately pursued the desperate adventurer and overtook him by the “great waters that are in Gibeon.” Unfortunately, they failed to capture Ishmael; for he managed to escape with eight men to the Ammonites. See, further, Gedaliah.

(3) A descendant of Benjamin and the son of Azel (1 Ch 8:38; cf 9:44).

(4) The father of Zebadiah who was “the ruler of the house of Judah, in all the king’s [Jehoshaphat, 2 Ch 19:8] matters” (2 Ch 19:11).

(5) The sons of Ishmael were called “a captain of hundreds,” who lived at the time of Jehoada and Joash (2 Ch 23:1).

One of the sons of Pashhur the priest. He was one of those men who had married foreign women and were compelled to "put away their wives" (Ezr 10:22).

WILLIAM BAUM

Ishmael (יִשְׁמַאֵל, Ismaháli):

(1) AV "Ishmael" (Jth 2:23), the son of Abraham by Hagar.

(2) 1 Esd 9:22 (AV, RV "Ishmael"), corresponding to Ishmael in Ezr 10:22. See preceding art.

Ishmaelites, ishmá-el-líts (יִשְׁמַעְלִיִם, yishma‘eylim): The supposed descendents of Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar, whom Abraham sent away from him after the birth of Isaac (Gen 21:14—21). The sons of Ishmael are given in Gen 25:13—14, they were twelve in number and gave rise to as many tribes, but the term Ishmaelite has a broader signification, as appears from Gen 37:28, 36, where it is identified with Midianite. From Gen 16:12 it may be inferred that it was applied to the Bedowin of the desert region E. of the Jordan generally, for the cedared there assigned to Ishmael, "His hand shall be against every man, and every man’s hand against him," fits the habits of Bedowin in all ages. Such was the character of the Midianites as described in Jgs 7, who are again identified with the Ishmaelites (8:24). These references show that the Ishmaelites were not confined to the descendents of the son of Abraham and Hagar, but refer to the desert tribes in general, like "the children of the east" (Jgs 7:12).

H. PORTER

Ishmahā, ish-mā’ya (ישמָהָ, yismah'ya, "Jeh is hearing"): 1. A man of Gibeon, chief of David’s 30 great warriors, who came to him at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:4, AV “Ismaiah”).

(2) Chief of the armed contingent of the tribe of Zebulun, which served David in the monthly order of the tribes (1 Ch 27:19).


Ishmerai, ish-mē’rī (ישֶׁמְרָי, yishmeray, from shāmār, meaning "to hedge about," i.e. "to guard,"
and therefore a “guard,” “protector”): A descendant of Benjamin, son of Ephraim, resident of Jerusalem, one of the “heads of fathers’ houses” throughout their generations, chief men (1 Ch 8 18).

ISHOD, Ishod, 1 (םִּהֹד, יִשֶׁרֹד): AV 1 Ch 7 18 for Ishod (q.v.).

ISHPAH, Ishpa (ישֶפָּה, יִשֶׁפַּה, “firm,” “strong”): A man of the tribe of Benjamin, of the house of Jeriah (1 Ch 8 16).

ISHPAN, Ishpan (ישפָּן, יִשֶׁפָּן, lit. “he will hide”): Descendant of Benjamin, son of Shashak, one of the “chief men, heads of fathers’ houses”; lived at Jerusalem (1 Ch 8 22).

ISH-SECHEL, Ish-sekel (ישֶסֶכֶל, 1ish sekel, “man of discretion”): Ezra, at one time in need of ministers for the house of God, sent unto Iddo the chief at the place Caspatha. “And according to the good hand of our God upon us they brought us a man of discretion [1 Ish-sekel], of the sons of Mahli, the son of Levi, the son of Israel” (Est 8 18). This is the only reference to Ish-sechel.

ISH-TOB, Ish-tob (ישֶתֹב, 1ish tov, “the men of Tob”): A place in Pal, probably a small kingdom, large enough, however, to supply at least 12,000 men of valor to the children of Ammon in their struggle against Joab, David’s general (2 S 10 6b). See Ishb.

ISHUAH, Ish-ta, Isuah, Ish-ta (ישֶנֶה, יִשֶׁנה, “he will live”): See Ishuah; Ishyah; Ishvi.


ISHVAY, Ish-va (ישֶנֶה, יִשֶׁנה, “even,” “level”): AV Ishuah and Isuah); Second son of Asher (Gen 46 17; 1 Ch 7 30). As only the families of his brothers Ishvi, etc., are mentioned in Nu 26 44, the supposition is that he left no issue.

ISHVI, Ish-vi (ישֶנֶה, יִשֶׁנה, “equal”): (1) The third son of Asher (Gen 46 17; 1 Ch 7 30), and founder of the family of the Leshvites (Nu 26 44, AV “Jesuites”), AV “Isaï,” “Jesuit,” and “Isaiah.” (2) The name is also found among the sons of Saul (1 S 14 49), AV “Isibai.”

ISLAND, island, ISLE, il (1) “םָא, 1, “island” or “isle”; AV has “coast” or “coast-land” in Isa 20 6; 23 25; RVv has “coast-lands” in Gen 10 5; Isa 11 10; 24 15; 59 18; Jer 25 22; Ezk 39 6; Neh 11 18; Zeph 2 11; RVv has “sea-coast” in Jer 47 4. [2] pl. לִשְׂנֵי, لִשְׂנֵא (13, 22; 34 14, Jer 50 39, [3] פָּלָס, פָּלָס, “small island” [Acts 27 16], [4] פָּלָס, פָּלָס, “island” [Acts 13 6, 28 13; 26 17 9.11; Rev 1 9; 6 14; 14 20]); Except as noted above, “isle” in RV is t4 “island” or “isle.” ARVAD (q.v.), a Phoen island-city N. of Tripoli, Syria, is mentioned in Gen 10 18; 1 Ch 12; Eze 27 24. This and Tyre were the only important islands on the coast, both of them very small. We find references to Kittim or Chittim, Cyprus (Gen 10 4; Nu 24 7; 1 Ch 1 7; Isa 23 12; Jer 2 10; Ezk 27 6; Neh 11 30); to Elisheba, perhaps Carthage (Gen 10 4; 1 Ch 1 7; Ezk 27 7); to “isles of the nations” (Gen 10 5; Zeph 2 11); to “isles of the sea” (Est 10 1; Isa 11 11; 24 15; Ezk 26 18); to “Tarshish and the isles” (Ps 72 10; of Is 66 19); to “isle” (RVv “sea-coast”) of Caphtor (Gen 47 4). Communication with these islands or distant coasts is kept up by the Tyrians (Ezk 27 3 15). The Jews were not a maritime people, and in early times their geographical knowledge was very limited. Of 32 OT passages referring to “island” or “isle,” 25 are in Isa, Jer, and Ezk. In the NT, besides the passages noted above, and Patmos (Rev 1 9), various islands are mentioned by name in connection with the voyages of St. Paul, e.g. Cyprus, Crete, Lesbos, Samos, Samothrace, Chios, Melita, Sicily (Syraeiss, Acts 28 12). “Jacksal” is a perfectly possible tr of ty’re (RVv “wild beasts of the islands,” RVv “wolves,” RVv “howling creatures”). See Coast; Geography; Jackal; Wolf.

ISLES OF THE GENTILES (Gen 10 5): AV “isles [in “coast-lands”] of the nations,” said of the territories of the sons of Japheth. The reference is to the coasts of the Western Mediterranean, with their islands (of “isles of the sea,” Est 10 1; Ezk 26 18, etc.). See Table of Nations.

ISMAACHIAH, isa-ma'-ka' (ישמך, יִשָּנְכָע, “Isma'akah-yah”), “Jeh who sustains”) One of the “overseers under the hand of Conaniah and Shelomith his brother, by the appointment of Hezekiah the king, and Azariah the ruler of the house of God” (2 Ch 31 13).

ISMAEL, is-ma'-el. See ISHEMAEL.

ISMAERUS, isa-la'-rus (ישמאֹרָע, ישמאֹרָע, “Ishmael”): AV “Omaerus” (1 Esd 9 34), corresponding to Amram in Ezr 10 34.

ISMAIYAH, isa-mi'ya. See ISHMAYAH.

ISPAH, is-pa'. See ISHPAH.

ISRAEL, is-ra'-el. See JACOB.
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Literature

Introductory.—The chief and best source from which we can learn who this people was and what was its history is the Bible itself, esp. the OT, which tells us the story of this people from its earliest beginnings.

(1) In the OT.—The origins of Israel are narrated in Gen.; the establishment of the theocracy, in the other books of the Pent.; the entrance into Canaan, in the Book of Josh.; the period preceding the kings, in the Book of Judges; the establishment of the monarchy and its development, in the Books of S, and the opening chapters of the Books of K, which latter report also the division into two kingdoms and the history of these down to their overthrow. The Books of Chronicles, with the books already mentioned, are a survey of the historical development from Adam down to the Babylon captivity, but confine this account to the theocratical center of this history and its sphere. Connected with Ch are the small Books of Esd. and Neh., which probably originally constituted a part of Ch, but which pass over the Exile and begin at once with the story of the Return. Then, too, these two books contain only certain episodes in the history of the Return, which were of importance for the restoration of the Jewish theocracy, so that the story found in them is anything but complete. With the 5th cent. BC the Bib. narrative closes entirely. For the succeeding centuries we have nothing but some scattered data; but for the 2d pre-Christian cent., we have a new source in the Books of the Macc, which give a connected account of the struggles and the rule of the Asmoneans, which reach, however, only from 174 to 135 BC.

The historical value of the OT books is all the greater, as the later the narrator or his sources stand in point of time to the events that are recorded; e.g. the contents of the Books of K have in general greater value as historical sources than what is reported in the Books of Ch, written at a much later period. Yet it is possible that a later chronicler could have made use of old sources which earlier narrators had failed to employ. This is the actual state of affairs in connection with a considerable number of matters reported by the Bib. chroniclers, which supplement the exceedingly meager extracts furnished by the author of the Books of K. Then, further, the books of the prophets possess an extraordinary value as historical sources for the special reason that they furnish illustrations of the historical situation and events from the lips of contemporaries. As an example we can refer to the externally flourishing condition of the kingdom of Judah under King Uzziah, concerning which the Books of K report practically nothing, but of which Ch give details which have been confirmed by the testimony of Isaiah.

(2) Josephus.—A connected account of the history of Israel has been furnished by Flavius Josephus. His work entitled Jewish Antiquities, however, as far as trustworthiness is concerned, is again considerably inferior to the Books of Ch, since the later traditions of the Jews to a still greater extent influenced his account. Only in those cases in which he could make use of foreign older sources, such as the Egyp Manetho or Phoen authors, does he furnish us with valuable material. Then for the last few centuries preceding his age, he fills a certain want. Esp. is he the primary authority for the events which he himself passed through and which he reports in his work on the Jewish Wars, even if he is not free from certain personal prejudices (see Josephus, Flavius). For the customs and usages of the later Jewish times the traditions deposited in the Talmud are also to be considered. Much less than to Jos can any historical value be credited to the Alexandrian Jew, Philo. The foreign authors, e.g. the Gr and the Lat historians, contain data only for the story of the nations surrounding Israel, but not for the early history of Israel itself.

(3) The Monuments.—On the other hand, the early history of Israel has been wonderfully enriched in recent times through the testimonies of the monuments. In Pal itself the finds in historical data and monuments have been, up to the present time, rather meager. Yet the excavations on the sites of ancient Taanach, Megiddo, Jericho, Gezer and Samaria have brought important material to light, and we have reason to look forward to geological and literary finds, which may throw clear light on many points that have remained dark and uncertain. Also in lands round about Pal, important documents (the Moabite Stone, Phoen inscriptions) have already been found. Esp. have the discovery and interpretation of the monuments found in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia every materially advanced our knowledge of the history of Israel. Not only has the connection of the history of this people with universal history been clarified by these finds, but the history of Israel itself has gained in tangible reality. In some detail matters, traditional ideas have given way to clearer conceptions; e.g. the chronology of the OT, through Assyriological research, has been set on a safer foundation. But all in all, these archaeological discoveries have confirmed the confidence that has been placed in the Bib. historical sources.

It is true that the rules applied to profane history cannot, without modification, be applied to the historical writings of the Hebrews. The

2. Religious Bib. narrators are concerned about Character something more than the preservation of the History facts and events. Just as little is it their purpose to

show what is the will of God, or the will of their people or their rulers, as this is done on the memorial tablets of the Egyp, the Assyr, and the Bab kings. Looked at merely from the standpoint of profane history, there are many omissions in the OT historical books that are found objectionable. Sometimes whole periods are passed over or treated very briefly. Then, too, the political pragmatism, the secular connection in the movements of the nations and historical events, are often scarcely mentioned. The standpoint of the writer is the religious. This appears in the fact that this history begins with the creation of the world and reports primitive traditions concerning the origin of mankind and their earliest history in the light of the revelation of the God of Israel, and that it makes this national history a member in the general historical development of mankind. Nor was this first done by the author of the Pent in its present shape. Already the different documentary sources were found combined in the Pent, namely E, J and P, which the Creator of the world had with this people. Also, when they narrate the national vicissitudes of Israel, the writers are concerned chiefly to exhibit clearly the providential guidance of God. They give special prominence to those events in which
the hand of God manifests itself, and describe with full detail the lives of those agents of whom Jeh made use in order to guide His people, such as Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon and others. But it is not the glory of these men themselves that the Bible is devoted to describing, but their importance for the spiritual and religious greatness of Israel. Let us note in this connection only the extreme brevity with which the politically successful wars of David are reported in 2 S; and how fragmentary are the records in which the author of the Books of K reports the reigns of the different kings; and how briefly he refers for all the other details of these kings to books that, unfortunately, have been lost for us. But, on the other hand, how full are the details when the Bible gives us its account of the early history of a Samuel or of a David, in which the providential guidance and protection of Jehovah appear in such a tangible form; or when it describes the building of the temple by Solomon, so epoch-making for the religious history of Israel, or the activity of such leading prophets as Elijah and Elisha.

Much less the deeds of man than the deeds of God in the midst of His people constitute the theme of the narrators. These facts explain, too, this sense of impartiality unknown in ancient literatures, with which the weaknesses and the faults of the ancestors and kings of Israel are reported by the Bib. writers, even in the case of their most revered kings, or with which even the most disgraceful deeds of the people are narrated. It cannot indeed be denied that this religious and fundamental characteristic is not found to the same degree in all the books and sources. The oldest narratives concerning Jacob, Joseph, the Judges, the pre-Mosaic kings, and the tribes, were certainly known only to the people of Israel. They rather belonged to a purely Semitic tribe, which had found its way from Northern Arabia into these districts. A striking confirmation of this view is found in a mural picture on the rock-tombs of Balatah near the city of Balatah, which shows foreigners, of whom pictures are here given (from the time of the XIIth Dynasty), called Amu, namely Bedouins from Northern Arabia or from the Sinai peninsula, showing such indisputable Jewish physiognomies as to be indecisively like the Semitic tribes of Israel. They were then the people of the stock of Abraham. The Semitic people, too, the leader of the caravans, Eshba'a (Abishua), has a name formed just like that of Abraham. When, in later times, Moses fled to the country of the Midianites, he doubtless was welcomed by such tribal relatives.

The Israelites at all times laid stress on their ethnographical connection with other nations. They knew that they were intimately related to a group of peoples who have the same name, and who are called their "kinsfolk". They traced their origin still farther back to the tribal founder, Shem. Linguistics and ethnology confirm, in general, the closer connection between the Sem tribes mentioned in Gen 10 and the people of the Sem tribes of the cases of Assur, Aram, and the different Arabian tribes. A narrower group of Semites is called Hebrews. This term is used in Gen in a wider sense of the word than is the case in later times, when it was employed as a synonym for Israel. According to its etymology, the word signifies "those beyond" those who live on the other side of the river or have come over from the other side. The river meant is not the Jordan, but the Euphrates. About the same time that the ancestors of Israel were immigrating into Canaan and Egypt, other tribes also emigrated westward and were called, by the Canaanites and by the Egyptians, 'ibhrin. This term is identical with Habari, found in the Am. Tab., in which complaint is made about the inroads of such tribes. The Israelites cannot have been meant here, but related tribes are. Possibly the Egypt Apria is the same word. The Israelites declared that they were descended from a particular family or tribe. This is the case in the case of the patriarchs. Modern researches have shown how intimately this history was interwoven with that of other nations. Already, between the religious forms of the OT and those of other Sem peoples, there have been found many relations. Religious expressions and forms of worship among the Israelites often show in language and cultus a similarity to those of the ancient Canaanites, the Phoenicians, the Syrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians. But it is a mistake to believe that the history and the religion of Israel are mere blemishes of those nations, clung tenaciously to their national life, even when they were surrounded by powerful nations, or were even scattered among these nations, as in the Exile, thus too their religion, at least in some respects, has been able to at times to preserve a very high originality and independence under the influence of the Divine Spirit, who had filled it.

1. Origins of Israel in Pre-Mosaic Times.—The Israelites knew at all times that Canaan was not their original home, but that their original ancestors had immigrated into this land. What was their earlier and earliest home? Tradition states that they immigrated from Haran in the upper Euphrates valley. But it is claimed that they came to Haran from Ur of the Chaldees, i.e. from a city in Southern Babylonia, now called Mugheir. This city of Ur, now well known from Bab inscriptions, was certainly home of the Sem tribes of ancient Assyria, and was certainly inhabited by Sem people. The foreign tribes, of whom pictures are here given (from the time of the XIIth Dynasty), called Amu, namely Bedouins from Northern Arabia or from the Sinai peninsula, show such indisputable Jewish physiognomies as to be decisively Semitic. These tribes, whether Semitic or not, are clearly related to the stock of Abraham. Then, too, the leader of the caravans, Eshba’a (Abishua), has a name formed just like that of Abraham. When, in later times, Moses fled to the country of the Midianites, he doubtless was welcomed by such tribal relatives.

2. Ethnographical and Historical Origins.—The Israelites traced their origin still farther back to the tribal founder, Shem. Linguistics and ethnology confirm, in general, the closer connection between the Sem tribes mentioned in Gen 10 and the people of the Sem tribes. A narrower group of Semites is called Hebrews. This term is used in Gen in a wider sense of the word than is the case in later times, when it was employed as a synonym for Israel. According to its etymology, the word signifies "those beyond" those who live on the other side of the river or have come over from the other side. The river meant is not the Jordan, but the Euphrates. About the same time that the ancestors of Israel were immigrating into Canaan and Egypt, other tribes also emigrated westward and were called, by the Canaanites and by the Egyptians, 'ibhrin. This term is identical with Habari, found in the Am. Tab., in which complaint is made about the inroads of such tribes. The Israelites cannot have been meant here, but related tribes are. Possibly the Egypt Apria is the same word. The Israelites declared that they were descended from a particular family or tribe. This is the case in the case of the patriarchs. Modern researches have shown how intimately this history was interwoven with that of other nations. Already, between the religious forms of the OT and those of other Sem peoples, there have been found many relations. Religious expressions and forms of worship among the Israelites often show in language and cultus a similarity to those of the ancient Canaanites, the Phoenicians, the Syrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians. But it is a mistake to believe that the history and the religion of Israel are mere blemishes of those nations, clung tenaciously to their national life, even when they were surrounded by powerful nations, or were even scattered among these nations, as in the Exile, thus too their religion, at least in some respects, has been able to at times to preserve a very high originality and independence under the influence of the Divine Spirit, who had filled it.

3. Patriarchal Origins and History.
into it also serfs and clients (cf. Gen 14:14). These last-named, it is sometimes thought, held the position of ‘sons’, without是真的他的descendants. Possibly the tribe that issued from Abraham through Reu is the tribe mentioned as ‘sons’ of ‘sons’, who were already more numerous than would seem to be the case according to tradition, which takes into consideration the small number of persons. Secondly, we should remember that the Israelite chronology, because of their patriarchal life, had become acclimatised to classify the relations of nations to nations in the scheme of the family. In this way such genealogies of nations as are found in Gen 10 and 11 were the less understood. Hence people had not been placed in the genealogies, without the author himself thinking of individual persons in this connection, who had borne the names, e.g., of Mizraim (Egypt), Cush (Ethiopia), etc., and were actually sons of Ham. The genealogy of the patriarchs is to explain only the closer or more remote relationship or connection to a group of nations. Gen 25:1 if also is a telling example, showing how independently these groups are united. A new wife (Keturah) does not at this place fit into the family history of Abraham. But the writer still wants to make mention of an Arabian group, which was already more distant from the Israelites than did the Ishmaelites. Out of this systematic further development of the living tradition, however, one difficulty arises. It is not in all places easy, indeed not always possible, to draw the line between what is reliable tradition and what is false continuation. But it is a misunderstanding of the historical situation, when the entire history of the patriarchs is to be seen in these clearly defined personalities as Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, in the particular of the events. The later history of which tribes is said to be embodied in the lives of these men: e.g., the name Abraham cannot have been the personal name of a god, but is found as the name of a person on old Bab tablets (Abu rama). The nomadic tribe was doubtless pronounced ḏḥḥ rām, i.e. ‘My father [God] is exalted’. The same is true of the name Jacob (really Jakob-ε); cf. Jaboa (Jebus), Ismael, and others, which find their analogues in old Arabian names.

(1) Patriarchal conditions—Gen 14.—Further, the conditions of life which are presupposed in the history of the Patriarchs are in perfect agreement with what we learn from the Amarna tablets. While formerly it was maintained that it would have been impossible for a single tribe to force its way into Canaan at that time when the country was thickly populated, it is now known that at that very time when the ancestors of the Israelites entered, similar tribes also found their way into the land, sometimes in a peaceable way, sometimes by force. Egypt for the time being had control of the land, but its supremacy was at no point declared by the ‘ḥbretn’, as did other peoples who forced their way into the country, caused the inhabitants much trouble. Esp. does Gen 14, the only episode in which a piece of universal history finds its way into the story of the tribal ancestors, turn out to be a document of great value, which reflects beautifully the condition of affairs in Asia. Such expeditions for conquest in the direction of the Mediterranean lands were undertaken at an early period by Bab Mursu, Sargon I of Akkad and his son Naram Sin. The latter undertook an expedition to the land of Magan along the exact way of the expedition described in Gen 14, this taking place in the days of Amraphel, i.e. Hammurabi. The fact that the latter was himself under an Elamite is in perfect agreement with the story of the inscriptions, according to which the famous Hammurabi of Babylon had first freed himself from the supremacy of Elam. The fact that Hammurabi, according to the accepted chronology, ruled shortly after the year 2000 BC, is also in agreement with Bib. chronology, which places Abraham in this very time. These expeditions into the country Marnu, as the Babylonians call Syria, had for their purpose chiefly to secure booty and to levy tribute. The Israelites themselves took part in such expeditions is not probable. These were punitive expeditions undertaken with a small force.

This ch 14 of Gen seems to be a translation of an old cuneiform tablet. As a rule the stories of the patriarchal age for a long time were handed down orally, and naturally were modified to a certain extent. Then, too, scholars have long since discovered different sources, out of which the stories have been woven together. This fact explains some irregularities in the story: e.g., the chronicler, when he treated the story of Joseph, often ranges its contents systematically, do not always harmonize with the order of events as reported by the other, and perhaps the Ephrimetic and the second the Judaic version of the story. But he was in the case of the relations of nations to nations in the scheme of the family. In this way such genealogies of nations as are found in Gen 10 and 11 were the less understood. Hence people had not been placed in the genealogies, without the author himself thinking of individual persons in this connection, who had borne the names, e.g., of Mizraim (Egypt), Cush (Ethiopia), etc., and were actually sons of Ham. The genealogy of the patriarchs is to explain only the closer or more remote relationship or connection to a group of nations. Gen 25:1 if also is a telling example, showing how independently these groups are united. A new wife (Keturah) does not at this place fit into the family history of Abraham. But the writer still wants to make mention of an Arabian group, which was already more distant from the Israelites than did the Ishmaelites. Out of this systematic further development of the living tradition, however, one difficulty arises. It is not in all places easy, indeed not always possible, to draw the line between what is reliable tradition and what is false continuation. But it is a misunderstanding of the historical situation, when the entire history of the patriarchs is to be seen in these clearly defined personalities as Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, in the particular of the events. The later history of which tribes is said to be embodied in the lives of these men: e.g., the name Abraham cannot have been the personal name of a god, but is found as the name of a person on old Bab tablets (Abu rama). The nomadic tribe was doubtless pronounced ḏḥḥ rām, i.e. ‘My father [God] is exalted’. The same is true of the name Jacob (really Jakob-ε); cf. Jaboa (Jebus), Ismael, and others, which find their analogues in old Arabian names. (2) Ideas of God.—Further, the conception of God as held by these fathers was still of a primitive character, but it contained the elements of the later religious development (see Israell, Religion). (3) Deportment into Egypt.—During a long period of famine the sons of Jacob, the heads of the twelve provinces, which made use of Joseph as an instrument, found refuge in Egypt, in the marshes of which country along the lower Nile Sem tribes had not seldom had their temporary abodes. The land of Egypt is a fertile and long-ordered country. The fertility of the amply watered districts, men, and animals could increase rapidly, and the virile tribe could, in the course of a few centuries, grow into a powerful nation. One portion of the tribes pastured their flocks back and forth on the plains, another built houses for themselves among the Egyptians and engaged in agricultural pursuits and in gardening (Nu 11:5). Egypt arts and trades also found their way among as this people, as also doubtless the art of writing, at least in the case of certain individuals. In this way their sojourn in this country became a fruitful factor in the education of the people. This stay explains in part the fact that the Israelites at all times were more receptive of foreign culture and more capable than their kinsmen, the Edomites, Ammonites, and others in this respect. Moses, like Joseph, had learned all the mysteries of Egyptian wisdom. On the other hand, the sojourn in this old, civilized country was a danger to the religion of the people of Israel. According to the testimony of Josh 24:14; Ezek 20:7ff.; 23:8,9, they adopted many more
II. Nationality under Moses.—It is reported in Ex 18 that a new Pharaoh ascended the throne, who knew nothing of Joseph. This doubtless means that a new dynasty came into power, which adopted a new policy in the treatment of the Sem neighbors. The expulsion of the Hyksos had preceded this, and the opposition to the Semotics had become more acute. The new government developed a strong policy for the expulsion of the Semotics of the N.E. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the laws of the empire were vigorously enforced in these border districts and that an end was made to the liberties of the uninvited shepherd tribes. This led to constantly increasing measures of severity. In this way the people became more and more unhappy and finally were forced to emigrate.

(1) Chronology.—It is still the current conviction that the Pharaoh of the oppression was Ramses II, a king who was extraordinarily ambitious of building, whose long reign is by Eduard Meyer placed as late as 1310 to 1244 BC. His son Merenptah would then be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But on this supposition, Bib. chronology ends, for new data have been discovered on the history of the period since then the time of the Judges must be cut down to unduly small proportions, but certain definite data also speak in favor of an earlier date for the Exodus of Israel. Merenptah boasts in an inscription that he subdued the Semotics to the borders of the land of Israel (which name occurs here for the first time on an Egyptian monument). And even the father of Ramses II, namely Seti, mentions Asher among those whom he conquered in Northern Pal, that is, in the district afterward occupied by this tribe. These data justify the view that the Exodus already took place in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, a thing in itself probable, since the energetic rulers of this dynasty naturally have inaugurated a new method of treating this province. The oppression of Israel would then, perhaps, be the work of Thothmes III (according to Meyer, 1501-1447 BC), and the Exodus would take place under his successor, Amenophis II. In harmony with this is the claim of the LXX (Deut 1:1) in which we recognize the Israelites (see below), were expelled by King Amenophis.

The length of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, according to Gen 15 13 (P), was in round numbers 400 years; more exactly, according to Ex 12 40 f (P), 430 years. But the last-mentioned passage in LXX reads, “the sojourn of the sons of Jacob, when they lived in Egypt and in the land of Canaan.” (The same reading is found in the Sam text, only that the land of Canaan precedes that of Egypt.) Since, according to this source (P), the Patriarchs lived 215 years in Canaan, the sojourn in Egypt would be reduced also 215 years. This is the way in which the synaogogue reckons (cf. Gal 3 17), as also Jos (Am, II, xvi, 2). In favor of this shorter period appeal is made to the genealogical lists, which, however, because they are incomplete, cannot decide the matter. In a longer duration of this sojourn we can appeal, not only to Gen 16 13 (LXX has the same!), but also to the large number of those who left Egypt according to Nu 26 52 (P), even if the number of 600,000 men there mentioned, which would presuppose a nation of about two million souls, is based on a later calculation and gives us an impossible conception of the Exodus.

Gal 3 17 has been preserved concerning the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, the history of the Exodus itself, which signifies the birth of Israel as a nation, is fully reported. In this crisis Moses is the prophetic mediator through whom the wonderful deed of God is accomplished. The deeds of God, which were revealed to his prophet, become revelations for the people. Moses himself had no other authority or power than that which was secured for him through his office as the organ of God. He was the human instrument to bring about the synthesis between Israel and Jeh, the God and the gods of Egypt, whose earthly representative Pharaoh is. The plagues which come over Egypt are all fought in the name of the gods of the country, but they occur in such extraordinary strength and rapidity at Moses’ prediction, and even appear at his command, that they convince the people, and finally Pharaoh himself, of the omnipotence of the God of the Israel. In the same way the act of deliverance at the Red Sea can be explained as the cooperation of natural causes, namely wind and tide. But the fact that these elementary forces, just at this critical time, proved so serviceable to the people of Israel, to destructive to their enemies, shows unmistakably the miraculous activity of God. This the Israelites experienced still further on the journey through the desert, when they were entirely dependent on Divine leadership and care. The outcome of these experiences, and at the same time its grandest demonstration, was the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai. From this time on Jeh was Israel’s God and Israel was the people of Jeh. This God claimed to be the only and absolute ruler over the tribes that were now inwardly united into one nation. From this resulted as a matter of course, that Moses as the recognized organ of this God was not only the authority, who was to decide in all disputes but also the one who created from a new and complete order of legal enactments proceeded. Moses became the lawgiver of Israel.

Even if the history of the origin of the OT covenant is unique in character, it is nevertheless profitable to take note of an analogy to the OT, which is, and which is adapted to make much in Israel’s history clearer. Mohammed also, after he had at the critical point of his career persuaded his followers to migrate from their homes, soon after, in Medina, concluded a covenant, according to which he, as the recognized speaker of Allah, claimed for himself the right to decide in all disputes. He, too, in his capacity as the prophet of God, was consulted as an infallible authority in all questions pertaining to the cultus, the civil and the criminal laws, as also in matters pertaining to politics and to war. And his decisions and judgments, uttered in the name of Allah, were written in the Koran. This Koran, too, became the basis of sacred law. And by causing the Hebrews divided and antagonistic tribes to subject themselves to Allah, Mohammed united these his followers into a religious communion and in this way, too, into a national body. The OT is the prophetic upbuilding of the prophecy of earlier times, but the work of Moses was original in character and truly inspired by God.

The historical character of the exodus out of Egypt cannot be a matter of doubt, though some suspect that the entire nation did not take part in the march through the Red Sea, but that certain tribes had disappeared from the land of Egypt, according to that mysterious portion of the Exodus to the East. We must not forget that the song of victory in Ex 15 does not mention a word about Pharaoh’s being himself de-
stroyed in going through the Sea. It is only the late Ps 136:15 that presupposes this as a certainty. That an entire nation cannot emigrate in a single night cannot be maintained in view of the fact that the inhabitants of the same Wadi-Tumidit, through which Moses led his people, is a matter of course, in view of the official character of these accounts and of their policy of passing over in absolute silence all disagreeable facts. And yet in the popular tradition of the people, which Manetho has handed down, there has been preserved some evidences of this event. It is indeed true that what this author reports about the Hyksos (see above) does not belong here, as this people is not, as Jos thinks, identical with the Israelites. However (Cap. I, xxvi, 5 ff), he narrates a story which may easily be the tradition concerning the exodus of the children of Israel as changed by popular use. King Amonophis, we are told, wanted to see the gods. A seer, who bore the same name, promised that his wish would be gratified under the condition that the consecrated place be cleared of all things that were unclean; and it is said that he accordingly drove 80,000 such persons into the stone quarries E. of the Nile. As the seer was afraid that these measures would be displeasing to the gods and the Sopet rotis (the Egyptian name may be written either as Sopet or Hatu) he appointed, i.e., seer, this story must be regarded as referring to such a non-Egypt nation. Hecateus of Abdera has a report of this matter which is much more like the Bib story, to the effect, namely, that a plague which had broken out in Egypt was checked when the people were angry at the Egyptians because they had neglected the religious cultus; for which reason they expelled all foreigners. A part of these is said to have migrated under the leadership of Moses to Judea and there to have founded the city of Jerus (of Diodorus Siculus xii.3; cf. Hexxvi.1).

(2) Geographical matters.—The Red Sea, through which the Israelites went under the leadership of Moses, is without a doubt the northern extension of the Gulf of Akaba, which is reached farther inland than the present Gulf of Suez; of Edouard Naville, The Store-City of Pihtom and the Route of the Exodus, 1885; and The Route of the Exodus, 1891. This savant is entitled to the credit of having identified the station Sukkoth on the basis of the monuments; it is the modern Tell-Maskhita and identical with Pithom, which was the name of the sanctuary at that place. Later the city was called Heropolis. The route accordingly went through the Sea, and to term it the modern Bitter Sea, N. of Suez. It is a more difficult task to trace the route geographically on the other side of the Sea. For it is a question whether "the Mountain of Jeh," which formed the goal of the journey, is to be located on the Sinai peninsula, or in the land of the Edomites, or even on the western coast of Arabia. A. H. Sayce and others reject the traditional location of Sinai on the peninsula named after this mountain, and declare that the Israelites marched directly eastward toward the Gulf of Akaba. The name of this mountain, emigrated in a single night and for similar reasons (of Sayce, Monuments, 249).

(1) Egyptian version of the Exodus.—The fact that the Egyptian monuments report nothing of this episode, so disastrous to that people, is a matter of course, in view of the official character of these accounts and of their policy of passing over in absolute silence all disagreeable facts. And yet in the popular tradition of the people, which Manetho has handed down, there has been preserved some evidences of this event. It is indeed true that what this author reports about the Hyksos (see above) does not belong here, as this people is not, as Jos thinks, identical with the Israelites. However (Cap. I, xxvi, 5 ff), he narrates a story which may easily be the tradition concerning the exodus of the children of Israel as changed by popular use. King Amonophis, we are told, wanted to see the gods. A seer, who bore the same name, promised that his wish would be gratified under the condition that the consecrated place be cleared of all things that were unclean; and it is said that he accordingly drove 80,000 such persons into the stone quarries E. of the Nile. As the seer was afraid that these measures would be displeasing to the gods and the Sopet rotis (the Egyptian name may be written either as Sopet or Hatu) he appointed, i.e., seer, this story must be regarded as referring to such a non-Egypt nation. Hecateus of Abdera has a report of this matter which is much more like the Bib story, to the effect, namely, that a plague which had broken out in Egypt was checked when the people were angry at the Egyptians because they had neglected the religious cultus; for which reason they expelled all foreigners. A part of these is said to have migrated under the leadership of Moses to Judea and there to have founded the city of Jerus (of Diodorus Siculus xii.3; cf. Hexxvi.1).

(3) The wilderness sojourn.—The duration of the sojourn in the †desert ‡is everywhere (as in Am 5:25) given as 40 years. In harmony with this is the fact that only a few of those who had come out of Egypt lived to enter Canaan. The greater part of these 40 years the Israelites seem to have spent at Kadesh. At any rate, there was a sanctuary at that place, at which Moses administered justice, while the different tribes probably were scattered over the prairies and 10 others that were unclean; and it is said that he accordingly drove 80,000 such persons into the stone quarries E. of the Nile. As the seer was afraid that these measures would be displeasing to the gods and the Sopet rotis (the Egyptian name may be written either as Sopet or Hatu) he appointed, i.e., seer, this story must be regarded as referring to such a non-Egypt nation. Hecateus of Abdera has a report of this matter which is much more like the Bib story, to the effect, namely, that a plague which had broken out in Egypt was checked when the people were angry at the Egyptians because they had neglected the religious cultus; for which reason they expelled all foreigners. A part of these is said to have migrated under the leadership of Moses to Judea and there to have founded the city of Jerus (of Diodorus Siculus xii.3; cf. Hexxvi.1).

(2) Geographical matters.—The Red Sea, through which the Israelites went under the leadership of Moses, is without a doubt the northern extension of the Gulf of Akaba, which is reached farther inland than the present Gulf of Suez; of Edouard Naville, The Store-City of Pihtom and the Route of the Exodus, 1885; and The Route of the Exodus, 1891. This savant is entitled to the credit of having identified the station Sukkoth on the basis of the monuments; it is the modern Tell-Maskhita and identical with Pithom, which was the name of the sanctuary at that place. Later the city was called Heropolis. The route accordingly went through the Sea, and to term it the modern Bitter Sea, N. of Suez. It is a more difficult task to trace the route geographically on the other side of the Sea. For it is a question whether "the Mountain of Jeh," which formed the goal of the journey, is to be located on the Sinai peninsula, or in the land of the Edomites, or even on the western coast of Arabia. A. H. Sayce and others reject the traditional location of Sinai on the peninsula named after this mountain, and declare that the Israelites marched directly eastward toward the Gulf of Akaba. The name of this mountain, emigrated in a single night and for similar reasons (of Sayce, Monuments, 249).
"ISRAEL" STELE IN MUSEUM AT CAIRO
Merom, and then went back and encamped at Gilgal on the Jordan. After this he advanced with his tribe of Ephraim into the heart of the land, while the southern tribes on their part forced their way through the Canaanites. But, while the tribes of the north, on their way from Gilgal to Shechem, were able to say that they had occupied the land, the same cannot be said of the southern tribes. It is true that they occupied the land, but they did so without a struggle.

The occupation of the land was not complete, and there were many districts in which Israel had gained the upper hand, but they generally did not wage the war of oppression that Moses had commanded. But they did not do so, and their religion was also endangered. Together with the sacred “holy places” (bamoth) of the original inhabitants, the altars and the sanctuaries there found also came into possession of the Israelites. Moreover, the tribe of Ephraim was the first to make an alliance, and with which old memories were associated. As a result, it readily occurred that Israel appropriated also symbols and religious ceremonies, and even the Baals and the Ashtoreths themselves, however little this could be united in principle with the service of Jeh. But if the Israelites lost their unique religion, their connection with the kindred tribes and their national independence were soon matters of history. The new religion absorbed the old.

III. Period of the Judges.—In such a period of weakened national and religious life, it could easily happen that Israel would again lose the supremacy that it had won by the sword.

The Canaanites could again bring into their power larger parts of the land. Also energetic and pushing nomadic tribes, such as the Ammonites, the Moabites, or other warlike peoples, such as the Philis, could bring the country under subjection, as actually did occur in the period of the Judges. The Book of Jgs reports a number of such instances of the subjection of Israel, which did not extend over the whole land, and in part occurred in different sections of the country at the same time. Judah and Simeon, the two tribes in the south, as a rule took no part in these contests, and had their own battles to fight; and the same is true of the tribes E. of the Jordan, among whom Northern Manasseh and Ephraim were in closest alliance. After a longer or shorter period of oppression, there followed in each case a revival of the national spirit against such oppression. And in all these cases the popular hero who became the liberator appealed to the religious consciousness that formed a bond of union between the tribes and their common God Jeh. In whatever wild a manner the youthful vigor of the people may have found its expression on these occasions, they are nevertheless conscious of the fact that they are waging a holy war, which accordingly can only end with the victory over the heathen spirit and false worship that had found their way into Israel. The most precious historical monument from these times is the song of Deborah (Jgs 5), which, like a mirror, reflects faithfully the conditions of affairs, and the thoughts of that age.

Jgs 17–21 belong to the beginning of this period. The first of these old stories narrates the emigration of a large portion of the tribe of Dan to the extreme north of the country and the origin of idolatry in that region (verset 17, 18). But the second story, too, both in form and contents, is, at least in part, very old and its historical value is amply protected against the attacks of modern critics by Hos 9 9; 10 9. This story reports a holy war of revenge against the tribe of Benjamin, which was unwilling to render satisfaction for the murder that had been committed at Gibeah in its territory. In the feeling of close solidarity and of high responsibility which appears in connection with the punishment of this crime, we still see the influence of the periods of Moses and Joshua.

First it is narrated of a king of Aram-naharaim that he had oppressed Israel for a period of 8 years (Jgs 3 8). This probably means a king of the Mitanni (Nimrod, periods, 297, 304), who at that time were trying to force their way through Canaan into Egypt. It was Othniah, the Kenazite, belonging to a tribe that was related to Judah, who delivered them. A second liberator was the Benjamite Ehud, who delivered the southernmost portion of the country from the servitude of Eglon, the king of the Moabites, by putting the latter to death (Jgs 3 12 f). On a greater scale was the defeat of Sisera, the king of the Canaanites, in the battle of Kishon (Jgs 4, 5). In the same region the battle of Gideon was fought with the plundering Bedouin swarms of the Midianites, who had repeatedly oppressed Israel (chs 6–8). Ahimelech, an unworthy son of the God-fearing Channah, who, some sixty years before, had established a local kingdom in Shechem, which stood for only a short time and came to a disgraceful end. Little more than the names are known to us of Tola, the tribe of Issachar, and Abimelech, in Gilead (ch 9). The first of them is the liberator of Sisera, who delivered the country from the Ammonites coming from the east (chs 11), with which was also connected a struggle with the jealous Ephraimites (ch 12); and still more fully are the details reported of the personal contests of the Nazirite Samson, belonging to the tribe of Dan, against the Philis making their inroads from the south, and who for many years proved to be the most dangerous enemies of Israel.

All these heroes, of whom so few are not so well known, are called judges, and it is regularly reported how long each of these “judged” Israel. They were not officials in the usual sense of the term, but were liberators of the people, who, at the inspitation of Jeh, gave the signal for a holy war. After the victory they, as men of Jeh, then enjoyed distinction, at least in their own tribes; and in so far as it was through their doing that the people had been freed, they were the highest authorities in political, judicial, and religious questions. They are called judges in conscious contradistinction from the kingly power, which in Israel was recognized as the exclusive prerogative of Jeh, so that Gideon declined it as improper when the people made him their king (Judges 8 22 f). The people recognized no limit on the merit of the war which came over these
men and impelled them to arouse their people out of their disgraceful lethargy. For this reason, too, they could afterward be regarded as having paved the way for judicial decisions in harmony with the mind and the Spirit of God, as this had been done already by the prophetess Deborah in the time of oppression. Yet, at least in the case of Samson (notwithstanding Jgs 16:31), it is not probable that he ever was engaged in the administration of justice. It is not even reported of him that he fought at the head of the people, but he carried on his contests with the Philistines in behalf of himself individually, even if, as one supposed, he was a witness for the power of God.

The chronology of the period of the Judges exhibits some peculiar difficulties. If we add together the data that are given in succession in the Book of Jgs, we get from Jgs 3:8 to 31, 410 years altogether. But this number is too large to make it harmonize with the 480 years mentioned in 1 K 6:1. Jewish tradition (e.g. Sêîther 'Olam) accordingly does not include the years of oppression in this sum, but makes them a part of the period of the individual judges. In this way about 111 years are eliminated. But evidently the redactor of the Book of Jgs did not share this view. Modern critics have sought to explain this by detailed two chronological methods, one of which counted on the basis of periods of forty years each, while the other was more exact and contained odd numbers. In this way we can shorten this period as does the Sêîther 'Olam. At any rate, it is justifiable, and is suggested by 10:7, to regard the oppression by the Ammonites (10:8 ff) and the oppression by the Philistines (13:1 ff) as contemporaneous. And other events, too, which in the course of the narrative are related as following each other, may have taken place at the same time or in a somewhat different sequence, as the author used different sources for the different events. But for this very reason his story deserves to be credited as historical. Such characters as Deborah, Jephthah, Ehud, Gideon, Ahimelech and Samuel are described as tangible historical realities. Even if, in the case of the last-mentioned, oral tradition has added decorative details to the figure, yet Samuel cannot possibly be a mere mythological hero of the kind that has been a national hero characteristic of this period, in whom are represented the abundance of physical and mental peculiarities characteristic of the youthful nation, as also their good-natured indifference and carelessness over against their treacherous enemies.

The lack of a central political power made itself felt all the more in the period of the Judges, since, because of the scattered condition of the people in the country that had been so minutely parcelled out, and because of the weakening of the religious enthusiasm of the preceding age, the deeper unity of heart and mind was absent. It is indeed impossible to imagine that at this time there was a total lack of governmental authority. A patriarchal organization had been in force from the beginning. The father of the family was the lawful head of those belonging to him; and a larger clan was again subject to an "elders" who held far-reaching rights in the administration of law, but also with the duty to protect his subordinates, and in case of want to support them. Unfortunately we are nowhere informed how these elders were chosen or whether their office was hereditary. Only a few authorities, such as Isa 3:6, throw a certain light on the subject. This institution of the elders Moses had already found established and had developed farther (Ex 18:13ff). It was retained in all the periods of Israel's history. When the people began to lose their spiritual direction, a number of "elders" bodies of such city elders were established. The tribes, too, had "elders" at their head. But for a united action of the whole nation this arrangement did not suffice; and esp. in the case of war the people of Israel felt that they were at a disadvantage compared with their enemies, who had kings to lead them. For this reason the desire for a king steadily grew in Israel. The dictators of the period of the Judges satisfied their needs only for the time being.

IV. The Kingdom: Israel-Judah.—In the time when the Israelites were oppressed by the Philistines the need of a king was esp. felt. As Samson had come to his death in servitude, the people themselves thus, at the close of this period of glorious achievements, the consciousness of a warlike race, which had only in recent times settled on the western coast of Pal, and from this base was forcing its conquests into the heart of the country.

After the most disastrous defeats, during which even the Ark of the Covenant was lost, there arose for the people, indeed, a father and a deliverer in the person of Samuel, who saved them during the most critical period. When his activity, however, has decayed, the mind of the people cannot be estimated too highly. He was, above all, during peace the faithful watchman of the most sacred possessions of Israel, a prophet such as the people had not seen since the days of Moses; and he doubtless was the first of those colonies of prophetic disciples who were in later times so influential in the development of a theocratic spirit in Israel. He guarded the whole nation also with all his power, by giving to them laws and cultivating piety in the land.

But as Samuel, too, became old and the people concluded for good reasons that his rule would have no worthy successors, their voice could no longer be silenced, and they demanded a king. Samuel tried in vain to persuade the people to desist from their demand, which to him seemed to be an evidence of distrust in the providence of Jeh, but was himself compelled, by inspiration of God, to introduce the new king, whom Jeh pointed out to him. It is indeed maintained by the critics that there are several accounts extant in S concerning the selection of Saul to the kingdom, and that these accounts differ in this, that the one regards the kingdom as a blessing and the other as a curse. The first view, which is said to be the older, is claimed to be found in 1 S 9:1-10:16, and 11; while the second is said to be in 8; 10:17-27; 11 12-14. Whatever may be the facts in regard to these sources, this is beyond any doubt, that Samuel, the last real theocratic leader, established the kingdom. But just as little can the fact be doubted, that he took this step with inner reluctance, since in his eyes this innovation meant the discarding of the ideals of the people to which he himself had remained true during his lifetime. The demand of the people was the outgrowth of worldly motives, but Jeh brought it about, that the "Anointed of Jeh" signified an advance in the history of the kingdom of God.

Saul himself, at first, in a vigorous and efficient manner, solved the immediate problems and overcame the enemies of his people. He began to conceive of his kingdom after the manner of heathen kingdoms and did not employ the spirit of Jeh and His appointed representative. Then there arose an open conflict between him and Samuel; and the fact that the Spirit of God had departed
from him appears in his melancholy state of mind, which urged him on to constantly increasing deeds of violence. That under these circumstances God's blessing also departed from him is proved by the collapse of his life's work in his final failures against the Philistines.

In contrast with this, David, his successor, the greatest king that Israel ever had, had a correct conception of this royal office, and even in his most brilliant successes did not forget that he was called to rule only as "the servant of Jehovah" (by which name he, next to Moses, is called oftest in the Bible). As a gifted ruler, he strengthened his kingdom from within, which, considering the heterogeneous character of the people, was not an easy matter, and extended it without by overpowering jealous neighbors. In this way it was he who became the real founder of a powerful kingdom. The conquest of Jerusalem and its selection as the capital city also are an evidence of his political wisdom. It is indeed true that he, too, had his personal failings and that he made many mistakes, which caused him political troubles, even down to his old age. But his humility at all times made him strong enough again to subject himself to the hand of Jehovah; and his humiliation was grounded on the fact that he was made of His spirit toward Jehovah, which shows itself in His Ps. In this way he really came to be a connecting link between God and his people, and upon this foundation the prophets built further, who prophesied a still closer union of the two under David.

While Saul was a Benjamite, David was of the tribe of Judah, and was for a short time the king of this tribe in Hebron, before the other tribes, becoming tired of the misrule of a descendant of Saul, v. W. they chose him as their king. He secured this after established as the center of his new kingdom the city of Jerusalem, which really was situated on the territory that had been assigned to Benjamin; and he also set this city apart as the religious center of the people by transferring the Ark of the Covenant to this place. In this way David, through his wisdom and his popular bravery, succeeded in uniting the tribes more firmly under his supremacy, and esp. did he bring the tribe of Judah, which down to this time had been more for itself, into closer connection with the others. Israel under David became a prominent kingdom. This position of power was, as a matter of fact, distasteful to their neighbors round about. The Philistines tried to destroy the new kingdom but were themselves overwhelmingly defeated and definitely overpowered. But other neighboring people, too, who, notwithstanding the fact that David did not assume an offensive attitude toward them, assumed a hostile attitude toward him, came to feel his superiority. Particularly severe and tedious was the war against the allied Ammonites and Syrians; and although the Edomites, too, regarded this as a favorable time for attacking Israel, this struggle also ended in a complete triumph for David. The petty, surrounding countries became subject to him from the Mediterranean Sea to Hamath (2 Sam. 8:9), and from the territory of the Lebanon, the inhabitants of which assumed a friendly attitude, to the borders of Egypt, which also recognized the new rule.

Solomon, the son of David, developed inwardly the powerful kingdom which he had inherited. To his father he seemed to be the right man for this because of his peaceful character and diplomatic abilities. He justified the hopes placed in him. Out of love to Jehovah he built the temple on Mt. Zion, regulated the affairs of state and the administration of justice, and by commercial treaties with the Phoenicians (King Hiram) brought about great prosperity in the land. He was the "golden" period in Israel. The culture and civilization, too, of the people were materially advanced by Solomon as he widened their horizon and introduced the literature of Proverbs, which had up to this time been more extensively cultivated by the neighboring people (Edom, Arabia, Egypt). He even developed this literature into a higher type. On the other hand, the brilliant reign of Solomon brought serious dangers to the new kingdom. His liberal-mindedness in the treatment of his foreign wives, in permitting them to retain their heathen worship, perhaps because he thought that in the end it was the same Divinity which these women worshipped under a different form, endangered the theocracy with its serious cultus and its strict morality. Through this conduct the king necessarily forfeited the sympathy of the most pious Israelites. At the same time, his love for magnificent structures surpassed the measure which was regarded as correct for the "Anointed of Jehovah." Then, too, his efforts, in themselves justifiable, to establish a more perfect organization of the monarchy, produced a great deal of dissatisfaction. Solomon did not understand, as did his father, how to respect the inherited liberty-loving tendencies of his people, and the burdens of taxation, to which the people were compelled to submit, were deeply felt, most of all by the Ephraimites, who at times had exhibited a jealous spirit, and could not forget their lost hegemony.

So long, indeed, as the wise Solomon and his advisors were at the helm, the various rebellious tendencies could not make themselves felt. But after his death the catastrophe came. His son, Rehoboam, at the Diet in Shechem, at which the princes placed their appeal for an end of taxation before his coronation, showed that he did not at all understand the situation. His domineering attitude brought things to a head, and he must have been glad that at least the tribe of Judah remained faithful to him. The northern tribes chose for their king Jeroboam I, who before this had already taken part in rebellious agitations, as the kingdom had been predicted to him by the prophet Ahijah (1 K 11:2). Israel was torn into two parts.

With this rupture the powerful kingdom established by David had reached its end. In regard to this flourishing period in Israel's history we are, however, not well informed through the sources. Esp. of the History of the Kingdom in 2 Sam. 9-20 and 1 K 2, 3, we have a narrator who must have been a contemporary of the events recorded. Klostermann surmises that this may have been Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok (2 Sam. 15:27); while Duhm, Budde, Sellin and others believe it to have been the priest Abiathar. Less unity is in evidence in the first Book of Kings, containing the history of the youth of David, which evidently was often described. The Books of Ch have only secondary value for the life of David. These books narrate in full detail the story of the preparations made by David for the erection of the temple and of his organization of the Levites. In regard to the reign of Solomon, the Books of K report more fully. Concerning the later kings, they generally give only meager extracts from more complete sources, which excerpts, however, have been shown to be reliable. The interest which the narrator has in telling his story is the high moral value which he ascribes to the fact as to the relation of the different kings to the cultus. Special sources have been used in compiling the detailed stories of the great prophets Elijah and Elisha, which are inserted in the history of the two kingdoms. On the other hand, the Books
of Ch pass over entirely all reference to the work of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom, as they ignore the entire history of the Ephraimite kingdom since the interest of these books is centered on the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Also in the J history, the much older Books of K deserve the precedence. Yet we owe to the writer of Ch a number of contributions to this history, esp. where he has made a fuller use of the sources than has been done by the author of the Books of K. The suspicion that everything which Ch contains, beyond what is to be found in K, is unhistorical, has turned out to be groundless. Thus, e.g., it would be impossible to understand the earlier prophecies of Isaiah under Jotham at all, if it did not appear from Ch to what prosperity and influence the people of Judah had by that time again attained. For it is only Ch that give us an account of the flourishing reign of his predecessor Uzziah, who is treated but briefly in K.

The chronology of the earlier portions of the period of the Kings is dependent on the date of the division of the kingdom. This date can be decided on the basis of the chronological order of the Books of K, which do not indeed agree in all particulars, but are to be adjusted by the Assyrian chronology. If we, with Kamp-hausen, Oettli and Kittel, regard the year 937 BC as the year of the division of the kingdom, then Solomon ruled from 977 to 937; David, from 1017 to 977. The length of the reign of Saul is not known, as the text of 1 S 13 1 is defective. It is very probable that we can credit him with about twenty years, according to Jos (1 K, X, viii), i.e., from about 1037-1017. In this case David transferred the seat of government to Jerusalem about the year 1010, and the completion of the erection of the temple of Solomon took place in 966. But this basis date of 937 is not accepted as correct by all scholars. Klostermann places the date of the rupture of the kingdom in the year 978; Koehler, in 973. For later chronological data, Assyrian sources are an important factor. The Assyrians were accustomed to call each year after the name of an official (lunu), and eponym lists are extant for 228 years. In these reference is made to an eclipse of the sun, which astronomically has been settled as having taken place on July 15, 765. We have in this list them the period from 1000 to 775, and it is made possible to determine the exact dates of the different military expeditions of the Assyrian rulers and their conflicts with the kings of Judah and Israel, on the presupposition, however, that the Assyrian inscriptions here used really speak of these kings, which in a number of cases is denied. Valuable help for determining the chronology of this period is the fall of Samaria in the year 722 and the expedition of Sennacherib against Jerusalem in 701, and also the fact that the earliest known distribution of the years between these dates to the individual kings is in places doubtful, as the numbers in the text are possibly corrupt, and in the synchronistic data of the Books of K mistakes may have been made.

V. Period of the Separated Kingdoms.—The two separated kingdoms differed materially. The kingdom of Ephraim was the more

1. Contrasts and Vicissitudes of the Kingdom.

of the city of Samaria, which was well adapted for this purpose. The dynasties, too, were only of short duration. It occurred but rarely that one family was able to maintain its supremacy on the throne through the Judahite centuries. The dynastic character remained fixed in this kingdom and became its permanent weakness. On the other hand, the smaller and often overpowered kingdom of Judah, which faithfully adhered to the royal line of David, passed through dangerous crises and had many unworthy rulers. But the legitimate royal house, which had been selected by Jeh, constituted spiritually a firm bond, which kept the people united, as is seen, e.g., by a glance at the addresses of Isaiah, who is thoroughly filled with the conviction of the importance of the house of David, no matter how unworthy the king who happened to rule might appear to him. In a religious respect, also, the arbitrary break with Zedon proved to be fatal for the Northern Kingdom.

Jeroboam.—It is true that faithful prophets of Jeh, such as the Abijah of Shiloh mentioned above, and Shemaiah (1 K 12 22 ff), proclaimed that the faithful division of the kingdom was a Divine judgment, and that Jeroboam was to be the instrument of it. But they soon were compelled to reach the conclusion that Jeroboam did not regard himself as a servant of Jeh, but as a sovereign who, through his own successor and the division of the kingdom, had secured the rule, and hence could arbitrarily decide all matters in reference to the cultus and the sacred sanctuaries of the people. According to his own will, and for political reasons, he established the new national sanctuary on Mount Gerizim. It was in these new sanctuaries that the Assyrans, by their military expeditions, were able to introduce their god, Assur, and the worship of the king, who thus became a god and Parthian symbol, in opposition to the old sanctuaries, too, walked "in the ways of Jeroboam." The independent prophets, however, did not die out, but, rather, prophecy developed its greatest activity in this very Northern Kingdom. As a rule, in its work it stood in opposition to the government, but at times it succeeded in gaining the recognition of the rulers.

Omri.—The earliest times of the divided kingdoms are, from a political point of view, character-

ized by a series of wars, among which the struggle of the peoples of the Euphrates and the Tigris, namely Assyria and Babylon, still had enough to do with themselves, and did not yet make any inroads into the Mediterranean lands; but, rather, it was the Syrians who first caused a good deal of trouble to the Northern Kingdom. Jerryboam did not succeed in founding a dynasty. Already his son Nadab was eliminated by a usurper, Baasha. The latter’s son, Elah, was murdered, after a reign of two years. It was not, however, his murderer Zimri, or Omri, who strove to secure the kingdom for himself, but Omri who became king (1 K 16), and who also attained to such prominence abroad that the cuneiform inscriptions for a long time after call Israel "the land of Omri." His ability as a ruler was quite remarkable. He took possession of Samaria as the capital city was his work. The inscription on the Mesha stone reports that he
also established the sovereignty of Israel vigorously on the east side of the Jordan.

**Ahab.**—His son Ahab, too, was an energetic and brave ruler, who succeeded in gaining a number of victories over the Syrians, who were now beginning to assume the offensive in a determined manner. Then, too, he was politic enough to win over to his interests the kingdom of Judah, with which his predecessors had lived in almost constant warfare. In this policy he succeeded, because the noble and large-hearted king Jehoshaphat was more receptive to such fraternal relations than was good for him. Ahab's covenants by these means with the kings against Syria brought Jehoshaphat into extreme danger and ended with the death of Ahab.

Ahab's fate was his wife Jezebel, the daughter of the Phoen king Ethbaal (Ichobal, according to Jos, Ant. VIII, xiii, 2 and Cap., I, 18), who had been a priest of Astarte. This intermarriage with a fanatical heathen family brought untold and endless misfortune over all Israel. This bold and scheming woman planned nothing less than the overthrow of the religion of Jehovah, and the substitution for it of the Baal and the Astarte cultus. As a first step she succeeded in having in the king tolerate this religion. The leading temple in the new resident city, Samaria, was dedicated to the Baal cultus, and this intangible lazzicous ethic religion was a great danger to the religion and the morals of the people. Hosts of Baal priests, ecstatic dervishes, traversed the country. Soon the queen undertook to persecute the Assyrian king, Zerubbabel. The men protested against the tolerance of the foreign false religion was interpreted as disobedience on their part to the king. Many faithful prophets were put to death. At this critical period, when the existence of the religion of Jehovah was at stake, the prophet Elijah, the Tishbite, appeared on the stage, and through a bitter struggle reestablished the worship of Jehovah. However, the fateful influence that this woman exerted was thereby not yet destroyed. It extended to Judah also.

**Rehoboam.**—In the kingdom of Judah, apart from the apostasy of different tribes, which left him only the vigorous tribe of Judah and portions of Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and Levi, Rehoboam experienced all the disadvantages, namely, the territorial and tribute imposition by King Shishak of Egypt (Egyg Sheshonk, founder of the XXIId Dynasty; 1 K 14 25 f.; cf. 2 Ch 12 2 ff). While under Solomon the relations of Israel to the Egypt court had in the beginning been very friendly, this was changed when a new dynasty came to the throne. After Jeroboam had failed in his first revolutionary project, he had found refuge at the court of Shishak (1 K 11 40). It is possible that Jeroboam made the Egyptian king lustful for the treasures of Jerusalem. The Egyptians did not, as a matter of fact, stop at the Ephraimitic boundaries, but in part also invaded the territory of Jeroboam; but their chief objective was Jerusalem, from which they carried away the treasures that had been gathered by Solomon. On the temple wall of Karnack this Pharaoh has inscribed the story of this victory and booty. From the names of the cities found in this inscription, we learn that this expedition extended as far as Megiddo and Taanach.

**Jehu.**—Rehoboam was succeeded by his son Abijah, or Abijah, according to Ch (the Abijam of K is hardly correct). He ruled only 3 years. But even during this short reign he was compelled to engage in a severe struggle with Jeroboam (1 K 15 18 f.; cf. 2 Ch 13).

**Asa.**—In every respect the reign of the God-fearing Asa, who sought to destroy the heathenism that had found its way into the cultus, was more fortunate. He also experienced Jeh's wonderful help when the Cushite Zerah made an incursion into his land (2 Ch 14 8 ff; i.e. probably the Cushite Zerah, cf. 2 K 18 21). This incursion was quelled by King Asa, who, however, did not belong to an Ethiopian dynasty. Possibly he is called an Ethiopian because he came into the country with Nubian troops. Less honorable was his conduct in the conflict with Baasha. When he was sorely pressed by the latter he bought, through the payment of a large tribute, the assistance of the Syrian king, Ben-hadad I, who, up to this time had been an ally of Baasha. This bribing of foreigners to fight against their own country was at first averted, but, when repeated, was rebuked by a bold prophet in the presence of the pious king, but the prophet was compelled to suffer abuse for his open testimony (2 Ch 16 7 ff).

**Jehoshaphat.**—A much more noble conduct characterized the dealings of Jehoshaphat in relation to the Northern Kingdom. His fault was that he entered too fully into the selfish offers of friendship made by Ahab. The worst step was that, in order to confirm his covenant, he married for his son Ahaziah as wife, Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab. Jehoshaphat was a chivalrous ally, who also joined Ahab's son, Jehoram, in a dangerous war against the Moabites; as this people under their king Moab had made themselves free from Jehoshaphat and his kingdom, and were hostile against them. For the inner affairs of the kingdom his reign was more fortunate. He was a God-fearing and an energetic prince, who did much to elevate the people in a material and a religious way and perfected its political organization. Nor did he fail to secure some noteworthy successes. However, the fact that the warning words of the prophets who rebuked him because of his alliance with the half-heathenish house of Omri were not the fanatical exaggeration of pessimistic seers, appears at once after his death.

**Jehoram.**—His son Jehoram, after the manner of oriental despots, at once caused his brothers to be put to death, of which doubtless his wife Athaliah was the cause. This woman transplanted the policy of Jezebel to Judah, and was scheming for the downfall of the house of David and its sanctuary. Under Jehoram the power of Judah accordingly began to sink rapidly. Edom became independent. The Philis, the Phoen-Lyvians, and the royal princes, with the exception of Ahaziah, the youngest son of Athaliah, were expelled. When the latter ascended the throne she had the absolute power in her hands.

**Jehu.**—During this time the judgment over the house of Omri was fast approaching. The avenger came in the person of the impetuous Jehu, who had been anointed king by one of the disciples of Elisha in the camp of Rarnoth in Gilead. According to 1 K 19 16, the order had already been given to Elijah to raise this man to the throne; but the compliance with this command appears to have been delayed. As soon as Jehu became aware that he was entrusted with this mission, he hastened to Jerreld, where Ahaziah, king of Judah, was just paying a visit to Jehoram, and slew them both. With heartless severity he extended this slaughter, not only to all the members of the house of Omri, together with Jezebel, but also to those numerous members of the Davidic royal house who fell into his hands. He likewise destroyed the adherents of Baal, whom he invited to their death in their sanctuary at Samaria. Deserved as this judgment upon the house of Jeroboam was (2 K 10 30), which Jehu, according to his own words, here set out, he did this in an unholy mind and with harshness and ambitious purpose. The puritanical Rechabites had sanctioned his action; but as more and more the true character of Jehu began to reveal
itself, he lost the sympathies of the pious, and Hosea announced to his house the vengeance for his bloody crimes at Jezebel (Hos 1:4).

Assyria.—The invasion of the Western part of the Assyrians in the time of Ahab, under king Shalmaneser II, had forced their way as far as Karkar on the Orontes, and they had fought a battle in 854 with the Syrians and their allies, among whom Ahab is also mentioned, with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 soldiers. If this is really Ahab, the king of Israel, which is denied by some, then he, at that time, fought against Assyria in conjunction with the Syrians, who otherwise had been so bitterly attacked by him. The Assyrians boast of this victory, but seem to have won it at a heavy price, as they did not press farther westward. When in 842 Shalmaneser came a second time, Jehu was certainly not among the allies of the Syrians. The Assyrians do not seem, on this occasion, to have been opposed by so powerful a league, and were able to attack the Syrians whom they conquered at Saniru (Hermon, Anti-Lebanon) in a much more determined manner. They laid siege to Damascus and had the interior provinces captured. Their forays, however, were rebuffed by a band of Israelites under the Hauran and Bashan, and they made a desert. In their march of victory they pressed forward as far as the Mediterranean. Phoenicia and other countries brought tribute. Among these nations Shalmaneser II mentioned, with especial mention of Jehu, the son of Omri (II Kgs. 10:32), who was compelled to deliver up gold and silver bars and other valuable possessions. But this expensive homage on the part of Jehu did not help much. Shalmaneser came only once more (839 B.C.), the eastern neighbors of the Assyrians did not appear again for a period of 35 years. All the more vigorously did the Syrians and other neighboring people make onslaughts on Israel. How fearfully they devastated Israel appears from Am 1.

Jehoahaz.—Under his son Jehoahaz the weakness of Israel became still greater. In his helplessness, the Lord finally sent him a deliverer (2 Kgs 11:3 ff). This deliverer was none other than the Assyrian king, Assur-bani-pal III (812–758 B.C.), who, through a military incursion, had secured anew his supremacy over Western Asia, and had besieged the king of Damascus and had forced him to pay an immense tribute. In this way Israel, which had voluntarily rendered subjects, was relieved of its embarrassment by the weakening of Syria.

Jehoshaphat, the son of Jehoahaz, experienced more favorable conditions. He also conquered Amaziah, the king of Judah; and his son, Jehoram II, even succeeded in restoring the old boundaries of the kingdom, as the prophet Jonah had predicted (2 Kgs 11:14 24:1 ff). His reign was the last flourishing period of the kingdom of Ephraim. See, further, Israel, Kingdom of.

Jehoshaphat.—The kingdom of Judah, in the meanwhile, had passed through severe crises. The most severe was caused by that Athaliah, who, after the murder of her son Ahaziah by Jehu, had secured absolute control in Jerusalem, and had abused this power in order to root out the family of David. Only one son of the king, Joash, escaped with his life. He, a boy of one year, was hidden in the temple by a relative, where the high priest Jehoiada, who belonged to the party opposed to the heathen-minded queen, concealed him for a period of 6 years. When Joash was 7 years old, Jehoiada, at a wellequipped timing, proclaimed him king. His elevation to the throne, in connection with which event the terrible Athaliah was put to death, introduced at the same time an energetic reaction against the heathenism of the people and even into Judah, and which the queen had in every way favored.

Joash was predestined to be a theocratic king. And, in reality, in the beginning of his reign of 40 years, he went hand in hand with the priests and the prophet of Jehu. After Jehoiada's death, however, he tolerated idolatrous worship among the princes (2 Ch 24:17 ff), and by doing so came into conflict with the faithful prophet Zechariah, the son of his benefactor Jehoiada, who rebuked him for his wrong, and was even stoned. A just punishment for this guilt was recognized in the misfortune which overtook the king and his country. The Syrian king, Hazael, when he was engaged in an expedition against Gath, also took possession of Jerusalem and made it pay tribute, after having apparently inflicted a severe defeat on the people of Judah, on which occasion many princes fell in the battle and Joash himself was severely wounded. Toward the end of his reign there was also much dissatisfaction among his subjects, and some of his courtiers finally murdered him (2 Kgs 12:21).

Amaziah.—However, his son Amaziah, who now ascended the throne, punished the murderers. The king was successful in war against the Edomites. This made him bold. He ventured to meet Joash, the king of Israel, and the result was that Joash and his army were defeated and captured. The people of Judah suffered the deepest humiliation. A large portion of the walls of Jerusalem was torn down (2 Kgs 14:11 ff). Amaziah did not feel himself safe even in his own capital city, because of the disaster that had befallen him. He fled to Lachish. Here he was murdered. So deep had Judah fallen, while Jeroboam II succeeded in raising his kingdom to an unthought-of power.

Uzziah.—But for Judah a turn for the better soon set in under this son of Azariah in K, the son of Amaziah, who enjoyed a long and prosperous reign.

Prosperous as Israel outwardly appeared to be during the reigns of these two kings, Jeroboam II and Uzziah, the religious and moral conditions of the people were just as little satisfactory. This is the testimony of the Prophets of the prophets Amos and Hosea, as also of Isaiah and Micah, who not much later began their active ministry in Judah. It is indeed true that these were not the first prophets to put into written form some of their prophetic utterances. The prophecies of Obadiah and Joel are by many put at an earlier date, namely Obadiah under Jehoram in Judah, Joel under Jeroboam in Israel, and Joel under Jeroboam in Judah. At any rate, the discourses of the prophets from this time on constitute an important contemporary historical source. They illustrate esp. the spiritual condition of the nation. Through these writings complaints are made concerning the heathen superstitions and the godless cultus of the people, and esp. the corruption in the administration of the laws, oppression of the poor and the helpless by the rich and the powerful, and pride and luxury of all kinds. In all these things the prophets see a terrible apostasy on Israel's part. But also the foreign policy of the different kings, who sought help, now of the one and then of the other of the world-powers (Egypt, Assyria), and tried to buy the favor of these nations, the prophets regarded as adultery with foreign nations and as infidelity toward Jeh. As a punishment they announced, since all other misfortunes sent upon them had been of no avail, an invasion through a conqueror whom Amos and Hosea always indicate shall be Assyria, and also deportations of the people into a heathen land, and an end of the Jewish state. Improvable as these threats may have seemed to the self-satisfied inhabitants of Samaria, they were speedily realized.

Successors of Jeroboam II.—After the death of Jeroboam, the strength of the Northern Kingdom...
collapsed. His son Zechariah was able to maintain the throne for only 6 months, and his murderer Shallum only one month. The general Menahem, who put him out of the way, maintained himself as king for 10 years, but only by paying a heavy tribute to the powerful King Tiglath-pileser III, who ruled from 745–727 (cf 2 K 15 19 f).

Pekah.—His son Pekahiah, on the other hand, soon fell by the hands of the murderer Pekah (2 K 15 25), who allied himself with Syria against Judah. The latter, however, invited the Assyrians to come into the country; and these, entering in the year 734 BC, put an end to the reign of this usurper, although he was actually put to death as late as 730 BC.

 Hoshea.—The last king of the Northern Kingdom, Hoshea (730–722 BC), had the Assyrians to thank for his throne; but he did not keep his fidelity as a vassal very long. As soon as Tiglath-pileser was dead, he tried to throw off the Assyrian yoke. But his successor Shalmaneser IV (727–722 BC), who already in the first year of his reign had again subdued the rebellious king Elaloeus of Samaria, soon compelled Hoshea also to submit to his authority. Two years later Hoshea again joined a confederacy of the Phœnician cities against Assyria, in which they even counted on the help of the Egyptian king, who, in the Bible, is called So or Seve (Egypt name is Shabaka). Now the Assyrians lost all patience. They at once came with their armies. Hoshea sought to have voluntarily submitted to the power of the Great King, who then made him a captive. The people, however, continued the struggle. Samaria, the capital city, was besieged, but did not fall until the 3rd year (722 BC) into the hands of the enemy. Shalmaneser, in the meanwhile, had died. Sargon, his successor, the city was indeed not destroyed, but a large portion of the inhabitants, esp. the leaders, were deported and transplanted to Northern Mesopotamia and to Media. Sargon states that the number of deported Israelites was 27,290. Prominent persons from other cities were also doubtless to be included in those deported. On the other hand, the Assy king settled Bab and Syrian prisoners of war in Samaria (721 BC), and in the year 715 BC, Arama, the land of the Syrians, was given to his successor. The city was indeed not destroyed, but a large portion of the inhabitants, esp. the leaders, were deported and transplanted to Northern Mesopotamia and to Media. Sargon states that the number of deported Israelites was 27,290. Prominent persons from other cities were also doubtless to be included in those deported. On the other hand, the Assy king settled Bab and Syrian prisoners of war in Samaria (721 BC), and in the year 715 BC, Arama, the land of the Syrians, was given to his successor. In the year 692 BC, which is a very approximate estimate of the period, the Bab city of Cuthah is several times mentioned, on account of which city the Jews afterward called the Samarians Cuthites. This report also makes mention of the religious syncretism, which of necessity resulted from the mixture of the people. But we must be careful not to place at too small figures the number of Israelites who remained in the country. It is a great exaggeration when it is claimed, as it is by Friedrich Delitzsch, that the great bulk of the inhabitants of the country of Samaria, or even of Galilee, was from this time on Babylonian.

Uziah and Jotham.—The kingdom of Judah, however, outlived the danger from Assyria. As King Uziah later in his life suffered from leprosy, he had Jotham as co-regent during this period. The earliest discourses of Isaiah, which belong to this period (Isa 2–4, 5), show that in Jerusalem the people were at that time still enjoying the fruits and prosperity of a long period of peace. But immediately after the death of Uziah, when the youthful Ahaz began to rule, the onslaught of the allied Syrians and Ephraimites took place under Rezin, or better Rezon, and Pekah. This alliance purposed to put an end to the Davidic reign in Jerusalem, probably for the purpose of making this people, too, a member of the league against the dangerous Assyrians. The good-sized army of Judah seems to have fallen a victim to the superior power of the allies before the situation described in Isa 7 could be realized, in which the siege of the city is described as a triumph of Judah. But it seems also at that time advanced against Judah. Elath, the harbor city on the Red Sea, from which Uzziah, too, as had been done by Solomon long before, sent out trading vessels, at that time came into their power. For 2 K 18 6 probably speaks of Edom and not of Aram (of 2 Ch 38 17). In his anxiety, Ahaz, notwithstanding the advice of Isaiah to the contrary, then appealed to the king of Assyria, and the latter actually put in his appearance in 734 BC and overcame the power of Syria and Ephraim, as we have seen above. However, the intervention of this world-power brought no benefit to Judah. Without this disgraceful appeal to a heathen ruler, Jeh, according to the promise of Isaiah, would have protected Judah, if Ahaz had only believed. And the Assyrians did not prevent the Philistines and the Edomites from falling upon Judah. The Assyrians themselves soon came to be the greatest danger threatening Judah. Ahaz, however, was an unstable character in religion, a mischievous and debauched heathen forms of worship, and even sacrificed his son to the angry sun-god, in order to gain his favor. The tribute that the people had to pay to Assyria was already a heavy burden on this little kingdom.

Hezekiah.—His noble and God-fearing son, Hezekiah (721–696 BC), was also compelled to suffer from the consequences of this misgovernment. The temptation was great to enter into an alliance with his neighbors and the Egyptians, so strong in cavalry, for the purpose of relieving Judah of the burdensome yoke of his Assyrian master. Isaiah warned against such unworthy self-help. At the advice of the ministers of Hezekiah, and because of the trust put in Egypt, the tribute was finally refused to the Assyrians. Hezekiah also sought to establish closer connections with Media and Babylonia, the king of Babylon and the enemy of the Assyrians, when the latter, after a dangerous sickness of the Assyrian king, had sent messengers to Jerus in order to congratulate him on the restoration of his health. This a great calamity, which continued in a state of desolation, so that Esarhaddon (680–666 BC) and Ashurbanipal (667–626 BC) sent new colonists there, which last mentioned sending them from Babylonia, Persia and Media (cf 2 K 18 17). In the year 720 BC, Pekah, king of Samaria, was defeated by Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, in a battle near Megiddo. The place name is mentioned in connection with the Assyrian campaigns under Sennacherib in the year 701 BC.

Sennacherib.—In the year 702 BC Sennacherib, with a powerful army, marched over the Lebanon and subdued the rebellious Phœnician cities, and marched along the seacoast to Philistia. The inhabitants of Ekron had sent their king, Padi, who sympathized with the Assyrians, to Hezekiah. Sennacherib came to punish Ekron and Ascalon. But he was particularly anxious to overpower the kingdom of Judah, which was so strong under his father, and depopulated. Now Hezekiah recognized his danger, and offered to submit to Sennacherib. The latter accepted his submission conditionally on the payment of a burdensome tribute, which Hezekiah delivered faithfully (2 K 19 14–16). Then Sennacherib was no longer satisfied with the tribute alone, but sent troops who were to despoil Jerus. Isaiah, who surely had not sanctioned the falling away from the Assyrian supremacy and had prophesied that the house of Jerahmeel, when Ahaz died or was put away, would suffer a severe punishment, from that moment, when the conqueror had maliciously broken his word, spoke words of comfort and advised against giving up the city, no matter how desperate the situation seemed to be (Isa 37 1 f). The city was then not given
up, and Sennacherib, on account of a number of things that occurred, and finally because of a pesty- 

cence which broke out in his army, was compelled to 

retreat. He seems to have taken part in 

met his death by violent hands. This deliverance of 

Jerusalem through the miraculous providence of God 

was the greatest triumph of the prophet Isaiah. 

Within his kingdom Hezekiah ruled successfully. 

He also purified the cultus from the heathen in- 

fluences that had forced their way into it, and was 

a predecessor of Josiah in the abolition of the sacri- 

fices on the high places, which had been corrupted by 

these influences.

Manasseh.—Unfortunately, his son Manasseh 

was little worthy of succeeding him. He, in every 

way, favored the idolatry which all along had been 

growing secretly. He inaugurated bloody perse- 

cutions of the faithful prophets of Jeh. According to 

a tradition, which it must be confessed is not 

supported by undoubted testimony, Isaiah also, 

now an old man, became a victim of these perse- 

cutions. Images and altars were openly erected to 

Baal and Astarte. Even in the temple-house on 

Mt. Zion, an image of Astarte was standing. As 

a result, an outburst of fanaticism cut short all 

usuali found their way among the people. At 

the same time the terrible service of Moloch, in 

the valley of Hinnom, demanded the sacrifice of chil- 

dren, and even a son of the king was given over to 

the deities. In the Book of Isaiah there is 

a story of a terrible affliction that Manasseh suffered, 

namely, that an Assyrian general dragged him in chains to 

Babylonia for having violated his promises to 

them, but that he was soon released. This is not 

an accurate version. He seems to have taken part in 

a rebellion, which the brother of the Assyrian king, 

who was also vice-king in Babylon, had inaugu- 

rated. This sad experience may have forced Ma- 

nasseh to a certain kind of repentance, at least, 

so that he distanced from his worst sacrileges. But 

his son Amon continued the old ways of his father, 

until after a brief reign he was put to death.

Josiah.—Much more promising was his young son 

Josiah, who now, only 8 years old, came to the 

throne. It is quite possible that, in view of such 

frequent changes in the disposition of the successors 

to the throne, his mother may have had great in- 

fluence on his character. Concerning Josiah, see 

2 K 22 1 ff. With increasing clearness and con- 
sideration the policy of reform presented itself. Josiah 

and his successors undertook religious and social 

reform. A special impetus to this was given by the 

finding of an old law book in the temple, the 

publication of which for the first time revealed the 

fearful apostasy of the times. The finding of this 

book in the temple, as narrated in 2 K 22 3 ff, took 

place in connection with the restoration of that 

building on a larger scale, which at that time had 

been undertaken. And very probably Édouard 

Naville is right in believing, on the basis of Egypt 

and Babylonian inscriptions, that Josiah was in- 

volved in the foundation wall of the building. 

Whether this had been done already in the days of Solomon 

is not determined by this fact. From the orders 

of Josiah we can conclude that the book which was 

found was Dt, which lays special stress on the fact 

that there shall be a central place for the cultus, and 

also contains such threats as those must have been 

which frightened Josiah. But under no circumstances 

was Dt a law book that had first been written at 

Bethel, where Josiah had not been to Jerus and his helpers. It would rather have been possible that 

the discovered old law was rewritten in changed 

form after its discovery and had been adapted to 

the language of the times. The people were obliged 

to obey the newly discovered law and were in- 

structed in its sense.

Jeremiah.—The prophet Jeremiah also, who a
Daniel 1, near the city of Nippur. From Hiiprere's excavations of this city, it has been learned that this river, or branch of the Euphrates

1. Influence river, is to be found at this place, and of the Exile Chaboras. In the same way, the many conflating tables with Jewish names which have been found at Nippur, suggest that a large Jewish colony lived at that place. Of the fate of these banished Jews for a period of 50 years, we hear almost nothing. But it is possible to learn what their condition was in exile from the Book of Ezekiel and the 2nd part of Isaiah. Nehemiah, a son of Josiah, called Mattaniah, who afterward was called Zedekiah. He governed for twelve years (597-586 BC), and by his life, morally and religiously corrupt, sealed the fate of the house and of the kingdom of David. The better class among the leading and prominent people had been banished. As a result, the courtiers of the king urged him to try once again some treacherous schemes against the Bab rulers and to join Egypt in a conspiracy against them. However, Jeremiah and Ezekiel warned against this policy, Zedekiah nevertheless constantly yielded to his evil advisers and to the warlike patriotic party, who were determined to win back by battle the independence of the small heathen kingdom he had assured the Great King of his loyalty (Jer 52:3), and still in the 4th year of his reign had personally visited in Babylon as a mark of his fidelity (Jer 52:50), he was induced in the 9th year of his reign to make yet another alliance with the Egyptians against the Babylonians and to refuse to render obedience to the latter. Nebuchadnezzar soon came and surrounded the city. At the announcement that an Egyptian army was approaching, the siege was again raised, and it was only when the prophet anathematized him that Zedekiah on his ally failed him. The Babylonians began again to starve out the city. After a siege of 18 months, resistance proved futile. The king tried secretly to break through the circle of besiegers, but in doing so was taken prisoner, was blinded by the Bab king and taken to Babylon. The majority of the prominent men and state officials, who were taken to the encampment of the conqueror in Riblah, were put to death. The conqueror, however, kept together with the temple, were totally destroyed. Nearly all the inhabitants who could be captured after the slaughter were dragged into captivity, and only people of the lower classes were left behind to cultivate the land. Gedaliah, a noble-minded aristocrat, was appointed governor of the city, and took up his residence in Mizpah. At this place it seemed that a new kernel of the people was being gathered. Jeremiah also went there. However, after two months this good beginning came to an end. Gedaliah was slain by Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, an anti-Chaldean, a fanatical and revengeful descendant of the house of David. The murderer acted in cooperation with certain Ammonites and Aramaeans, who were driven into the temple, and also in cooperation with the king of Ammon. The Jews in later times considered the murder of Gedaliah as an especially great national calamity, and fasted on the anniversary of this crime. And as the people also feared the revenge of the Babylonians, many migrated to Egypt, compelling Jeremiah, now an old man, to accompany them, although he prophesied to them that no good would come of this scheme. They first stayed at the border city Taanach, near Pelusium, and then scattered over Upper and Lower Egypt.

2. Daniel—The inhabitants of Judah, who had been deported by Nebuchadnezzar at different times, were settled by him in Babylonia, e.g. at the river Chebar (Ezk 1:1).
this temple had been spared on one occasion by Cambyses, who was in Egypt from 525 to 521 BC. The answer of Baghai also has been preserved, and he directs that the temple is to be built again and that the megaliths and incense are again to be introduced. The megaliths are thus known to the temple in the letter is made only of the unbloody sacrifices, while in the first letter burnt sacrifices also are named. The sacrifices of animals by the Jews would probably have assuaged too much the anger of the devotees of the divinities which was wounded at Sardis. Up to the present time we knew only of the much later temple of the high priest Onias IV at Leontopolis (160 BC).

1. Career of Cyrus (Cyrus), first made himself free from the supremacy of Media which, after the capture of the city Ecbatana, became a part of his own kingdom (549 BC). At that time Nabonidus was the king in Babylon (555-538 BC), who was not displeased at the collapse of the kingdom of the Medes, but soon learned that the new ruler turned out to a greater danger to himself. Cyrus subjugated, one after the other, the smaller kingdoms in the north. But Nabonidus was too unwarlike to meet Cyrus. He confined himself to sending his son with an army to the northern boundaries of his kingdom. On the other hand, the king of the Lydians, Croesus, who was related by marriage to King Astyages, who had been subdued by Cyrus, began a war with Cyrus, after he had formed an alliance with Egypt and Sparta. In the year 540 BC, he crossed the river Hydros. Cyrus approached from the Tigris, and in doing so already entered Bab territory, conquered Croesus, took his capital city Sardis, and put an end to the kingdom of Lydia. The pious Israelites in captivity, under the tutelage of Deutero-Isaiah, watched these events with the greatest of interest. For the prophet taught them from the beginning to see in this king "the deliverer," who was the instrument of Jeh for the return of the Israelites out of captivity, and who 

VII. Return from the Exile and the Restoration.
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round about them, esp. from the mixed peoples of Samaria. Samaria was the breeding-place for this hostility against Jerus. The governor at that place, Sanballat, was the head of this hostile league. The Samaritans had already contracted with foreign women, should be dissolved. But this exclusiveness was the outcome of legal conscientiousness, and at this period it was probably necessary for the self-preservation of the people of Jor.

Malachi — the prophet of Malachi, who was almost a contemporary of the two mentioned, it can be seen that the marriages with the foreign women had also brought with them a loosening of even the most sacred family ties (Mal 2 14f.). After an interval of 12 years, Nehemiah again returned to Shushan to the court; and when he later returned to Jerus he was compelled once more to inaugurate a stringent policy against the lawlessness which was violating the sanctity of the temple and of the sacred family ties. Nehemiah, a grandson of Manasseh, a grandson of the high priest, who had married a daughter of Sanballat. This Manasseh, according to Jos (Ant, XI, viii, 2), erected the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim, and established the priesthood at that place. This is no doubt correct. These accounts of Jos are often combined without cause with the times of Alexander the Great, although they transpired about 110 years earlier.

The history of the Jews in the last decades of the Persian rule is little known. Under Artaxerxes III (Ochus), they were compelled to suffer much, when they took part in a rebellion of the Phoenicians and Cyripians. Many Jews were at that time banished to Hircania on the southern coast of the Caspian Sea. The Pers general, Bagoas, afterwards forced them to leave the temple (Jos, Ant, XI, vii, 1). He undertook to install as high priest, in the place of John (Jochanan), his brother Joshua (Jesus). The latter, however, was slain by the former in the temple. For the first time the high priest appears as more of a political position, something that it never was in the pre-Exilic times, and according to the law was not to be.

VIII. The Jews under Alexander and His Successors. — As the Jews were then tired of the rule of the priests, they were not dissatisfied with the victorious career of Alexander the Great. He appears to have assumed a friendly attitude toward them, even if the story reported by Jos (Ant, XI, viii, 4) is scarcely historical. The successors of Alexander were also, as a rule, tolerant in religious matters. But for political and geographical reasons, Pal suffered severely in these times, as it lay between Syria and Egypt, and was an object of attack both of the leading ruling families in this period, the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucidae in Syria. At the same time Hellenism, which had been so powerfully advanced by Alexander as a factor of civilization and culture, penetrated the land of Israel also. Or culture and language spread soon in Pal and in many places was supreme. The more strict adherents of Judaism recognized in this a danger to the Mosaic order of life and religion, and all the more zealously they now adhered to the traditional ordinances.

These are called imi (Heb. "the proscriptions") or hokhadim (Aramaic, Hodeshadi). 1 Macc 42; 7 13; 2 Macc 14 6). The world-transforming Hellenistic type of thought spread esp. among the aristocrats and the politically prominent, and even found adherents among the priests, while the hokhadim belonged to the less conspicuous ranks of the people.

A struggle for life and death was caused between these two tendencies by the Syrian king, Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), into whose hands the sovereignty of Pal had fallen. He undertook nothing less than to root out the hated Jewish religion. In the year 166 BC he commanded that the temple of Jeh in Jerus should be dedicated to the Olympian Jupiter and forlaid most stringently the observance of the Sabbath and circumcision. A large portion of the people did not resist his oppression, but adapted themselves to this tyrannical heathendom. Others were forced and died as martyrs. In 165 BC a priest, Mattathias, gave the signal for a determined resistance, at the head of which stood his brave brethren, the Hasmoneans, or Maschiyaus. From this time, they undertook the leadership of the faithful. He succeeded in freeing Jerus from the yoke of Persia, and the temple on Mt. Zion. The temple was dedicated anew and was given over to the old cultus. After a number of victorious campaigns, Judah the Hasmonean was taken by the death of a hero in 161 BC. His brother, Jonathan, who took his place at the head of the sect, could not secure the independence of the land rather through deliberate planning than through military power. He assumed, in addition to his sacred office of high-priestly dignity. After his death by violence in 143 BC, he was succeeded by his brother Simon, the latter, of this double honor. The Hasmoneans, however, rapidly became worldly minded and lost the sympathies of the people. The son of a certain Simon of Samaria, John Hyrcanus (135—100 BC), broke entirely with the Pious, and his family, after his death, came to an end in disgraceful struggles for the rule of the land fell into the hands of Herod, a tyrant of Idumaean origin, who was supported by the Romans. From 37 BC he was the recognized king of Judah. See ASMONIAE; MACCABEES.

IX. The Romans. — After the death of Herod (4 BC), the kingdom, according to his last will, was to be divided among his three sons.

1. Division of the Roman Territories. — Archelaus received Judaea; Antipas, of territory Galilæa; Philip, the rest of Syria and other lands in the north. However, Archelaus was soon deposed by the Romans (6 AD), and Judaea was made a part of the province of Syria, but was put under special Roman procurator, who resided in Caesarea. These procurators (the best known was Pontius Pilate, 26—36 AD), had no other object than to plunder the land and the people. In this way the conflict was gradually generated between the people and their oppressors, which ended with the destruction of Jerus by the Romans in 70 AD. As early as the reign of Titus, 70—81 AD, the Romans took Jerusalem, the capital, and destroyed the temple.

2. Destruction of the Romans. — As early as the reign of Titus, 70—81 AD, the Romans took Jerusalem, the capital, and destroyed the temple.

King Agrippa I, who was again ruling the whole territory of Herod, succeeded in adjusting the conflict. His son Agrippa II (135—100 AD) built a much smaller kingdom (40—100 AD). He, too, sought to prevent the people from undertaking a struggle with the Romans, but in vain. By his unscrupulous treatment of the people, the procurator Gessius Florus drove the Jews into an insurrection. The Zealots gained the upper hand. Florus was compelled to leave Jerus (66 AD). Even the good-sized city which Cestius Gallus commanded could not get control of the city, but was completely overpowered by the Jews on its retreat at Bethhoron. Now the entire country rose in rebellion, The Romans, under the leadership of Vespasian,
advanced with considerable power and first conquered Galilee, then under Jos (67 AD). In Jerusalem, in the meanwhile, different parties of the Jews were still fighting each other. Titus, the son of Vas- pasian, took the chief command after Vespasian had already conquered the E. Jordan country and the western coast, but had hastened to Rome in order to become emperor. Titus completely surrounded the city a few days before the Passover festival in the year 70. On the northern side the Romans first broke through the first and newest city wall, and later that the southern. The third offered a longer resistance, and at the same time famine wrought havoc in Jerusalem. At last the battle raged about the temple, during which this structure went up in flames. According to the full description by Jos (B.J., VI, iv, 3-6), Titus tried to prevent the destruction of the temple; according to Sulpicius Severus (Chron. II, 20), however, this destruction was just what he wanted. A few fortified places yet maintained themselves after the fall of Jerusalem, e.g. Machaerus in the E. Jordan country, but all held out very long.

Later insurrection of Bar-Cochba.—Once again the natural ambition for independence burst out in the insurrection of Bar-Cochba (132-35 AD). Peering law, esp. Rabbi Akiba, who enkindled this fire, in order to rid the country of the Gentiles. However, notwithstanding some temporary successes, this insurrection was hopeless. Both the city and the country were devastated by the enraged Romans still more fearful, and were depopulated still more than in 70. From that time Jerusalem was lost to the Jews. They lived on without a country of their own, without any political organization, without a sanctuary, in the Diaspora among the nations.

The spiritual and religious life of the Jews during the period preceding the dissolution of the state was determined particularly by the

3. Spiritual Life in the Period

the teaching of Jesus Christ. —The crown of the history of Israel-Judah was the appearance of Jesus Christ. Looked at superficially, it may indeed appear as though His person and His life had but little influence on the development of the national history of Israel. However, more closely viewed, we shall see that this entire history has its goal in Him and finds its realization in Him. After full fruit had developed out of this stock, the latter withered and died. He was to be the bearer of salvation for all mankind.

LITERATURE.—The earliest historian of Israel was the Jew, Flavius Josephus, in the 1st Christian cent. His example was followed by few in the early church, and we mention only the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus. The Eusebius, the history of his De Civitate Dei. It was only in the 17th cent. that a keen interest was awakened in this subject. Cf. esp. James Usher, Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti, London, 1605; J. B. Bousset, Discours sur l'histoire universelle, Paris, 1861; Rumpf, Priester, The Old and the New Testament Connected in the History of the Jews and Neighboring Nations, 2 vols., London, 1716; S. Shukford, The Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected, London, 1727, this work treating the subject apologetically against the Deists. Cf also J. Sauvain, Discoveries historiques, Amsterdam, 1720. Cocceius and his school systematized this history on the basis of their theological conviction of a general apocalyptic vision. Frankfort, 1724. More systematic is the work of Vitringa, Hypothese historiae et chronologiae sacrae, Frankfort, 1708. The work of Chemnitz furnished the excellent work of Franz Budde, Historiae Ecclesiae Veteris Testamenti, Jena, 1715. In recent times, the school furnished some good general overviews of the history of Israel, such as CH. F. Reuss, Einleitung in die bibl. Geschichte, 1700. More popular is the work of J. J. Hess. The best Catholic work from this time is J. Jahn's Archæologia, 1802; while the Rationalistic period furnished Lorenz Bauer's Geschichte der hebr. Nation, 1800. In the 19th cent. the rationalistic and the conservative tendencies run parallel, and a new impulse was given to the study of this history by the phenomenal archaeological finds in Egypt and in Assyria and Babylonia. Critical reconstruction of Israel's history characterized the works of Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen. Other works of prominence are the Geschichte des Volkes Gottes, by Ewald; Krebs, Geschichte des alten Bundes (these are: Hidde, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, with critical tendency. The work of August Koechler, Lehre der biblischen Geschicht, 1871, is positive, while Wellhausen's Geschichte Israels is a classic of the advanced school. Other works mentioned here are the histories of Roman, Kuenen, Stade, Winslow, Pieplenbrug, Cornill, Gute, Cheyne, and others. Kittel's Geschichte der Hebräer (1875) is more moderate in tone. For the NT the richest storehouse is Schürer's Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (rev.); Hauser's Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte is also good.

FROM THE JEWISH stand-point this history has been treated by S. Friedländer, Geschichte des israelit. Völker; and J. M. Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten; Moritz Raphall, Post-biblical History of the Jews from the Close of the OT till the Destruction of the Second Temple, in the Year 70.

Among English works may be especially mentioned Millman's History of the Jews, Stanley's, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, with smaller works by Octley and others. American works on the subject from the critical point of view are a History of the Heb. People, by Kent, and a History of the Jewish People by Kent and Blegen in the "Historical Series for Bible Students," published by Moors, Scribner. Cf also McCurdy and the Monuments, Toy, Judaism and Christianity; H. F. S. OHELI.
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F. The War of the Maccabees
G. The Rebirth of the Kingdom
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A. Loss of Independence
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LITERATURE

I. THE FIRST PERIOD.—The circumstances leading up to the foundation of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, or the Kingdom of the Ten

1. The Two Tribes, have been detailed under the Kingdoms. When the two kingdoms were viewed in a secular point of view it would be more natural to regard the latter as an offshoot from the former, rather than the converse. But not only is the kingdom of Judah of paramount importance in respect of both religion and literature, but its government also was in the hands of a single dynasty, whereas that of the Northern Kingdom changed hands no less than 8, during the two and a half centuries. Moreover, the Southern Kingdom, by Augustus, was ruled for a time as long as the other.

No sooner had Jerobeam I been elected the first ruler of the newly founded state than he set about managing its affairs with the energy

2. The Ist Dynasty for which he was distinguished (1 K. Dynasty 11-25).

To complete the disruption it has established a sanctuary in opposition to that of Jerus (Hos 8 14), with its own order of priests (2 Ch 11 14; 13 9), and founded two capital cities, Shechem on the W. and Penuel on the E. of the Jordan (1 K. 12 25).

Peace seems to have been maintained between the two kingdoms during the 17 years' reign of Rehobom, but on the accession of his son Abijah war broke out (1 K. 15 6-7; 2 Ch 13 3 ff). Shortly afterward Jerobeam died and was succeeded by his son Nadab,
who was a year later assassinated, and the 1st Dynasty came to an end, after an existence of 23 years, being limited, in fact, to a single reign. Omri, the founder of the dynasty, was a Phoenician king who went to the east to fight the Assyrians and was killed in the battle of Karkar (1 K 15: 29). He was succeeded by his son Ahab, who was a warrior and a warrior-king, but whose reign was cut short by his death in battle against the Moabites (1 K 22: 7).

Ben-hadad, the king of Syria, attempted to seize the throne of Israel, but he was defeated by the Israelites at the battle of the Kadesh (1 K 20: 34). The result of the battle was a defeat for Ben-hadad, and the Israelites were able to assert their independence from Syria.

The period of the Syrian Wars was marked by the rise of the Assyrian Empire, which sought to expand its territory at the expense of its neighbors. The Assyrians were a powerful and aggressive people, and they were able to defeat the Hebrews and other peoples in the region.

The Assyrians were known for their military successes, but they were also known for their cruelty and ruthlessness. They were a nation of warriors, and they were not afraid to use violence to achieve their goals.

In the 8th century BC, the Assyrians began to expand their empire, and they were able to conquer the kingdom of Judah and the city of Jerusalem.

The Assyrians were a powerful and aggressive people, and they were able to defeat the Hebrews and other peoples in the region. They were a nation of warriors, and they were not afraid to use violence to achieve their goals.
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But it was not until the

long reign

of

Jerobam II, son of Joshah, that the

frontiers

of

Israel, were, for the first time since the

beginning

of

the

kingdom, restored to their ideal limits.

Even

Damascus

and

Hamath were subdued (2 K 14 28).

But the prosperity was superficial.

Jer-

obam II stood at the head of a military

oligarchy, who

crushed

the great mass of the people under

them.
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The

dynasty,

which

had been

founded

in

blood

and

had lasted some 90 years, on the

accession

of

Jerobom's son, Zachariah, gave

place to 12 years of anarchy.

Zachariah

was almost immediately

assassinated

by

Shallum, who

within a month

was in turn

assas-

sinated by

Menahem, a soldier of the

tribe

of

Gad, stationed in Tiraah, to

avengen the death of his master.

The

low

social

condition
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Israel at this time is depicted

in the pages of Hos. The atrocities
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soldiers
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Menahem are mentioned by Jos

(1 K 19, xi, 1).

III. Decline and Fall.—Meantime Pul

or Pulu had

founded the second Assyrian empire under

the

name

of

Tiglath-pileser III. Before

conquering

Babylonia, he broke

the power

of

the

Hittites

in the W., and

made himself master of the routes leading to the

Phoen

seasports. As

the

eclipse

of

the

Assyrian

power had allowed the expansion

of

Israel under Jeroboam II, so its revival

now crushed the independence of the nation for-

ever. Menahem bought stability for his throne

by

the

payment

of

an immense

tribute

of

1,000 talents

of

silver, or $2,000,000, reckoning the silver talent

at $2,000. The money was raised by means of an

assessment

of

50 talents
each upon all the men

of

famous

wealth. The payment of this tribute is

mentioned on the Assyrian monuments, the date

being 778.

Menahem reigned 10 years. His son Pekahiah

was, soon after his accession, assassinated by one

of

his own captains, Pekah, son of

Rahasiah, who

with the help of some Gileadites, as

king. He formed an alliance with Rezin of

Damascenus against Israel, defeating Ahas in two pitched

battles, taking numerous captives, and even reaching

the walls of Jerus. The result was disastrous

to both allies. Ahas called in the aid of the Assy-

rians. Tiglath-pileser put an end to the kingdom

of

Damascus, and deported the inhabitants of Northern

and Eastern Pal. The kingdom of Israel was reduced

to the dimensions of the later province of

Samaria. Pekah himself was assassinated by

Hosha-

en, who became under the tutelage of the

Assyr

overlord. The depopulated provinces were

filled

with colonists from the conquered countries of

the East. The year is 734.

Hoshea was never an independent king, but the

mere

vassal

of

Assyria. He was foolish enough to

withhold the annual tribute, and to

turn

to Egypt for succor. Meanwhile, the

king

laid

siege

to

Samaria, but died during the siege. The

city was taken by his successor Sargon, who

had

seized the throne, toward the end of the year

722.

The Northern Kingdom had lasted 240 years,

which

fall into three periods of about 80 years each,

the middle period being the period of the

Syrian wars. It was fully formed when it broke off from the Southern

kingdom, its history shows no development

or evolution, but is made up of undulations of prosperity and of decline. It was at its be-

tween its foundation, and still under Jerob-

boam II. It was strong under Baasha, Omri and

Ahab, but generally weak under the other kings. Every change of dynasty meant a period of anarchy,

when the country was at the mercy of every in-

vader. The fortunes of Israel depended entirely

on those of Assyria. When Assyria was weak,

Israel was strong. Given the advance of Assyria, the destruction of Israel was certain. This was

necessary and was clearly foreseen by Hosea (9 3, etc). The wonder is that the little state, surrounded

by such powerful neighbors, lasted as long as it did. See, further, ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, V.

LITERATURE.—The most important works are Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (ET by Marein

and Glover), Weilhausen, Geschichte Israels; Deen-

bourg, Essai sur l'histoire . . . de la Palestine; and

there are many more. Ewald is best known to En-

glish readers through the medium of Dean Stanley's Lectures

on the History of the Jewish Church. See further

under CHRONOLOGY, ISRAEL, and arts, on individual kings.
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LITERATURE

I. Introduction.—In former times it was the rule to draw out of the OT its religious contents only for dogmatic purposes, without making any distinction between the different books. These writings were all regarded as the documents of the Divine revelation which had been given to this people alone and not to others. At the present time the first inquiry in the study of these books deals historically with the religious development of the Israelites. This religion was not of a strictly uniform nature, but is characterized by a development and a growth, and in the centuries which are covered by the OT books it has passed through many changes. Then, too, in the different periods of this development there were various religious trends among the people and very different degrees in the extent of their religious knowledge. The common people were at times still entangled in crude heathen ideas, while the bearers of a high Divine light ranked vastly above them. And even in those times, when these enlightened teachers secured full recognition, there occurred relapses into lower forms of religion on the part of the masses, esp. because the influence of the nations surrounding Israel at all times made itself felt in the religious life and thoughts of the latter. And even when the correct teachings were accepted by the people, a malformation of the entire religion could readily occur through a petrification of the religious life. It is the business of the science of the history of religion to furnish a correct picture of this development, which in this article can be done only in the form of a sketch.

One of the recent results of the science of the history of religion is the knowledge that the religion of Israel itself, and not merely the corruptions of this religion, stood in a much closer connection with other religions than had in former times been supposed. The wealth of new data from the history of oriental nations lately secured has shown that it is not correct to regard the religion of Israel as an isolated phenomenon, but that considerable light is thrown upon it from analogous facts from surrounding regions. Of especial importance in this respect is the study of Assyr and Bab antiquities, with their rich and illustrative monuments, and, by the side of these, also those of Egypt; and, further, although these are indeed much smaller in number, the inscriptions and monuments of a number of peoples situated much nearer to Israel and ethnologically more closely connected with them, such as the Moabites, Arameans, Arabsians, Canaanites, Phoenicians, and others. For later times, Persia is an esp. important factor.

There have been numerous attempts to connect the religion of Israel and the religions of these nations there existed such close connections that a relationship between them cannot be denied. It is indeed true that these similarities are mostly of a formal nature, but there are those who have come to different conclusions from the Divine Being and of the relation of man to this Being. We find such connecting links in the cultus, in the traditions concerning the creation of the world, concerning the earliest history of mankind, etc.; further, in the conception of what is legally right and of the customs of life; in the ideas concerning death and the world beyond; concerning the souls of men and the supernatural spiritual world, and elsewhere. These analogies and related connections have appeared so pronounced to some scholars, especially Assyriologists, that they are willing to find in the religion of the Israelites and Jews only a reflection of the Bab, or of what they call the "religion of the ancient Orient." But over against this claim, a closer and deeper investigation shows that a higher world of thought and ideals at all times permeates the Israelite religion and gives to it a unique character and a Divine truth, which is lacking in all other religions and which made Israel's religion capable of becoming the basis of that highest Divine revelation which through Christ came forth from it. We will here briefly sketch the progress of the development of this religion, and then formulate a summary of those characteristics which distinguish it from the other religions.

II. Historical Outline.—(1) The traditional view.
   —The sources for this period are meager. Yet what has been reported concerning the religion of the period of the Patriarchs is enough to give us a picture of their conceptions and thoughts. And this picture is more deserving of acceptance than is the representation of the matter by the traditional dogmatists of the church and also that of those modern scholars who are under the influence of a revolutionary idea, and who undertake to prove in the Bib. history of Israel the complete development from the lowest type of fetishism and animism to the heights of ethical monotheism. The views of the old church teachers were not without influence on the doctrine concerning the one true God which had been communicated by God to Adam in its purity and perfection, and by him had been handed through an unbroken chain of true confessors of the faith (Seth, Noah, etc.), down to Abraham. But this view does not find confirmation in the Bib. record. On the contrary, in Josh 24 2.15, it is even expressly stated of the ancestors of Abraham that they had worshipped strange gods in Chaldea. And the ancestors of the people of the land, the Canaanites, and others, do not appear on the stage of history with a teachable creed, but themselves first learn to know gradually, in the school of life, the God whom they serve, after He has made Himself known to them in extraordinary manifestations. Abraham does not yet know that Jehovah does not demand any human sacrifices. Jacob still has the narrow view, that the place where he has slept is the entrance portal to heaven (Gen 28 16.17). Omnipresence and omniscience are not yet attributes which they associate with their idea of the Divinity. They still stand on a simple-minded and primitive stage, as far as their knowledge of the living God is concerned.

(2) The modern view.—Over against this, modern scholars describe pre-Mosaic Israel as yet entirely entangled in Sem heathen ideas, and even regard the religion of the people in general, in the post-Mosaic period down to the 8th cent. BC, as little better than this, since in their opinion the Jehovah-religion had not thoroughly permeated the ranks of the common people, and had practically remained the possession of the men, while the women had continued to cultivate the ancient customs and views. W. R. Smith and Wellhausen have pointed to customs and ideas of the pre-Mosaic Israel. Curtius has gone so far to such in the modern life of oriental tribes, which are claimed to have been the property of the most ancient Sem heathen tribes, and those scholars use these as the key for the ancient Israelitic rites
and customs. But even if much light is thrown from these sources on the forms of life and cultus as depicted by the Scriptures, much caution must be exercised in the use made of this material. In the first place, neither these Arabs of the 6th cent. After that time necessary usage can be regarded as "primitive Semites." In the second place, it is a question, even if in the earliest period of Israel such customs are actually found, what they really signified for the tribe of Abraham. We are here not speaking of a prehistoric religion, but of the religion of that tribe that came originally from Ur of the Chaldees, and migrated first by way of Haran to Canaan, and then to Egypt. In this tribe such primitive customs, perhaps, had long been spiritualized. For these Hebrews cannot be regarded as being as uncivilized as the New Zealanders, or the Indians of North America, or those Bedouins who have never left the desert; for they had lived in Babylonia for a long period, even if, while there, they had withdrawn themselves as much as possible from the more cultured life of the cities. The patriarchs were in touch with the civilization of the Babylonians. We do not, indeed, want to lay special stress on the fact that they lived in Ur and in Haran, two cities of the highest antiquity in the world. But the history of the family of Abraham, e.g. his relation to Sarah and Hagar, shows indisputable influence of Bab legal ideas. Probably, too, the traditions concerning the beginnings of history, such as the Creation, the Deluge, and the like, were brought from Babylon to Canaan by the tribe of Abraham.

3. A higher conception of the Deity; "atu, 'el.—But this tribe had come to Babylonia from Northern Arabia. It is a very important fact that the oldest Arabian inscriptions, namely the Minaean and the Sabaean, lead us to conclude that these tribes entertained a relatively high conception of the Deity, as has been shown by Professor Fritz Hommel. The oldest Arabian proper names are not found combined with names of all kinds of gods, but with the simple 'atu, 'el, or God, or with 'il, "my God." Then, too, God is often circumvented by the nouns expressing relationship, such as 'abt, "my father," 'amat, "my mother," and others, which express an intimate relationship between man and his God. Corresponding to these are also the old Sem proper names in Canaan, as also the name Abraham, i.e. 'Abhir, "father of a brother," as well as his successors and others. We accordingly must believe that the ancestors of Abraham immigrated into Babylon with a comparatively highly developed religion and with a uniform conception of God. Here their faith may have been unfavorably influenced, and it is not impossible that the religious disagreement between the patriarch and his neighbors may have been a reason for his migration. Abraham himself is regarded by the Canaanites as a "friend of God," who stands in an intimate relationship with his God, and he is accordingly to be regarded, not merely as a secular, but also as a religious tribal head, an 'Imdan, a prophetic personality.

4. Totemism; animism, etc.—Still less is it correct to ascribe to this tribe the lowest religious stage possible, namely that of fetishism or of totemism (worship of demons or worship of animals) and the like. Some think they find evidences of the worship of animals in Israel. The fact that some Israelitish deities were called "wild cow"(?), others of Rachel ("mother sheep"), is claimed to refer to the fact that these animals were totems of the tribe, i.e. were worshipped as ancestors. But for this claim there is no scintilla of proof. These names of women, esp. in the case of a nomadic tribe, can be explained in a much more simple way. The calves that appear in later times as images of Jeh are just as little a proof for the claim that calves were worshipped by the ancestors of Israel as divinities. We read nothing of such an image before the sojourn in Egypt, and after that time necessary usage can be regarded symbolically. The fact, again, that from the days of Moses, and without a doubt earlier than this, certain animals were not allowed to be eaten, does not justify the conclusion which Professor B. Stade and others have drawn from it, viz. that these animals were in olden times regarded as divine (tabu), and for that reason were not permitted to be eaten, and only afterward were avoided as "unclean." The list of unclean animals in Lev 11 and Dt 14 speaks for an altogether different reason for regarding them as unclean. It is not at all thinkable that these many, and as a rule unclean and low class of animals, were at one time accorded divine honor, while the higher and cleaner class had been excluded from this distinction. We have accordingly no reason for finding animal worship here. On the other hand, it is self-evident, in the case of such an old nomadic tribe, that man stood in a more familiar relationship to his animals, and for this reason the prohibition of the more clean animals was more rigorous than it was afterward the case. This was done only on extraordinary occasions, and it readily was accorded a religious consecration. See also TOTEMISM.

The idea is also emphatically to be rejected, that in the pre-Mosaic period animism prevailed in Israel—the worship of spirits and of demons. It has been tried in vain to show that in the most primitive period of Israel's religion the worship of ancestors occupied a prominent place. As Professor Emil Kautsch has emphasized, the arguments which have been drawn from the mourning customs of the Israelites in favor of this claim (as this is done by F. Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode, nach den Vorstellung des alten Israel und des Judentums, Giessen, 1892) are altogether inadequate, as is also the appeal to the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, as though the purpose of the institution was to secure for the deceased who had died without issue somebody who would attend to his physical wants. The argument from the cultus of the Teraphim is quite convincing, but is not more convincing than is actually the case, and that gifts, such as food, oil, and the like, were placed in the tomb of the deceased, as was often done by the Canaanites, yet this would be in the ancient Israelitish religion a matter of subordinate importance, which could readily be explained on the ground of natural feelings. It could never be made to appear plausible that all religions had grown out of such a cultus. If the teraphim are to be regarded as having been originally images of ancestors, which is quite plausible, then they would indeed represent a continuous ancestral cultus, as the people evidently kept these images in their houses in order to attract to themselves blessings, to avert misfortunes and to secure oracles. But these dolls, modeled after the form of human beings, already in the period of the Patriarchs were regarded as a foreign element and in contradiction to the more earnest religious sentiments (cf Gen 31 19; 35 24).

That Israel, like of Israel, like other peoples, did at one time pass through an "animistic" stage of religious development could best be proved, if at all, from their conception of the soul. Among the purification these are esp. necessary which are demanded by the presence of a dead body in the same room with the living, as the living are defiled by the soul.
of the deceased in leaving the body (Nu 19:14). Even the uncovered vessels are defiled by his soul-substance (19:15). This, however, is a biological conception, which has nothing to do with the conception of the Deity.

Or are those perhaps right, who think that the primitive Israelites had accepted animism in this sense, that they did not as yet worship any actual divinities, but only a multitude of spirits or demons, be these ghosts of departed human beings or the spirits of Nature, local numina? In favor of this last-mentioned view, appeal is made to this fact, that the favorite places with denbies where very circumscribed spheres of power are very often to be met with, esp. at springs, trees, oases, at which a demon or divinity is regarded as having his abode, who is described as the ba'al or master in this place; as, for instance, or after the Baal-tears of the Israelites and others. Such local spirits would then be the 'elohim, out of which would grow more mighty divinities of whole cities and countries. To these it would be necessary yet to add those spirits which were described as the 'avim of the hardy spars of ancestors, who also could have grown into higher divinities, while the rest of the mass of deities, good and bad, had to content themselves with a lower rank.

As against this, we must above all consider the fact that in ancient Israel the demons played a very subordinate rôle. The contrast in this regard with Babylonia is phenomenal. It is probably the case that at all periods in Israel there existed a belief in unclean spirits, who perhaps lived in the desert (of the יָאָבָשָׁו, אָבָשָׁו, or in the demoniac, and could otherwise, too, do much harm. But they are now described as having much influence on man's life. How few indications of such a view can be found and how little most of these indications prove we can see in the work of H. Duhm, Die bösen Geister im A.T., Tübingen, 1906. After the Bab exile, and still more after the Bab-remnant of the Israelites in Babylon, their imagination was to a much greater degree than before saturated by the faith in spirits. Then the closer study of such Sem הבִּלְוּב teaches us that they were not originally considered in such a narrow sense. They are very often of a solar nature, celestial powers who have their abode at a particular place, and there produce fertility, but in this special function represent a general power of Nature. The same is the case with the Syrian divinities. These are by no means merely the personifications of the small power of a particular tribe, but claim to be absolute beings, which shows that they are regarded as higher divinities which the tribe has appropriated and adapted to its own political ideas. We accordingly have no right to think that such a divinity was to be regarded as really confined to a particular hill, or even to a certain stone or tree where it was worshipped. The rock or stone or tree divinities of the ancient Arabs are celestial powers, who have only taken their abode at these places, even if popular superstition did actually identify them with such stones or trees.

It is therefore a misconception of the actual state of affairs when the conclusion is drawn that stone-worship is meant when Jacob erects a stone monument, the moqebbâd at Bethel, and anoints it with oil, and when this is understood to be a low type of fetishism. Stones are to the present day, for the wandering tribes, the signs by which important localities, esp. sacred places, are designated. The symbolical significance of such stones may be quite different, as also the relation which a divinity is thought to sustain to such a stone monument. For this reason, too, the judgment of the Bible concerning such objects is quite different. Only then, when they are symbols of idolatry, as the hammanim, i.e. representations of the sun-god, ba'al hamman, are they everywhere rejected in the OT.

In the same way a mighty tree, esp. if it is found near a spring of water, is in the Orient, by its very nature, a proof of the life-producing God. Such a tree naturally suggests that it is a place where divine life can be felt. Trees that have been made sacred by manifestations of the divinities or have been consecrated by the memory of a great personality, esp. the oak, the terbolith, the palm, were regarded by the Jews as holy; the divinity was sought. Only in that case, as was indeed common in Canaan, when the unchallenged powers of Nature were here adored, was this custom reprehensible in the eyes of the prophets. The 'asherim, too, are of a decidedly heathen character, as these trunks of trees were symbols of the goddess Asherah. Further, it was a favorite custom to worship the divinities on the high places, for the reason that they were regarded as in or attached to the heavens. Only in the worship of those who were letterized on these bâmôth they were, in later times, so hateful to the prophets.

(5) Conception of God. — In answer to the question, what ideas the patriarchs, the pre-Mosaic leaders of the people of Israel, entertained regarding God, attention must first of all be drawn to the fact that God spoke to some of these personally, be this in one form of manifestation or in another. These men heard the word of God with their own ears, and that, too, in the most important events of their lives. In the case of Abraham, these revelations are fundamental for him and for his people. The prophetic factor, which goes through the entire history of Israel and constitutes the life-principle that fills its religion and causes development, is at the very first beginnings the source whence the knowledge of God is taken. This presupposes a personal God; and, as a matter of fact, a fixed personality is demanded by the character of such a God. His "I" impresses itself upon man with absolute power and demands his service entirely. This "I" constantly remains the same, and everywhere evinces the same power, be this in Haran or in Canaan or in Egypt, and whether it manifests itself to Abraham or to Isaac or to Jacob. This oneness is not formulated as a didactic proposition, but as a living reality: only this God existed for His adherents. These appeals to Him at all times with equal success. The manifestations of this God may be of a different kind at different times. He is even entertained, on one occasion, as a personal guest by His friend Abraham, together with two companions (Gen 18:1 ff.). On another occasion (Gen 15:17) Abraham beholds Him in the symbolical form as a burning and fiery furnace (probably to be regarded as similar to the movable altar discovered by Sellin in Tannach). But these are to be regarded as special favors shown by God. In general it was the rule that God could not be seen without the beholder suffering death. Then, too, the conviction is very old, that what man sees in the case of such theophanies cannot have been God Himself, but that He had manifested Himself through a subordinate agent, an angel (this is particularly the case in the document E in Gen). This angel, however, has no significance in himself, but is only the creature-veil, out of which God Himself speaks in the first person. In the most elementary manner this formal limitation of God appears in Gen 11:5 where the designation coming from heaven in order to look at something on earth; and in 18:21, when He desires to go to Sodom personally, in order to convince Himself that what He has intended to send upon this city
is also the right thing. It is indeed possible to find in the first instance some traits of irony, and possibly in the second case the epic details may have added something. However, God is no longer spoken of in such a way as in the Mosaic times. This shows that the document J at this place contains material that is very old. All the more is it to be noted what exalted conceptions of God prevail already in these narratives. He dwells in heaven (11:5; 19:24), something that has without reason been claimed not to have been the idea entertained in the older period. He is the God of the world, who exercises supremacy over all the nations. He rules with justice, checks pride, avenges injustice, and that, too, not only in a summary manner on whole countries, but in such a way that He takes into consideration every individual and saves the one just man out of the midst of the mass of sinners (18:25; 19). In short, He is already the true God, although yet incompletely and primitively grouped in His attributes.

This God, ruling with omnipotent power in Nature and history, has entered into a special relationship with the tribe of Abraham. He has become the Covenant-God of the patriarch, according to the evidence of the old documentary P (Gen 15:18). We accordingly find here already the consciousness that God who rules over the world has entered into a special relationship with one small nation or tribe. This fact appears also in this, that Abram (Gen 14:18) addressed the highest God of the priest-king Melchizedek (Gen 14:20 ff) as his God, as the founder of heaven and of earth, and identifies Him with his own Covenant-God Jehovah.

(6) Cultus.—As far as the cultus is concerned, it can be stated that at this period it was still of a simple, but solemn and dignified character. The people preferred to worship their God at such places where He had manifested Himself, usually on a high place, on which altar an altar had been erected. There were no images of the Divinity extant. As the word מֵיתִיב, "altar," shows, the sacrifices were usually bloody. Human sacrifice had already in the days of Abraham been overcome by the substitution of an animal, although in olden times it had been practiced, perhaps, as the sacrifice of the firstborn; and in later times, too, through the influence of the example of heathen nations, it may have found its way into Israel now and then. Both larger and smaller animals were sacrificial fowls. Thus the phrase "feeding on the sacrifice in connection with God, too, enjoyed the food which served man as his sustenance, although God, in a finer way, experienced as a pleasure only the scent of the sacrifices, as this ascended in the flame and the smoke (Gen 8:21). But the main thing was the blood as the substrate of the soul. The fruits of the field, esp. the first-fruits, were also offered. Of liquid offerings, it is probable that in primitive times water was often brought, as this was often a costly possession; and in Canaan, oil, which the inhabitants of this country employed extensively in their sacrifices (Jgs 9:9, something that is confirmed also by recent excavations); also wine (Jgs 9:13). As the ancient burnt or whole sacrifices (Gen 8:20) gave expression to reverence, thankfulness, the prayer for protection or the granting of certain favors, the people from the very beginning also instituted sacrificial feasts, which gave expression to the covenant with God, the communion with the Covenant-God. In this act the sacrifice was divided between God and those who sacrificed. The latter ate and drank joyously before God after the parts dedicated to Him had been sacrificed, and esp. after the blood had been poured around the altar. The idea that this was the original form of the sacrifice and that gift-sacrifices were introduced only at a later period when agriculture had been introduced is not confirmed by historical evidences. That man felt himself impelled, by bringing to His God gifts of the best things he possessed, to express his gratitude, was too natural not to have been from the beginning a favorite expression of religious feeling. In connection with the sacrifices the name of God was solemnly called upon. J or P tell us that this name came into use only through Moses.

According to P (Gen 17:10 ff), circumcision was already introduced by Abraham in his tribe as the sign of the covenant. There are good reasons why the introduction of this custom is not like that of so many other ceremonies attributed to Moses. The custom was without doubt of an older origin. From whatever source it may have been derived in its earlier ethnological stage, for the Israelite circumcision is an act of purification and of consecration for connection with the congregation of Jehovah. A special priesthood, however, did not yet exist in this period, as the head of the family and of the tribe exercised the priestly functions (cf Gen 35:1 ff), although the peoples inhabiting Canaan at that time had priests (Gen 14:18).

(1) The covenant-idea.—Israel claims that its existence as a nation and its special relation to Jehovah begins with its exodus from Egypt and with the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai (cf Am 3:2; 9:7). The covenant with Jehovah Abraham, thus it is through whom God delivered His people from bondage and received them into His covenant (see concerning Moses as a prophet and mediator of the covenant, Israel, History). It is a matter of the highest significance for the religion of Israel that the relation of this people to Jehovah was not one which existed by the nature of things, as was the case with the other oriental tribal and national religions, but that it was the outgrowth of a historical event, the act by which God willed Himself to with them. The conception of a covenant, upon which Jehovah entered as a matter of free choice and will, and to which the people voluntarily gave their assent, is not an idea of later date in the religious history of Israel, which grew out of the prophetic thoughts of the 8th and 7th cents. BC, as has been claimed, but is found, as has been made prominent by Professor Fr. Giesebricht (Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaiabendes, 1900), already in the oldest accounts of the conclusion of the covenant (E, J), and must be ascribed to the Mosaic age. This includes the fact, too, that this covenant, which unites Jehovah with Israel, could not be of an indissoluble character, but that the covenant was based on certain conditions. The superficial opinion of the people might often cause them to forget this. But the prophets could, in later times, base their proclamations on this fact. Further, the thought is made very prominent that this covenant imposed ethical duties. While the divinities of other nations, Egypt, Bab, Phoen, demanded primarily that their devotees should erect temples in their honor and should bring them an abundance of sacrifices, in Israel the exalted and distinguished people was foremost. The covenant relation to the God of Israel can legitimately be found only where the relation to one's fellow-man is normal and God-pleasing (Decalogue).

(2) The Covenant-God, Jehovah.—The special revelation which Moses received is characterized...
by the word Jehovah (Yahweh) as a name for God. This name, according to the well-authenticated report of Ex 6:3 (P), which is supported also by Ex 3:14 in the same time as the fathers. It does not necessarily mean that nothing had been known of this name. Bab prayers often speak of an "unknown god," and in doing this refer to a god with whom those who prayed had not stood in personal relation. The God of the fathers appeared to Moses, but under a name which was not familiar to the fathers nor was recognized by them. In agreement with this is the fact that only from the time of Moses proper names compounded with some abbreviation of Jehovah, such as Jah, Jehovah, are found, but soon after this they became very common. Accordingly, it would be possible that such names were in scattered cases found also before the days of Moses among the tribes of Israel, and it is not impossible that this name was familiar to other nations. The Midianites esp., who lived originally at Mt. Sinai, have been mentioned in this connection, and also the Kenites (Stade, Budde), some scholars appealing for this claim to the influence according to Ex 15, Jethro had on the institutions of Moses. However, the matters mentioned here refer only to legal procedure (cf vs 14 ff). We nowhere hear that Moses took over the Jehovah-worship from this tribe. On the contrary, Jehovah is already known at this time. This worship Jehovah, the God of Moses, and the common sacrificial meal, according to ver 12, did not take place in the presence of Jehovah, but, accompanying it to the guest, in the presence of Elohim. Then we note that the Kenites, who lived among the Israelites, ever had any special prominence in the service of Jehovah, as was the case, e.g., with the Median Magi, who had charge of the priesthood among the Persians, or with the Etruscans among the Romans, who examined the entrails. Yet the Kenites would necessarily have enjoyed special authority in the Jehovah-cultus, if their tribal God had become the national God of Israel. The only thing that can be cited in favor of an Arabian origin of the name of Jehovah is the Arab word-form, רַבִּית, rabith, for רַבִּית, bedeth. On the other hand, a number of facts indicate that Jacob or Jao as a name for Jehovah was common in Syria, Philistia and Babylonia; cf Joram, son of the king of Hamath (2 S 8:10), and Jaubih, the king of this city, who was regarded as a Jehovah. In addition, the Jehovah names Jahve-Ilu and Jahum-Ilu on inscriptions as early as the times of Hammurabi. But his readings are sharply attacked. However, this may be the name God as proclaimed by Moses was not only something new for Israel, but was also announced by him (possibly also with a new pronunciation, Yahweh instead of Yahu) with a new signification. At any rate, the explanation in Ex 3:14 (E), "If Am that I Am," for doubting which we have no valid reasons, indicates a depth in the conception of God which far surpasses the current conceptions of the Syrian and the Bab pantheon. It would, perhaps, be easier to find analogous thoughts in Egypt speculation, which show that the name Jehovah of God is not the idea of speculative priest, but is a popular God who claims to control all public as well as private life.

(3) Monotheism of Moses.—Attempts have been made to deny the monotheistic character of the God, and some have thought that the term "monolatry" would suffice to express this stage in man's knowledge of God, since the existence of other gods was not denied, but rather was presupposed (cf passages like Ex 15:11), and it was only forbidden to worship any god in addition to Jehovah. However, this distinction is fundamental, and separates, in kind, the religion of Moses from that of the surrounding nations. For among these latter, the worship of more than one divine being at the same time was the general rule. The Egyptians, the Canaanites, the Arameans, and the Babylonians are, like those of the Egyptians, beings that spontaneously increase in number. They are divided into male and female groups of two, while in Hcb there is not even a word extant for goddess, and the idea of a female companion-being to Jehovah is an impossibility. Then, too, it is characteristic of the ethnic god that he is multiplied into many b'atim, and does not feel it as a limitation or restriction when some kindred divinity, Jah, Jehovah, is found, but soon after this they became very common. Accordingly, it would be possible that such names were in scattered cases found also before the days of Moses among the tribes of Israel, and it is not impossible that this name was familiar to other nations. The Midianites esp., who lived originally at Mt. Sinai, have been mentioned in this connection, and also the Kenites (Stade, Budde), some scholars appealing for this claim to the influence according to Ex 15, Jethro had on the institutions of Moses. However, the matters mentioned here refer only to legal procedure (cf vs 14 ff). We nowhere hear that Moses took over the Jehovah-worship from this tribe. On the contrary, Jehovah is already known at this time. This worship Jehovah, the God of Moses, and the common sacrificial meal, according to ver 12, did not take place in the presence of Jehovah, but, accompanying it to the guest, in the presence of Elohim. Then we note that the Kenites, who lived among the Israelites, ever had any special prominence in the service of Jehovah, as was the case, e.g., with the Median Magi, who had charge of the priesthood among the Persians, or with the Etruscans among the Romans, who examined the entrails. Yet the Kenites would necessarily have enjoyed special authority in the Jehovah-cultus, if their tribal God had become the national God of Israel. The only thing that can be cited in favor of an Arabian origin of the name of Jehovah is the Arab word-form, רַבִּית, rabith, for רַבִּית, bedeth. On the other hand, a number of facts indicate that Jacob or Jao as a name for Jehovah was common in Syria, Philistia and Babylonia; cf Joram, son of the king of Hamath (2 S 8:10), and Jaubih, the king of this city, who was regarded as a Jehovah. In addition, the Jehovah names Jahve-Ilu and Jahum-Ilu on inscriptions as early as the times of Hammurabi. But his readings are sharply attacked. However, this may be the name God as proclaimed by Moses was not only something new for Israel, but was also announced by him (possibly also with a new pronunciation, Yahweh instead of Yahu) with a new signification. At any rate, the explanation in Ex 3:14 (E), "If Am that I Am," for doubting which we have no valid reasons, indicates a depth in the conception of God which far surpasses the current conceptions of the Syrian and the Bab pantheon. It would, perhaps, be easier to find analogous thoughts in Egypt speculation, which show that the name Jehovah of God is not the idea of speculative priest, but is a popular God who claims to control all public as well as private life.

(4) Impossibility of representing Jehovah by an image. —The 2d principle which the Mosaic Decalogue establishes is this, Jehovah cannot be represented by any image. In this doctrine, too, there is a conscious contrast to the nations round about Israel (in addition to Ex 20:4, cf Dt 5:8; also Ex 24:17). That in the last-mentioned passage only molten images are forbidden, while those hewn of stone or made of wood might be permitted, is an arbitrary claim, which is already refuted by the fact that the Mosaic sanctuary did not contain any image of Jehovah. The Ark of the Covenant was indeed a visible symbol of the presence of God, but it is a kind of throne of Him who sits enthroned invisibly above the cherubim, as has been shown above, and accordingly does not admit of any representation of God by means of an image. This continued to be the case in connection with the central sanctuary, with the exception of such aberrations as are already found in Ex 32 and which are regarded as a violation of the Covenant, also at the time when the sanctuary was stationed at Shiloh. The fact that at certain local cults Jehovah-images were worshipped is to be attributed to the influence of heathen surroundings (cf on this point J. Robertson, loc. cit., 215 ff).

(5) Ethical character of the God of Moses.—A further attribute of the God of Moses, which exists far above the ethnic divinities of the surrounding peoples, is His ethical character. This appears
in the fact that His principles inculcate fundamental ethical duties and His agents are chiefly occupied with the administration of legal justice. Moses himself became the lawgiver of Israel. The spirit of this legislation is deeply ethical. Only we must not forget that Moses cannot have originated these ordinances and laws, and created them as something absolutely new, but that he was compelled to build on the basis of the accepted legal customs of the people. But he purified these legal usages, which he found in use among the people, through the infallible guidance of God, protected as much as possible the poor, the weak, and the female sex, as is shown by a comparison with related Bab laws (CH). Then, too, we must not forget that the people were comparatively uneducated, and esp. that a number of crude classes had found a place in theocracy, with priests ordained to directions in theocratical instruction, and elevated the female sex, as is shown by the system, but is entirely the outcome of Mosaic principles. Most embarrassing for our Christian feeling is the hardness of the Mosarites, whose King Mesha, on his famous monument, 3. The Religion of Israel—especially the cruder tendencies, before the 8th Cent. BC are still too pronounced to endure the great trial of faith demanded by the conquest of the land of Canaan. In the same way, the heroic struggles of Joshua, carried on under the directions of Jeh and resulting in the conquest of the country, were followed by a reaction. The zeal for battle weakened; the work of conquest was left unfinished; the people arranged to make themselves a land, and before it had been won, peace was concluded with the inhabitants. This decay of theocratic zeal and the occupation of the land by the side of and among the Canaanites had a direful influence on the Jeh-religion as it had been taught the people by Moses. The people adopted the sanctuaries of the country as their own, instead of rooting them out entirely. They took part in the festivals of their neighbors and adopted their customs of worship, including those that were repulsive. The local Baals, in whose honor harvest and autumn festivals were celebrated as thanksgiving for their having given the products of the earth, were in many places worshipped by the Israelites. The possibility of integrating the name Baal in both a good and bad sense favored the excuse that in doing this the people were honoring Jeh, whom in olden times they also hesitatingly called their Baal, as their Lord and the master of the land and of the people. By this rule all things in Israel, and Jeh had many other organs or agents besides the priests, esp. the prophets, who not rarely, as the representatives of the sovereign God, sharply opposed themselves to the priests. The theocratical principle, however, was limited to its expression in that public and private life, civil and criminal law, military and political matters were all controlled by religious principles.

(7) The Mosaic cultus.—As a matter of course, Moses also arranged the cultus. He created a holy shrine, the tabernacle, which contained the Ark of the Covenant, and in its general arrangements became the model of the sanctuary or temple built in later times. He appointed sacred seasons, in doing which he connected them with previous customary festival days, but he gave sharper directions concerning the Sabbath and gave to the old festival of spring a new historical significance as the Passover. Moses further appointed for this sanctuary a priestly family, and at the same time ordained that the tribe to which this family belonged should assume the guardianship of the sanctuary. The lines separating the rights of the priests and of the Levites have often been changed since his time, but the fundamental distinctions in this respect to Moses, as regards the priests and Levites, are still in existence. Moses has also, as a matter of course, put the sacred rites, the celebrations of the sacrifices, the religious institutions and ceremonies, into forms suitable to that God whom he proclaimed. This does not mean that all the priestly laws, as they are now found recorded in the Pentateuch, were word for word dictated by him. The priests were empowered to pronounce Töráh, i.e. Divine instruction, on this subject, and did this in accordance with the directions received through Moses. Most of these instructions were at first handed down orally, until they were put into written form in a large collection. But in the priestly ordinances, too, there is no lack of traces to show that these date from the period of Moses and must at an early time have been put into written form. (1) Decay of the name Canaan.—Upon the intense religious feeling produced by the exodus from Egypt and the events at Mt. Sinai, there followed a relapse, in connection with which it appears that in this religious feeling of the people there were still too pronounced tendencies to en-
Mosaic ordinances, and at the same time prepared for a new future by the establishment of colonies of prophets and by the constitution of the kingdom. This latter innovation seemed to be at variance with the principles of a strict theocracy. It is the merit of Samuel that he created the theocratic kingdom, by which the anointed of Jehovah himself was to become an important agent in the government of the ages. It is indeed true that the first king, Saul, did not realize this ideal, but his successor, David, appreciated it all the more. And even if David was far from realizing the ideal of a theocratic king, he nevertheless was able to erect a kingdom which prophecy tried to attain, viz., a king who was personally and most intimately connected with Jehovah, and who, as the servant of Jehovah, was to realize entirely in his own person the mission of the people to become the servants of Jehovah, and was thus to furnish the guarantee for the survival of Jehovah and his people. This universalistic character of the literature, which was the very reason that He rules according to ethical principles, also regards the personal and grants him His special protection and requites to him good or evil according to his conduct, *divine,* which David originated, give evidence of a more intimate association of the individual with his God.

The very oldtest of these psalms, a number of which point to David as their author, are not liturgical congregational songs that were originally individual prayer-songs, which emanated from personal experiences, but were in later times, employed for congregational use. The prejudice, that only in later times such expressions of personal piety could be expected, is refuted by analogies of a more ancient penitential and petitionary prayer of the Babylonians, in which, as a rule, the wants of the individual and not those of the nation constitute the contents. These Babylonian penitential prayers show that among the Babylonians the feeling of guilt as the cause of misfortune was very vivid, and that they regarded repentance and confession as necessary in order to secure the forgiveness of sins. However, the more exalted character of the Israelitish conception of God appears in the case of David, in this respect, since the Babylonian feels his way in an uncertain manner in order to discover what God or goddess he may have offended, and tries to draw out the sympathy of the one divinity over against the wrath of another. But much more can this difference be seen in this, that the heathen singer is concerned only to get rid of the evil or the misfortune that oppresses him. The communion with his god whose favor he seeks to regain is in itself of no value for him. In David’s case the matter is altogether different, as he knows that he is bound to Jehovah by a covenant of love (Ps 15, 2), and his heart delights in this communion, more than it does in all earthly possessions (Ps 4, 8); and this is even more so in the case of the author of Ps 73 25-26. Such words would, for good reasons, be unthinkably in the case of a Bab psalmist.

In the times of those earliest kings of Israel, which, externally, constituted the most flourishing period in their history, unless tradition is entirely at fault, the spiritual world of thought also was enriched by the Wisdom literature of the Proverbs, the earliest examples of which are (4) Wisdom literature since Solomon. — This hokhamed, or hokham, or prophets, was marked by the peculiarity that it ignores the special providential guidance of Israel and their special relation to their God, and concerns itself more to the general revelation of God in Nature and in the history of mankind, but in doing this regards the past and the present, the inner and the outer, the individual and the general, as of equal importance. It was connected with the religious ideas in his own time, and held the belief in the existence of God, and at the same time has the practical purpose of exhorting to a moral and God-pleasing life. The idea that this cosmopolitan tendency is to be attributed to Dr. Influences, and according-ingly betrays a later period as the time of its origin, is to be rejected, as far as Proverbs and Job are concerned. The many passages in Prov that speak of conduct over against the king as representative of the world, or of the many passages in Job, which attribute the knowledge of the universe to the sages, and which are thus significant in this respect, as the Book of Job shows, in which the Israelite author introduces as speakers of this art from this time of the world, and proves it. We can also compare the superscriptions in Prov 31: 1, in which groups of proverbs as collections and in accordance with this, in which the idea is further developed, which the sages of the world produced, his prover-wisdom, or at any rate cultivated it with special favor, is in itself probable, and is confirmed by the fact that the Queen of Sheba (South Arabia) came to Jerusalem in order to listen to his wisdom. But this also presupposes that in her country a similar class of wisdom was cultivated. This was also the case in Egypt in very early antiquity, and in Egypt the law and the canons of the precepts that remind us of the proverbs of Solomon (cf. Transactions of the Third International Congress of the History of Religions, Oxford, 1908, 1, 288 ff; see WISDOM).

(5) The sanctuary on Mt. Zion. — The kingdom of David and of Solomon not only externally marks the highest development of the history of Israel, but intellectually, too, prepared the soil out of which the religious literature of the nation grew, and which was, in its turn, the basis of the nation’s consolation. It was esp. under David a significant matter, that at this time the higher spiritual powers were in harmony with the political. This found its expression in the Divine election of David and his successor, which was confirmed by the covenant of the Ark of the Covenant at Mt. Zion. In the same way, Solomon, by the erection of the Temple, sought to strengthen and suitably equip this central seat. As a matter of course, the sacred shrines throughout the land did not thereby, at once lose their significance, but the direction of the sanctuary in Jerusalem was not at all intended to establish a “royal chapel” for the king, as Wellhausen has termed this structure, but it claimed the inheritance of the tabernacle in Shiloh, and the prophets sanctioned this development of the sanctuary. The advent of the sanctuary in Jerusalem was not at all intended to establish a “royal chapel” for the king, as Wellhausen has termed this structure, but it claimed the inheritance of the tabernacle in Shiloh, and the prophets sanctioned this development of the sanctuary. The centralized tendency of the preceding reigns were thwarted. Jeroboam erected other sacred shrines; esp. did he make Bethel a “king’s sanctuary” (Am 7 13). At the same time he encouraged religious syncretism. It is true that the god-covered images of heifers (by the prophets, in derision, called “calves”!) were intended only to represent the Covenant-God Jehovah. However, this representation in the form of images, an idea which the king no doubt had brought back with him from his sojourn in Egypt, was a temptation to the corrupt religious instincts in the nation, and gave to the Ephraimitic worship an inferior character in comparison with the service in the Temple in Jerusalem, where no images were to be found. But in other respects, the glory of the sanctuary in Jerusalem, the king in the arrangement of the cultus proved to be a potent factor in the Northern Kingdom from the beginning. The opposition of independent prophets was suppressed with all power. Nevertheless, the prophetic agitation against the rehgious spirit, which the kings themselves could not afford to ignore.

This proved to be the case particularly when the
dynasty of Omri, who established a new capital city, Samaria, openly favored the introduction of Phoen idolatry. Ahab’s wife, Jezebel, even succeeded in having a magnificent temple erected in the new capital to her native Baal, and in crushing the worship of the latter faithful to Jeh. It now became a question of life and death, so far as the religion of Jeh was concerned. The struggle involved not only certain old heathen customs in the religion of the maesics, dating back to the occupation of Canaan, but it was the case of an invasion of a foreign and heathen creed, with a clearly defined purpose. His volupitous worship was not at all in harmony with the serious character of the Mosaic religion, and it seriously menaced, in a people naturally inclined to sensuality, the rule of the stringent and energetic queen. The treachery and energetic queen was already certain that she had attained her purpose, when an opponent arose in the person of Elijah, who put all her efforts to naught.

(7) Elijah and Elisha.—In his struggle with the priests of Baal, who deported themselves after the manner of modern devishes, we notice particularly the exalted and dignified conception of God in 1 K 18. While in the chapter of the two prophets, the ideas of Elijah is by no means that these gods have in their own territory the same rights as Jeh in Canaan and Israel. Elijah mocks this Baal because he is no God at all (18 21), and the whole worship of the priests convinces him that they are not serving a real and true God, but only the product of their imagination (18 27). This is monothemism, and certainly not of a kind that has only recently been acquired and been first set up by Eli- jah, but that came down from the days of Moses. Elijah proves himself to be a witness and an advocate of the God of Sinai, who has been betrayed in a treacherous manner. The fact that he inflicts a dire and fateful punishment on the idolatrous Baal (19 19-21) shows clearly that not His external and fearful power, but His calm and deep character was felt by Elijah to be the distinguishing mark of his God. His successor, Elisha, after the storm had cleared the horizon of religious truth, in the performance of his prophetic duties was able again to show forth more emphatically the fatherly care and the helpful, healing love of His God.

In general, the political retrogression of the nation and the opposition of those in power, which the prophets and the faithful worshippers of Jeh in later times were compelled to experience often enough, served greatly to intensify and to spiritualize their religion. The unfortunate situation of the present, and the weaknesses and failures in the actual state of theocracy, directed their eyes to the future. The people began to study the wonderful ways of God in dealing with His people, and they began to look to the end of these dealings. A proof of this is found in the comprehensive accounts contained in the old history of the covenant-people as recorded in the Pentateuchal documents E and J, which were composed during this period. Whether these extend beyond and later than the period of Joshua or not, can remain an open question. In any case, there are extant many written ordinances concerning the times of the Judges, and concerning the history of Samuel, David and Solomon, which in part were written down soon after the events they record, and which, because of their phenomenal impartiality, point to an exceptionally high prophetic watchman from which the ways of God with His people were observed.

(1) The writing prophets.—The spiritual development of the deeper Israelitish religion was the business of the prophets. The prophet of the Sinaitic BC, and probably from the middle of the 9th, we have in written form their utterances and discourses. Larger collections of such prophecies were certainly left by Amos and Hosea. These prophets stood entirely on the basis of the revelations which by Moses had been made the foundation of Israel’s religion. But in contrast to the superficial and mistaken idea of the covenant of Jeh entertained by their contemporaries, these prophets make clear the true intentions of this covenant, and at the same time, through their new inspiration, advance the religious knowledge of the people.

(2) Their opposition to the cultus.—This appears particularly in their rejection of the external and unspiritual cultus of their age. Over against the false worship of God, which thinks to satisfy God by the offering of sacrifices, they proclaim the true worship, which consists in keeping all things in the fulfillment of the duties of the law and of love toward their fellow-men. They denounce as a violation of the covenant not only idolatry, the worship of strange gods, and the heathen symbols and customs which, in the course of time, had crept into the service of Jeh, but they declare also that the religion which is based solely on the offering of sacrifices is worthless, since God, who is in no way dependent on any services rendered by men, does not care for such sacrificial, but is concerned about this, that His commands be observed, and that these consist above all things in righteousness, uprightness in the dealings of man with man, and in mercy on the poor, the weak, the defenceless, who cannot secure justice for themselves. (Cf., e.g., 1 S 15 22; Hos 6 6; Isa 1 11 ff; Jer 7 21 ff, and other passages equally pointed. See on this subject, J. Robertson, Early Religion, etc, 440 f.) Such a transfer of the center of religion from the cultus to human righteousness has no parallel either in other Sem and ancient religions. Yet it is not something absolutely new, but is a principle that has developed out of the foundation laid by Moses, while it is in most pronounced contrast to the complex of many strange religious utterances that condemn the unthinking and the un consecrated cultus must not be misunderstood, as though Isaiah, Jeremiah and others had been modern spiritualists, who rejected all external forms of worship. In this case they would have ceased to be members of their own people and children of their own times. What they absolutely reject is only the false trust put in an opus operatum, i.e., a mechanical performance of religious rites, which had been substituted for the real and heartfelt exercise of religion. Then, too, we are not justified in drawing from passages such as Jer 7 22 the conclusion that at this time there did not yet exist in written form a Mosaic sacrificial code. Such a code is found even in the Book of the Covenant, recognized by critics as an older Pent document (Ex 20-23, 34), and the fact that the Sabbath commandment is found in the Decalogue does not prevent Isaiah from writing what he has penned in 13 14. That at this period, therefore, there were extant many written ordinances by Hos 8 12, and the connection shows that the cultistic ordinances are meant. We must accordingly take the prophet’s method of expression into consideration, which delights in absolute contrasts in cases where we would speak relatively. But this is not
intended to weaken the boldness of the prophetical thoughts, which purpose to express sharp opposition to the religious ideas current at that time. For, on the contrary, after the prophecies of the great Oriental crisis, the concept of a personal Divine and living God, i.e., He enters into the life of man. His holiness is exaltation above Nature and the most pronounced antagonism to all things unclean, to sin. Sin is severely dealt with by God, esp., as has already been mentioned, there is no word of love and no mercy to one’s neighbor. Because they are saturated with this conviction of the absolute holiness of God, the preexilic prophets proclaim to their people more than anything else the judgment which shall bring with it the dissolution of both kingdoms and the destruction of Samaria and of Jerusalem, together with its temple. First, its destruction is proclaimed to the Northern Kingdom; later on to the Southern. In doing this, these inspired men testify that Jeh is not removed beyond the sea. He will come. He Himself calls the destroyer to come, since all the nations of the world are at His command.

4. Their Messianic promises.—However, the prophets never conclude purely negatively, but they always see on the horizon some rays of hope, which promise to a “remnant” of the people better times. A “day of Jeh” is coming, when He will make His final settlement with the nations, after they have carried out His judgment. His people, namely, the exiles, the people of the destruction of the gentile world, He will establish His rule over the world. This fundamental thought, which appears again and again with constantly increasing clearness, is often the form that a future king out of the house of David, in whom the idea of the “anointed of Jeh” has been perfectly realized, will first establish in Judah-Israel a pure rule of God, and then also gain the supremacy of the world. Some critics have claimed that all of these Messianic and eschatological predictions derive from the post-exilic period. In recent years a reaction against this view has set in, based on the belief that in Egypt and Babylonia also similar expectations are found at an early period. These promises, which are clearly examinable, are found to be so intimately connected with the other prophecies of Isaiah, Hosea, and others, that to separate them would be an act of violence. In their most magnificent character, these pictures of the future are found in Isa., while in Jer. their realization and spiritualization have progressed farther.

5. Reformation.—While the prophets are characterized by higher religious ideas and ideals, the religion of the masses was still strongly honey-combed with the elements of heathendom. Yet there were not totally wanting among the common people those who listened to these prophetic teachers. And esp. in Judaea there were times when, favored by pious kings, this stricter and purer party obtained the upper hand. This was particularly the case under the kings Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah. During the reigns of these kings the cultus was reformed. Hezekiah and Josiah attacked particularly the local sanctuaries and the personal and private sacrifices, and concentrated the sacrificial cultus in Jerus. In doing this they were guided by the faithful priests and prophets and by the ancient Mosaic directions. Josiah, who, more thoroughly than others, fought against the disintegration of the Jeh-strain, found his help in the newly discovered Book of the Law (Deut.) That the sacrifices should be made at one place as we saw, an old Mosaic arrangement. However, Moses had foreseen that local altars would be erected at places where special revelations had been given (Ex. 20:24-25). In this way the numerous altars at Bethel, on Carmel, and elsewhere could claim a certain justification, only they were not entitled to the same rank as the central sanctuary, where the Ark of the Covenant stood. And where the sons of Aaron performed their priestly functions. Dr. demands more stringently that all real sacrificial acts shall be transferred to this central point. This rule Josiah carried out strictly. The suppression of the current sacrifices on the high places, the fall of Northern Kingdom aided in effecting the collapse of such shrines, while the sanctuary in Jerus. because it was delivered from the attack of the Assyrians, won a still greater recognition.

6. Destruction of Jerusalem.—However, immediately after the death of Josiah, the apostasy from Jeh again set in. The people thought that they had been deserted by Him, and they now more than before sought refuge in an appeal to a mixture of gods derived from Babylonia, Egypt, Persia and elsewhere. Ezek 8 and 9 describe this temple which made itself felt even in the temple-house in Jerus. The people were incapable of being made better and were ripe for destruction. The temple, too, which it was thought by many could not be taken, was doomed to be destroyed from its very foundations.

1. Spiritual purification through the Exile.—A mighty change in the religion of Israel was occasioned by the deportation to Babylon and the better educated Jews Babylonian Exile to Babylon and their sojourn there for a period of about 50 years, and by the still longer stay of a large portion of the exiles in this country. The nation was thus cut off from the roots of the native heathendom in Pal and also from the external organization of the theocracy. This brought about a purification and a spiritualization, which proved to be a great benefit for later times, when the political manifestation of their religious life had ceased, and the personal element came more into the foreground. Jeremiah and Ezekiel emphasize, each in his own way, the value of this religious life for the individual. A spiritual communion came into being, or, during the Exile, Ezekiel found its bond of union in the world of Jeh, and which insisted on serving God without a temple and external sacrificial cultus (which, however, was still found among the exiles in Egypt). Separated from their homes, they collected all the more diligently the sacred memories and traditions, to which Ezekiel’s plans for the temple belonged. Their sacred literature, the Torah or Law, the prophetic books, the historical writings, the Ps. and other literature were collected, and in this way preparations were made for the following period.

2. Relations to the gentile world.—The most earnest classes of Jews, at least, absolutely declined to have anything to do with the Bab religion and worship. They saw here the worship of images in its most repulsive and sensual forms, and they also learned its absolute impotency when the haughty Chaldaean empire was overthrown. Deutero-Isaiah (es 40-46) shows that the Israelites now become more conscious than ever of the great value of their own religion, the Nation, and its Creator of heaven and earth over against this variegated Pantheon of changeable gods in forms of wood and metal images. From this time on, the glory of the Creator of the universe and His revelation in the works of Nature were raised and met with a more and more emphatically than ever before. This same prophet, however, proclaims also the new fact of the
mission-calling of Israel among the nations of the world. This people, he declares, is to become the instrument of Jeh to make the Gentiles His spiritual subjects. But as this people in its present condition is little fit for this great service, he sees with his prophetic eye a perfect 'Servant of Jeh,' who carries out this mission, a personal, visible 'Servant of Jeh,' who establishes the rule of God upon earth, by becoming, in the first place, for Israel a second Moses and Joshua, but who then, too, wins over the heathen nations by this message. He accordingly takes the place of the prophetic Son of David. However, He is not a personal ruler, but carries out His work through mere spiritual power and in lowliness and weakness. Indeed, His suffering and death become the atonement to wipe out the guilt of His people (Isa 53). We can see in this further development of the deepening and spiritualization of the eschatological hopes how strongly the unaccustomed misfortunes and surroundings of the exiles had influenced them. Notwithstanding all their antagonism to the aberrations of the heathen world, which were made use of against them by the Gentiles there was also some receptivity for the higher truths. The worshippers of Jeh felt themselves more akin to the Persians than to the Babylonians, as the former served without images a god whose name was Jehovah. This was conceived as an eternal divine being. Thought from Persia as are also found in the later literature of Israel, although it is not the case that the idea of Satan was first taken from this source. The doctrine of the resurrected Christ and the demand for the forgiveness also can be gained from OT premises. However, the religion of the Babylonians was not without influence on that of the Jews. It is indeed out of the question that it was only during the Exile that the Jews took over the accounts of Creation and the Deluge and others similar to the Bab, as these are found in Gen 1-11. But the development of the angelology shows the evidences of later Bab and Pers influences. As a rule, dogmatics play a more important role in post-exilic times than ever before, particularly about the beginnings of the Christian era. Magic art, too, entered largely into the faith of later Judaism, and it can be shown that both of these are connected with:

(1) Life under the law. — The people which returned from the Exile was a purified congregation of Jeh, willing to serve Him. They aimed to reestablish the theocracy. They failed in their undertaking, because the Religion of the loss of the political independence of the people, the same importance as formerly, but the religious cultus and the religious life of the people were all the more stringently observed. The post-exilic period was characterized by religious legalism. The people were exceedingly zealous in observing the old ordinances, and tried to find righteousness in the correctness with which the Mosaic law was observed, as this was now deemed by the teachers of the law, the Exekiel, had taken the lead in this particular, and had laid great emphasis on the formal ordinances, although in connection with this he also insisted upon real moral earnestness. But it was an easy matter that in the course of time an external work-righteousness and petrification of true religion should arise. Yet the later prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, even if they do ascribe a greater importance to external matters than the preexile prophets did, show that they were the spiritual successors of the prophetic line. They teach a healthy ethical and sanctifying type of practical religion and continue to proclaim the hopes for an expansion and spiritualization of the Kingdom of God. The leaders of these times, Zerub-
in the apocryphal work known as “Wisd of Solomon,” in which we find a positive defence of wisdom as the principle of revelation over against the Epi-
curean world-wisdom of Hellenism. In doing this, the book makes use of Platonism and Stoicism and of the 

dhikmaq, or wisdom of the old Jewish lit., has been 

Hellenized. Philo goes still farther in adapting Judaism to Gr taste and to humanism. A more 

liberal conception of inspiration also appears in the reception of contemporaneous literary products 

into the OT Canon, even of some books which had originally been written in the Gr language. The 

means observed in adapting national Hebraism to Hellenistic universalism was the allegorical method 

of interpretation, which Philo practised exquis-

itively and which then passed over to the Christian 

church Fathers of the Alexandrian school. This 

school constitutes the opposite extreme to the 

rabbinical, which clung most tenaciously to the letter 
of the sacred text. 

(6) Apocalyptic literature.—A unique phenomenon 
at the close of the Bib. and in the earliest post-Bib. 
period is, finally, the APOCALYTIC LITERATURE 
(q.v.). Since the days of the Maccabees we find the 
custom in certain Jewish circles, of using the old 
prophetic books and adapting them to the events of 
the times, of drawing up a systematic picture of the 
future. The authorship of these writings was usually 

attributed to one of the ancient saints, e.g. to Enoch, 
or Abraham, or Moses, or Elijah, or Jeremiah, or 
Baruch, or Ezra, or others. The model of these 
Apocalypses is the Book of Dn, which, on the basis 
of older visions, in the times of the oppression by 
Antiochus Epiphanes, pictures, in grand simplicity, 
the development of the history of the world down 
to the final triumph of the Kingdom of God over 
the kingdoms of the world. 

III. Conclusion.—When we consider this whole 
development, it cannot be denied that the religion 
of Israel passed through many changes. It grew 
and purified and spiritualized itself out of its own 
inherent strength; but it also suffered many re-
lapses, when hindering and corrupting influence 
gained the upper hand. But it received from 
without not only degenerating influences, but also 
what that developed its growth. Its original 
and native strength also shows itself in this, that 
without losing its real character it was able to 
appropriate to itself elements of truth from without 
and assimilate these. 

The specific and unique character of this religion was, by which it was distinguished 
from all other religions of antiquity, and by reason of which it alone was 
capable of producing from itself the highest revelation in Christ, it must be 
answered that its uniqueness lies, most 
of all, in its conception of God and of Divine things, 
and of God’s relation to the world. The term “monotheism” but inadequately expresses this 
peculiarity; for monistic tendencies are found 
also in other nations, and in Israel monothetic often 
shows itself in a strongly corrupted form. The 
advantage of Israel lies in its close contact with the 
living God. From the beginning of Israel’s history, a 
strictly personal God gave testimony of Himself 
to different personalities with a decision which 
demanded absolute submission; and, in addition, 
this was a holy God, who elevated mankind above 
Nature and above themselves, a God who stood in 
the most absolute contrast to all that was impure 
and unrighteous. At the same time there was wonderful in His 

grace and His mercy to the sinner. This direct 
revelation of God to specially chosen bearers of the 
Divine truth goes through the entire history of 
Israel. Through this factor this religion was being 
constantly purified and unfolded further. The 

Israelites learned to conceive God in a more spiritual, 
correct, and universal manner, the more they 
advanced in experience and culture. But this God 
did not thereby become a mere abstract being, 
but retained in himself the personal qualities of 
so many nations. He always continued to be a living 

God who takes an active part in the lives of men. We 
need notice only those prophets who describe 
the greatness of God in the grandest way, such as 
Hosea, Isaiy, and Isaiah, who depict the personal 
life of God in the boldest way through anthropomorphisms. 

In agreement with this, too, we find that this 
religion demands the personal subjection of men to 
God. As was the case with all the 

2. Relation of religions of antiquity, that of the OT, 
of Man to 

This God a national religion than one of the indi-

vidual. This brought with it the demand for the external observance of tribal 
customs in the name of religion. However, 
the traditional customs and legal ordinances had already 
been sitted and purified by Moses. And, as a matter 
of necessity, in a religion of such a pronounced 

personal character, every individual of the 

people must become more and more a matter 
of importance. This idea became deeper and more 
spiritual in the course of time and developed into 

a pure love for God. It did not prevent this reli-
gion from becoming profoundly 

accepting of God, 

but when the doctrines and the cults were most cor-

rectly observed. But the vital kernels found em-

bedded in the revelation of God constantly proved 
their power of rejuvenation. And at that very 
time when the world down to the 

final triumph of the Kingdom of God over 
the kingdoms of the world. 

LITERATURE.—Of the lit. on the religion of Israel we 
may yet make particular mention of the following: 

1. THE LIVING AND 

2. ISRAELITE, iš-rə-el-ht. ISRAELITISH, iš-rə-
el-itish: Belonging to the tribes of Israel (q.v.). 

3. ISSACHAR, iš-sō’kər (יִשָּׂאָר), yissä’ə₁(kəh)'

LXX, Σωτήρ, Ἰσσαχάρ, Tisch. Issachar, so also in the NT, Treg. and WH): 

(1) The 9th son of Jacob, the 5th born to him by 

Leah (Gen 30:17 f). His birth is in this passage 

connected with the strange story of Reuben and 

his mandrakes, and the name is 

apparently conceived as derived from "iš-sākah, "a
hired workman." There is a play upon the name in Gen 49 15, "He bowed his shoulder to hard work, and his neck to the taskwork." Wellhausen (Text der Bücher. Sam., 95) thinks that the second element of the name may denote a deity; and Sokar, an Egyptian god, has been suggested. The name in that case would mean "worshipper of Sokar." Practically nothing is preserved of the personal history of this patriarch beyond his share in the common actions of the sons of Jacob. Four sons were born to him before Jacob's family removed to Egypt (Gen 46 13). When his land was divided by lot at Sinai the tribe numbered 54,000 men of war over 20 years of age (Nu 1 29). At the end of the wanderings the numbers had grown to

2. The Tribe David, the Chronicler puts the figures at 87,000 (1 Ch 7 5). See Numbers.

The place of Issachar in the desert-march was with the standard of the tribe of Judah (along with Zebulun) on the E. side of the tabernacle (Nu 2 5), this group forming the van of the host (10 14 f). The rabbis say that this standard was of 3 colors, sardine, topaz and carbuncle, on which were inscribed the names of the 3 tribes, bearing the figure of a lion's whelp (Tg. pseudo. Jon. on Nu 2 3). The domain of the tribe was Nethanel ben Zuar (Nu 1 8, etc). Later this place was held by Igal ben-Joseph, the tribal representative among the spies (Nu 13 7). The prince chosen from Issachar to assist in the division of the land was Palliel ben-Anna (34 20). The position that the Mosaic law assigns to Issachar (3 13) is at the strange ceremony near Shechem was on Mt. Gerizim, "to bless the people" (Dt 27 12).

Sixteen cities of Issachar are mentioned in Josh 19 17 ff, but the only indications of boundaries are the townships of Tirzah in the N. and Jordan in the E.

3. The Tribal Territory Zebulun and Naphtali (19 13 ff); on the W. with Manasseh and possibly Asher (17 10); and on the S. with Manasseh (ver 11). It does not seem to have had any point of contact with the sea. The portion of Issachar, therefore, included the plain of Esdraelon, Tabor, the hill of Moreh, and the slopes E. to the Jordan. The frontier along the S. edge of the plain was held by Manasseh. Tola, a man of Issachar, held Shamir, a stronghold in Mt. Ephraim (Jgs 10 1). To Manasseh was given Beth-shean with her "towns" (Josh 17 11). No reliable line can be drawn for the S. border. The district thus indicated was small; but it embraced some of the most fruitful land in Pal. By the very riches of the soil Issachar was tempted. "He saw a resting-place that it was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and he bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant under taskwork" (Gen 49 15). The "mountain" in Dt 33 19 may possibly be Tabor, on which, most likely, there was an ancient sanctuary and place of pilgrimage. This would certainly be associated with a market, in which Issachar and Zebulun, the adjoining tribes, would be able to enrich themselves by trade with the pilgrims from afar. Issachar took part in the battle with Sisera (Jgs 4 15). To Israel Issachar gave one judge, Tola (Jgs 10 1), and two kings, Baasha and his son (1 K 15 26, etc).

Of the 200 "heads" of the men of Issachar who came to David at Hebron it is said that they were "men that had understanding of the time, to know how to interpret the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, the dates of solemn feasts, and could interpret the signs of the times. A company from Issachar came to celebrate the Passover when it was restored by Hezekiah (2 Ch 30 18). Issachar has a portion assigned to him in Ezekiel's ideal division of the land (48 25); and he appears also in the list in Rev (7 7).

(2) A Korahite doorkeeper, the 7th son of Obed-edom (1 Ch 26 8).

ISHSHAH, i.sh'-sh'a (יִשְׁשָּׁה), yishshiyah, "Jeh exerts"; AV Ishiah:

(1) Mentioned among David's heroes, a great-grandson of Tola (1 Ch 7 9).
(2) Mentioned among the men who came to David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12 6; AV "Jesiah").
(3) A member of the priesthood of the house of Rehabiah (1 Ch 24 21; AV "Jesiah").
(4) Another Levitical priest of the house of Uziel (1 Ch 26 20; 24 25).

ISHSHIJAH, ish-sh'-ja (יִשְׁשִּׁיָּה), yishshiyah, "Jeh lends"; AV Ishiah:

A man of the household of Harim, named among those who, at Ezra's command, were induced to put away their "strange wives" (Ezr 10 31). Also called "Ascas" (1 Esd 9 32).

ISSUE, ish'th (םֶשָׁה, ἁναμίκτης; לָיְנָה, מַשָּׂה, מַשָּׂה, Σωτήρ, ιεσπρόσβος, θυγατέρα); When used as a description of a bodily affection the word signifies: (1) A discharge, the consequence of uncleanness and sin (Lev 15 2 ff; Nu 5 2). As such it was one of the judgments which were to afflict the family of Joab (2 S 3 29); (2) a hemorrhage, either natural (Lev 12 7, where the word used is mēgōr, lit. a "fountain"); or the consequence of disease (Mt 9 20; Mk 5 25; Lk 8 43).

ISSUES, ish'tz (םֶשֶׁת, ἄνοδος, πατήρ), lit. "outgoings": (1) Ways of escape (Ps 68 20 AV); (2) free moral choices (Prov 4 23).

ISTALCURUS, i-stal-kur's (Ἰσταλκούρος, La-talko-roos); 1 Esd 5 40, corresponding to Zabbud in Ezr 8 14. In Swete's text the name is istalkalos.

ISUAH, is'th-a. See Ishyav.

ISUI, is't-i. See Ishvi.

ISVAH, is't-a. See Ishyav.

ITALA, it'a-la, VERSION. See Latin Version, The Old; Vulgate.

ITALIAN, i-tal'y-an, BAND. See Band.

ITALY, it'a-di (Italikia, Italia): At first confined as a name to the extreme southern part of the Italian peninsula in the region now called Calabria, whence its application was gradually extended. In Gr usage of the 5th cent. BC, the name was applied to the coast as far as Metapontum and Paestum, being synonymous with Oenotria. The Oenotrians are represented as having assumed the name of Italians (Itali) from a legendary ruler Italus (Dionysius, i.12.35; Vergil, Aen. i.533). The extension of Rom authority seems to have given
this name an ever-widening application, since it was used to designate their allies generally. As early as the time of Polybius the name Italy was sometimes employed as an appellation for all the country between the two seas (Tyrrenian and Adriatic) and from the foot of the Alps to the Sicilian Straits (Polyb. 3.9.50; 5.27.10; 8.5.23; 9.5.32; 10.1.16; 11.9.5), although Ctesiaspine Gaul was not placed on a footing of complete equality with the peninsula as regards administration until shortly after the death of Julius Caesar. From the time of Augustus the term was used in practically its modern sense (Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, I, 57-57).

The name Italy occurs 31 times in the NT: Acts 18 2, Aquila "lately come from Italy," because of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius; Acts 27 4, the decision that Paul be sent to Italy; He 13 24, separation from those of "Italy." The adj. form is found in the appellation, "Italian band" (cohors Italica, Acts 10 1).

The history of ancient Italy, in so far as it falls within the scope of the present work, is treated under Rome (q.v.).

George H. Allen

**ITCH** (אָית), הָיאִז, יָאָס, יִפְקָד, יָפָרָה: Only in Dt 28 27, where it probably refers to the parasitic skin disease of that name which is very common in Pal. It is due to a small mite, *Sarcoptes scabiei*, which makes burrows in the skin and sometimes causes extensive crusts or scabs, attended with a severe itching. It is very easily communicated from person to person by contact, and can be cured only by destruction of the parasite. This disease disqualified its victims for the priesthood (Lev 21 20).

**ITHAI**, יִתְחָה. See ITTAL.

**ITHAMAR**, יִתְחַמָּר, יִתְחָמָר, "land" or "island of palms"; Gesenius; or "father of Tamar," הַיָּאָב, being perhaps for הַיָּאָב, "abbey": Cook in EB—though both derivations are uncertain: The 4th son of Aaron (Ex 6 23; 28 1; 1 Ch 6 3), Eleazar being the 3d, Nadab and Abihu the 1st and 2d. While Nadab and Abihu were prematurely cut off for offering strange fire before the Lord (Lev 10 1-2; Nu 3 4; 26 61), and Eleazar was appointed chief of the tribe of Levi (Ex 6 23) and high priest (Ex 38 1), Ithamar was made the treasurer of the offerings for the Tabernacle (Ex 38 21), and superintendent of the Gershonites and Merarites in the service of the Tabernacle (Nu 4 28-33). In the time of Eli the high-priest of that name to be in his family, but how, and whether before Eli's day or first in Eli's person, is not told and need not be conjectured. W. R. Smith in EB (art. "Ell"), on the strength of 1 S 2 27-28, holds that the priesthood was originally in Eli's line; but the words "the house of thy father" do not necessarily mean only the house of Ithamar, but may, and most probably do, refer to Aaron and his descendants, of whom Ithamar was one. Nor does the cutting off of Eli's family from the priesthood and the setting in their place of "a faithful priest," who should do everything according to Jeh's will and walk before Jeh's anointed forever, find its complete fulfilment in the deposition of Abiathar or Ahimelech, his son, and the installation of Zadok in the time of Solomon (1 K 2 28; 1 Ch 26 21; see ZADOK). A descendent of Ithamar, Daniel by name, is mentioned among the exiles who returned from Babylon (Ezr 8 2).

T. WHITELAW

**ITHIEL**, יִתְחַּיל, יִתְחָל, יִתְחָל, "God is":

(1) A son of Jeshua of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned among the inhabitants of Jerus in Nehe miah's day (Neh 11 7).

(2) The name is perhaps also found in the oracle of Agur (Prov 30 1). See ITHIEL AND UCAL.

**ITHIEL AND UCAL** (יִתְחַּיל יִתְכָּל), "'ith'él ve'ukhālı̂l": Names of the two men to whom Agur the son of Jakeh spoke his words (Prov 30 1). The purport of introducing these persons is strange and obscure; the margin proposes therefore, by the use of a different pointing, to read the verse, "The man said, I have wearied myself, O God, I have wearied myself, O God, and am consumed," thus doing away with the proper names; a reading which does not correspond not inaptly with the ten preceding verses. See AGUR; PROVERBS, BOOK OF, II, 6.

**ITHLAH**, יִתְחָלוֹה, יִתְחָלָה; AV Jethlah: An unidentified town in the territory of Dan, named with Abijalon and Elon (Josh 19 42).

**ITHMAH**, יִתְחָמֶה, יִתְחָמָה, "priesty": A citizen of the country of the Moabites, David's deadly enemies, yet mentioned as one of the king's heroes (1 Ch 11 46).

**ITHNAN**, יִתְחָנָן, יִתְחָנָן: A town in the S. of Judah mentioned along with Hazor and Ziph (Josh 18 23), apparently the "Ethan" of Jerome (Onom 118 13). Not identified.

**ITHRA**, יִתְחָר, יִתְחָר, "abundance":

(1) A descendant of Seir the Horite, son of Dishon (Gen 36 26; 1 Ch 1 41).

(2) One of the sons of Zophah of the tribe of Asher (1 Ch 7 37).

**ITHREAM**, יִתְחְרָם, יִתְחָרָם, "resi- dence of the people"?): The 6th son born to David at Hebron. His mother's name was Eglah (2 S 3 5; 1 Ch 3 3).

**ITHRITE**, יִתְחַרִיט, יִתְחַרֵית, "excellence," "preeminence": A family in Israel, whose home was Kirath-jearim (1 Ch 2 53). Among the 87 heroes of David, two are mentioned who belonged to this family, Ira and Gareb (2 S 23 38; 1 Ch 11 40).

**ITHTAH-KAZIN**, יִתְתָּה-קָזִין, יִתְתָּה-קָזִין, "'ith'āh kāzin": Josh 19 13 AV for Eth-kazin. Ittah is correctly Eth with Hē locale, meaning "toward Eth."

**ITTAL**, יִתְחָה, יִתְחָה, יִתְחָה, יִתְחָה: (1) A Gittite or native of Eth, one of David's chief captains and most faithful friends during the rebellion of Absalom (2 S 15 11-22; 18 2-4.12). The narrative reveals David's chivalrous and self-sacrificing loyalty on the part of Ittai. He seems to have but recently left his native city and joined David's army through personal attachment to the king. David rapidly promoted him. Hearing of Absalom's rebellion and approach to Jerusalem, he flees with David. The latter remonstrates, urges him to go back and join Absalom, as he is a foreigner and in exile. His interests are in the
capital and with the king; there is no reason why he should be a fugitive and perhaps suffer the loss of everything; it would be better for him, with his band of men, to put himself and them at the service of Abalon, the new king. "Mercy and truth be with thee," says David in his midst. David was double, absolutely refuses to go back, but will stand by David until the last. Remonstrance being useless, the monarch orders him across the river, double glad that he had such a doughty warrior and faithful friend by his side. On muster ing his hosts to meet Abalon, David makes Itai a chief captain with the intrepid Joab and Abishal. He doubtless did part in the battle, and is nothing more is said of him it is possible that he fell in the fight. (2) A Benjamite, one of David’s 30 mighty men (2 S 23 29; 1 Ch 11 31, “Itai”).

ĪTURAEA, i-tū′rē-ə (Trōpaula, Iturana). The term occurs only once in Scripture, in the definition of Philip’s territory: “the Ituratae koī Trachonitidos chōrēs, which AV renders: of Iturana and of the region of Trachonitis, and RV: “the region of Iturana and Trachonitis” (Lk 3 1). Sir W. M. Ramsay has given reasons for the belief that this word was certainly never used as a noun by any writer before the time of Eusebius (Ezōpos, 1594, IX, 51 ff, 143 ff, 298 ff). It must be taken as an adjectival, indicating the country occupied by the Ituraeans. The descent of the Ituraeans must probably be traced to Jetur, son of Ishmael (Gen 25 16), whose progeny were clearly numbered among the Arabian nomads. According to the Ituraeans Eupelemus (c 150 BC), quoted by Eusebius (Præp. Evang. IX, 30), they were associated with the Nabataeans, Moabites and Ammonites against whom David warred on the E. of the Jordan. They are often mentioned by Lat writers; their skill in archery seems greatly to have impressed the Romans. They were skilful archers (Caesar, Bell. Afr. 20); a lawless (Strabo, xvi 2 10) and predatory people (Cicero, Philipp. II,112). In the Lat inscriptions Ituran soldiers have Syrian names (IHP, I, ii, 326). They would therefore be the most northerly of the confederates opposed to David (supra), and their country may occasionally be sought in the neighborhood of Mt. Hermon. There is nothing to show when they moved from the desert to this district. Aristeobulus made war against the Ituraeans, compelled many of them to be circumcised, and added a great part of their territory to Judea, 140 BC (Ant, XIII, xi, 3). Dio Cassius calls Lysaniæ “king of the Ituræans” (xlix 32), and from him Zenodorus leased land which included Uthasa and Paneas, 25 BC. The capital of Lysaniæ was Chálca, and he ruled over the land from Damascus to the sea. Jos speaks of Soemus as a tetrarch in Lebanon (Vita, 11); while Tacitus calls him governor of the Ituræans (Ann. xii, 23). The country of Zenodorus, lying between Trachonitis and Galilee, and including Paneas and Uthasa, Augustus bestowed on Herod, 20 BC (Ant, XV, x, 3). In defining the tetrarchy of Philip, Jos names Batanea, Trachonitis and Auranitis, but says nothing of the Ituræans (Ant, XVII, vi, 4; BJ, ii, xxvii). The names and Uthasa and Uthasa must be included, and this may have been Ituran territory (IHP, I, ii, 333). It seems probable, therefore, that the Ituræans dwelt mainly in the mountains, and in the broad valley of Coele-Syria; but they may have also occupied the district to the S.E. of Hermon, the modern Jīdār. It is not possible to define more closely the Ituran country; indeed it is not clear whether St. Luke intended to indicate two separate parts of the dominion of Philip, or used names which to some extent overlapped.

It has been suggested that the name Jētār may be derived from the Heb יֶתָר, yēṭār, and so be equivalent to Ituræa. But the derivation is impossible.

W. EWING

IVAH, i′vah. See IVYAH.


1 K 10 18; 22 39; 2 Ch 9 17; Ps 46 8; Cant 5 14; 7 4; Ezek 27 6 15; Am 3 15; 6 4; [2] ṢNN, shenhabbim; IXX δόντες ὡπάντων, ὠβάντων, ὁδόντα ἐφανθίνων, “elephants’ teeth” (1 K 10 22; 2 Ch 9 21); [3] ἐφαντίνως, ἐφανθίνως, “of ivory” (Rev 18 12); Shēn occurs often, meaning “tooth” of man or beast. In the passages cited it is tr in EV “ivory” (cf “crag,” 1 S 14 4 5; “chill.” Job 39 28 bis; “flesh-book of three teeth,” 1 S 2 13). Shenhabbim is thought to be a contracted form of shen hit ‘ibbim, 1 c 67, the art., and ‘ibbim, pl. of ‘ibbâh or ‘ibbâ; 2 Edf abu, “elephant,” and of Lat ebur, “ivory” (see Liddell and Scott, s.v. ἔβρας). On the other hand, it may be a question whether bim is not a native form connected with the Arab Ŧl, “elephant.” If the word for “elephant” is not contained in shenhabbim, it occurs nowhere in the Heb Bible.

Ivory was probably obtained, as now, mainly from the African elephant. It was rare and expensive. It is mentioned in connection with the magnificence of Solomon (1 K 10 18 23), being brought by the ships of Tarshish (2 Ch 9 21). An “ivory house” of Ahab is mentioned in 1 K 22 39. It is mentioned among the luxuries of Israel in the denunciations of Amos (3 15; 6 4). It occurs in the figurative language of Ps 45 8; Cant 5 14; 7 4. It is used for ornamentation of the ships of the Tyrians (Ezek 27 6), who obtain it with ebony through the men of Dedan (viii 4), which men are among the merchandise of Babylon (Rev 18 12).

We do not learn of the use of elephants in war until a few centuries before the Christian era. In 1 Mac 6 8, there is a reference to the defeat of Antiochus the Great, “having an hundred and twenty elephants” by Scipio Africanus in 190 BC. 1 Mac 1 17 speaks of the invasion of Egypt by Antiochus Epiphanes with an army in which there were elephants. 1 Mac 6 28 47 has a detailed account of a battle between Antiochus Eupator and Judas Maccabaeus at Bethsura (Beth-zur). There were 32 elephants. Upon the “beasts” (ἔθρα, thērâ) there were “strong towers of wood”; “There were also upon every one two and thirty strong men, that fought upon them, beside the Indian that ruled him.”

In Job 40 15, AVhm has for “behemoth,” “the elephant, as some think.” ALFRED ELY DAY

IVORY, TOWER OF (יוֹבֹא וַרְיָה, miqḥād hašōn): In Cant 7 4 the neck of Shulammite is compared in whiteness and stateliness to a (or the) tower of ivory. The def. art. may suggest that the comparison is with some actual tower in or near Jerusalem; but more probably the language is simply a figure.

IVVAH, i′vāh. See IVYAH.
apparently due to a misreading: The name is wanting in the MT and LXX of Isa 36 19.

Ivah was a city apparently conquered by the Assyrians, and is mentioned by them, in the vs quoted, with Hamath and Arpad, Sepharvaim and Hiphtah. It has been assimilated with the Avva of 2 K 17 24 as one of the places whence Sargon brought captives to Samaria, and identified with Hit on the Euphrates, between Anah and Rama-dieh, but this seems improbable, as is also the suggestion that it is Ptolemais, the modern Tmim, between Antioch and Aleppo. Hommel (Expos T. April, 1898, 330) upholds the view that Hena and Ivah, or, as he prefers to read, Avvah, are not places at all, but the names of the two chief gods of Hamath, Arpad and Sepharvaim. This would be consistent with 2 K 18 34; but 19 13: "Where is the king . . . of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivahv?" and 17 31, where the gods of Sepharvaim are stated to be Adrammelech and Atnamelech, raise serious difficulties. In all probability, the identification of Ivah depends upon the correct localization of the twofold Sepharvaim, of which Hena and Ivah may have been the names. The identification of Sepharvaim with the Bab Sip(par)ar is now practically abandoned. See SEPHERVAIM.

T. G. Pinches

IVY, i'vi (κοσσῆς, κισσός): The only mention of the word in all the sacred writings is in 2 Macc 6 7 in connection with the oppression of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes: "On the day of the king's birth every month they were brought by bitter constraint to eat of the sacrifices; and when the feast of Bacchus (Dionysus) was kept, the Jews were compelled to go in procession to Dionysus, carrying ivy," this plant (Hedera helix) being sacred to the god Dionysus as the symbol of the culture of the vine (cf Eur. Bacchae, passim). It was of ivy or of pine that the "corruptible crown" of the famous Isthmian games was made (1 Cor 9 25).

J. Hutchinson

IYAR, i'yar'. See IYAR.

IYE-ABARIM, i-yē-əb′a-rim (יוֹדֵי הַעֲבָרִים, יִיֶּהָ הַעֲבָרִים), "the heaps of the Abarim"; AV Iye-abarim; in Nu 51 11 LXX reads B, Ἰσραήλ, Chalget): A place in the journeys of Israel named after Oboth, said to be "in the wilderness which is before Moab, toward the sunrise" (Nu 21 11), "in the border of Moab" (33 44). The inscription given here are not sufficient to guide to any identification, and, so far, nothing has been discovered in the district to help us. Called simply "Iym" (AV "Tim") in Nu 33 45.

IYIM, i'yim (יוֹיֶם, יִיָם, "heaps"—the form of which, יֵמָו, יִיָּם, is the constr.): (1) A short form of the name Iye-abarim (Nu 33 45).

(2) A town in the territory of Judah (Josh 15 29; EV wrongly "Tim"). It lay in the extreme S., "toward the border of Edom." It is not identified.

IYAR, i'yar' (יוֹדֵי, יִיָּד; יֵיָד, יִיָּד): The 2d month of the Jewish year, corresponding to May. It is not mentioned in the Bible. See CALENDAR.

IZEHAR, i'zhē-hār, i'zhē-hār (Nu 3 19 AV). See IZAR.

IZEHAR, i'zhē-hār (יהֶשֶׁר), "the shining one": (1) The father of Korah (Nu 16 1), descended from a Kohathite Levite of this name, whose descendants formed a family, in the tribe of Levi (Ex 6 18; Nu 3 19; 1 Ch 6 18-28). (2) A descendant of Judah, whose mother's name was Helah. ARV gives the name Zohar (1 Ch 4 7).

IZEHARITES, i'zhē-hār-its (יהֶשֶׁר), yishēḥâr): The descendants of Izhar, son of Kohath, and grandson of Levi (Nu 3 19-27). In David's reign some of these were "over the treasures of the house of Jeh" (1 Ch 26 23), others "for the outward business over Israel, for officers and judges" (ib. ver 29).

IZLIAH, i'zhē-la (זֶלְיוֹה, yizlē'āh, "Jeh delivers"); AV JEZLIAH: A son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 18).

IZRAHIAH, i'zra-hēa' (יהֹיָה, yisrahōēh, "Jeh appears, or shines"): (1) A descendant of Issachar, grandson of Tola, only son of Uzzi (1 Ch 7 3). (2) The leader of the singing at the purification of the people, on the occasion of Nehemiah's restoration; here rendered "Jearahiah" (Neh 12 12).

IZRAHITE, i'zra-hīt (יהֹיָה, yizrahē, "rising, shining"): Shamhuth, the captain of the 5th monthly course (1 Ch 27 8), is called an "Izrahite." The name may be derived from the town or family of Izrah, but more likely is a corruption of the word "Zerahite," descendant of Zerah of Judah.

IZRI, i'zē-ri (יהֹיָה, yereē, "creator", "former"): A man of the sons of Jeduthun, leader of the fourth band of musicians, who served in the sanctuary (1 Ch 25 11). Identical with Zeri (ver 3).

IZZIAH, i'zē-ia (יהֹיָה, yissēyahā, "Jeh unites"); AV Jeziyah: One of the faithful Jews who put away their foreign wives. He belonged to the family of Parosh (Ezr 10 25; 1 Esd 9 26, "Iddias").

JAANAI, ja'a-nāi: See BEEROTH-BENE-JAANAIN.

JAANAIN, ja'a-nāi: AV for JANAI (q.v.).

JAAR, ja'a-ār (יָּרָא, ya'ar, "forest" or "wood"): Is only once taken as a proper name (Ps 132 6 RVm), "We found it in the field of Jaar." It may be a shortened form of the name Kiriah-jezem, where the ark had rested 20 years. See KIRIATH-JEZREH.

JAARE-OREGIM, ja'a-ār-ō'rē-gim, -ōre-gim (יָּרָא-רֶּגֶים, ya'ārē rē'gīm): In 2 S 21 10, given as the name of a Bethelenean father of Ethanah, who is said to have slain Goliath the Gittite (cf
JAARESHIAH, ja'ar-ē-sha'a (יהָרְשַׁיָּה), ya'dresh-yath, meaning unknown: In 1 Ch 8 27, a Benjaminite, son of Jeroham. AV has "Jaareshiah."

JAASAI, ja-a'sil. JAASAU, ja-a'so. See JASSU.

JAAAS, ja-a'sh (בָּש, ya'dasä, meaning uncertain): In 1 Ch 11 47, a Mezobite, one of the "mighty men of the armies," and probably the "Jassiel" of 1 Ch 27 21, "the son of Abner," and a Benjaminite tribal prince of David's. AV "Jasiel."

JAASAI, ja'as-a-sh (בר, ya'daša, meaning uncertain): JAASAU (RVm and Kt'rh, בַּש, ya'daša), and JAASAU (AV): In Ear 10 37, one of those who had married foreign wives. LXX τὰς the consonantal text as a vb, κατ εποίησαν, "and they did." 1 Esd 9 34 has "Elasis."

JAAZANIAH, ja-az-a-nil (גָּזְנִי, ya'dzan-yahu, in 2 K 25 23; Ezek 8 11; גָּזְנִית, ya'dzan-yah, in Jer 36 3; Ezek 11 1, "Jeh hears"): (1) In 2 K 25 23, "son of the Maccathite," and one of the Judaean "captains of the forces" who joined Gedaliah, the puppet governor appointed by Nebuchadrezzar over Judah, at Mizpah. He is the "Jezaniah" of Jer 40 8; 42 1. Though not mentioned by name, he was presumably one of those captains who joined Johanan in his attack on Ishmael after the latter had slain Gedaliah (Jer 41 11-13). He is also the same as Azariah of Jer 43 2, a name read by LXX B in 42 1 also. Jer 43 5 relates how Johanan and his allies, Jaazaniah (= Azariah) among them, left Judah with the remnant, and took up their abode in Egypt. (2) In Jer 35 3, son of Jeremiah (not the prophet), and a chief of the Rechabite clan, from whose "staunch adherence to the precepts of their ancestors" Jeremiah "points a lesson for his own countrymen" (Driver, Jer 215). (3) In Ezek 8 11, son of Shaphan, and one of the seventy men of the elders of Israel whom Ezekiel saw in a vision of Jerusalem offering incense to idols. (4) In Ezek 11 1, son of Azur, and one of the 25 men whom Ezekiel saw in his vision of Jerus, at the E. door of the Lord's house, and against whose iniquity he was commanded to prophesy (11 13-15). DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JAAZER, ja'a-zèr (גָּזְר, ya'dzer). See JAZER.

JAAZIAH, ja-a-zil (גָּזַי, ya'dziyahu, "Jeh strengthens"): In 1 Ch 24 26 27, a Levite, "son of Merari. But the MT is corrupt. LXX B reads 'Oteb (Οτέβ), which some take to suggest Uziel (cf 27 25); see Curtis, Crit. and Exeget. Comm. on the Books of Ch, 274-75; Kittel, ad loc.

JAIZIEL, ja-a'zi-el (גָּזִי-ל, ya'dzi'el, "God strengthens"): In 1 Ch 16 18, a Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the time of David. Kittel and Curtis, following LXX 'Oteb (Οτέβ), read "Uziel," the name they adopt for Azriel in ver 20, and for Jeziel in 16 5.

JABAL, ja'bal (גַּבַּל, yabbâl, meaning uncertain): In Gen 4 20, a son of Lamech by Adah. He is called 'the father of those who dwell in tents and who keep sheep.' (Gen 35 22). He is the "king of Bashan," which in Phoen and Heb "means primarily 'ram,' then 'ram's horn' as a musical instrument, and finally joyous music" (in the designation of the year of Jubilee). See also Skinner, Gen, 103, on the supposed connection in meaning with Abel. DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JABBOK, jab'ok (גָּב֖וֹק, yabbôk, "luxuriant river"): A stream in Eastern Pal first named in the history of Jacob, as crossed by the patriarch, "of blue," referring to the clear blue color of the water. It rises near to A'mmân—Rabbâth Ammon—and makes a wide circuit, flowing first to the E., then to the N.W., until it is joined by the stream from Wâdy Jerash, at which point it turns westward, and flows, with many windings, to the Jordan, the confluence being just N. of ed-Dâmîyeh. It drains a wider area than any other stream E. of the Jordan, except the Yarmûk. The bed of the river is in a deep gorge with steep, and in many places precipitous, banks. It is a great defile, cutting the sand of Gilead in two. It is lined along its course by a luxuriant growth of oleander which, in season, lights up the valley with brilliant color. The length of the stream, taking no account of its innumerable windings, is about 90 miles. The mouth of the river has changed its position from time to time. In the lower reaches the vegetation is tropical. The river is fordable at many points, save when in full flood. The particular ford referred to in Gen 32 cannot now be identified. W. EWING

JABESH, ja'bes (גַּבְש, yabhâsh): A short form of JABESH-GILEAD (q.v.).

JABESH-GILEAD, ja'beš-gil'e-ad (גַּבְשֶׁ-גִּלְאָד, yabhâsh gîl'âd; or simply גַּבְש, yabhâsh, "dry"): A city E. of the Jordan, in the deliverance of which from Nahash the Ammonite Saul's military prowess was first displayed (1 S 11 1 f.). At an earlier time the inhabitants failed to share with their brethren in taking vengeance upon Benjamin. This laxity was terribly punished, only 400 virgins being spared alive, who afterward became wives to the Benjaminites (Jgs 21). The gratitude of the inhabitants to Saul was affectingy proved after the disaster to
that monarch on Gilboa (1 S 31). David, hearing of their deed, sent an approving message, and sought to win their loyalty to himself (2 S 2 4 ff). Robinson (BR, III, 39) thought it might be represented by a post, about 6 miles from Pella (Fākīl), on the southern bank of Wādy Yābīs. The distance from Pella agrees with the statement of Onom (s.v.). Others (Olyphant, Land of Gilead, 277; Merrill, East of Jordan, 430, etc.) would identify it with the ruins of Meramme, about 3 miles S.E. of Pella, on the N. of Wādy Yābīs. The site remains in doubt; but the ancient name still lingers in that of the valley, the stream from which enters the Jordan fully 9 miles S.E. of Beisīkīn.

W. Ewino

Jabez, jabez (יָבֶז), yaḇēz, "sorrow" ([height]):

1. Place: An unidentified town probably in the territory of Judah, occupied by scribes (1 Ch 2 55). For an ingenious reconstruction of the passage see EB, s.v.

2. Person: The head of a family of Judah, noted for his "honorable" character, though "his mother bare him with sorrow" (1 Ch 4 9 10), yaḇēz being interpreted as if it stood for yaḇē'ēh, "he causes pain." The same phrase upon words recurs in his prayer, "that it be not to my sorrow!" His request was granted, "and the sorrow implied by his omission name was averted by prayer" (Dummelow, in loc.).

Jabin, jabin (יָבִין), yāḇīn, "one who is intelligent," "discerning." The word may have been a hereditary royal title among the northern Canaanites. Cf. the familiar usage of parōḵ meleḵ miṣrāyim: (1) "The king of Hazor," the leading city in Northern Pal, who led an alliance against Joshua. He was defeated at the waters of Merom, his city was taken and he was slain (Josh 11 1 9).

(2) "The king of Canaan, that reigned [or had reigned] in Hazor." It is not clear whether he dwelt in Hazor or Harosheth, the home of Sisera, the captain of his host at the time of the story narrated in Jgs. He oppressed Israel in the days preceding the victory of Deborah and Barak. To the Israelites he must have been but a shadowy figure, as he was by his powerful captain, Sisera, for the song makes no mention of him and there is nothing to indicate that he even took part in the battle that freed Israel (Jgs 4 2 7 17 23 24 bis; Ps 83 9 10).

Ella Davis Isaacs

Jabeel, jaḇe'ēl, Jabeel, jaḇe'ēl, yāḇē'ēl, "God is builder"); LXX Λαβης, Labēn, Swete reads Lemēn, Apoc Παβηα, Iamēna, Παβηα, Iamēna:

1. A town on the northern border of the land assigned to Judah, near the western sea, mentioned in connection with Ekron (Josh 15 11). The place is now represented by the modern village of Yebna which stands upon a hill a little to the S. of the Naher Rubin, about 12 or 13 miles S. of Jaffa, on the road from there to Askelon, and about 4 miles from the sea. It had a port, now called Mina Rubin, a short distance S. of the mouth of the river, some remains of which still exist. Its harbor was superior to that of Jaffa (PEFS, 1875, 167 88). Its exact site is not clear, and it is usually identified with the site of Japhi, as it occurs in the passage mentioned, but it appears under the form "Japhi" (יָפִה, yaphi) in 2 Ch 26 6, as is evident from the mention of Gath and Ashdod in connection with it. LXX reads Παβη (Pamēn, Jabēn) where the Heb reads יָפִה (yaphi), "even unto the sea," in Josh 15 40, where Ekron and Ashdod and other cities and villages are mentioned as belonging to Judah's inheritance. Jos (Ant, V, i, 22) assigns it to the tribe of Dan. We have no mention of its being captured by Joshua or occupied by Judah until the reign of Uzziah who captured it and plundered its walls in his war upon the Philis (2 Ch 26 6).

The position of J. was strong and was the scene of many contests, both in the period of the monarchy and that of the Maccabees. It is mentioned frequently in the account of the wars of the latter with the Syrians. It was garrisoned by the Seleucid kings, and served as a base for raiding the territory of Judah. When Judas Maccabaeus defeated Gorgias and the Syrians he pursued them to the plains of J., but did not take the fortress (1 Macc 4 13). Gorgias was there attacked by the Jewish generals Joseph and Azarias, contrary to Judas' orders, who were repulsed with loss (6 56 60; Jos, Ant, XII, viii, 6).

Apollonius occupied it for King Demetrios (1 Mac 10 60); and Cendebeus for Antiochus, and from there harassed the Jews (15 40). Judas burned the port and navy of J. (2 Macc 12 8 9). It was taken by Simon in 142 BC (Jos, Ant, XIII, vi, 7; BJ, I, ii, 2), together with Gazara and Joppa, but was restored to its inhabitants by Ptolemy in 62 BC (Ant, XIV, iv, 4), and was rebuilt by Gabinus in 57 BC (BJ, I, viii, 4). It was restored to the Jews by Augustus in 30 AD. Herod gave it to his sister Salome and she bequeathed it to Julia, the wife of Augustus (Ant, XVIII, 2; BJ, II, ix, 1).

The town and region were prosperous in Roman times, and when Jesus was besieged by Titus the Sanhedrin removed to J., and it afterwards became the seat of a great rabbinical school (Milman, Hist Jews, 1, 411 12), but was suppressed in the persecution under Hadrian. Antonius allowed it to be revived, but it was again suppressed because of hostile language on the part of the rabbis (ib, 451 52). The Crusaders built there the castle of Belin, supposing it to be the site of Gath. It was occupied by the Saracens, and various inscriptions in Arab. of the 13th and 14th cents. have been found there (SWP, II, 441 42).

2. A town of Naphtali mentioned in Josh 19 33, and supposed to be the southern Iemma, S.W. of the sea of Galilee (SWP, I, 365). It is the Kefr Yama of the Talma.

H. Porter

Jachin, jaḵîn (יַחֵיָן), yaḵîn, "to establish":

1. The 4th son of Simeon (Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15; Nu 26 12). In 1 Ch 4 24 his name is given as "Jarib" (cf AVm, RVm). "Jachin," the patronymic of the family, occurs in Nu 26 12.

2. Head of the 21st course of priests in the time of David (1 Ch 24 17). It is used as a family name in 1 Ch 9 10, and as such also in Neh 11 10, where some of the course are included in the list of those who, having returned from Babylon, willingly accepted the decision of the lot, and abandoned their rural retreats to become citizens and guardians of Jerusalem (vs 1 f).

James Chirchiton

Jachin, jaḵîn, and Boaz (יַחֵיָן, yaḵîn, "he shall establish"); זַבָּא, ḏô'az, "in it is strength," 1 K 7 15 22; 2 K 25 16 17; 2 Ch 3 15 17; Jer 52 17): These were the names of the two bronze pillars that stood before the temple of Solomon. They were not used in supporting the building; their appearance, therefore, must have been solely due to moral and symbolic reasons. What their true meaning is it not easy to say. The pillars were not
altar pillars with hearths at their top, as supposed by W. R. Smith (Religion of the Semites, 191, 468); rather they were "pillars of witness," as was the pillar that witnessed the contract between Jacob and Laban (Gen 31:52). A difficulty arises about the height of the pillars. The writers in K and Jer affirm that the pillars before the porch were 18 cubits high apiece (1 K 7:15; Jer 52:21), while the Chronicler states that they were 55 cubits (2 Ch 3:15). Various methods have been suggested of reconciling this discrepancy, but it is more probable that there is a corruption in the Chronicler's number. On the construction of the pillars and their capitals, see Temple. At the final capture of Jerusalem they were broken up and the metal of which they were composed was sent to Babylon (2 K 25:13. 16). In Ezekiel's ideal temple the two pillars are represented by pillars of wood (40:49).

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

JACIMUS, iā'si-mus (Ant, XII, ix, 3). See Alcimus.

JACINTH, iā'sinth. See HYACINTH; STONES, PRECIOUS.

JACKAL, jak'ol: (1) אֶתֶּבֶן, tannim, "jackals," AV "dragons;" cf לִחְוֹת, fallān, Arab., לַחוֹת, tannān, Arab. לִחְוֹת, tannān, "sea monster" or "monster," ERV "dragon" (Job 7:12 m; Ps 74:13; 142:7; Isa 27:1; 51:9; Jer 51:34), "serpent," (Ex 9:10.12; Dt 32:33; Ps 91:13), AV "whale" (Gen 1:21; Job 12:7); but יָנָן, tannān, "jackals," AV "sea monsters" (Lam 4:3), "jackal's well," AV "dragon well" (Neh 2:13), and tannān, "monster," AV and ERY "dragon" (Ezk 29:3; 32:2).
(2) יִשְׂנֵּה, tīsim, "wolves," AV "wild beasts of the islands;" cf א, t, pl. יִשְׂנֵה, tīsim, "island;" also אֶתֶּבֶן, fallān, "a cry," איה, איו, "to cry," "to howl!" Arab. عَوْى, "toow;" "to bark" (of dogs, wolves, or jackals); אֶבֶן אֶזְרָא, "thee drya", colloquially בָּיְאָב, "jackal."
(3) יִשְׂנֵּה, tīsim, "wild beasts of the desert."
(4) אָוָּה, othim, "doeful creatures."

"Jackals" occurs as a tr of tannim, AV "dragons," in Ps 44:19; 85:4; 89:19; Lanka 12:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; of the fem. pl. form tannōh in Mal 1:3, and of tannin in Neh 2:13 and Lam 4:3. Tannin is variously referred to a root meaning "to howl," and to a root meaning "to stretch out," trop. "to run swiftly, i.e. with outstretched neck and limb extended" (Ges.). Either derivation would suit "wolf" equally as well as "jackal." The expression in Jer 10:22, "to make the cities of Judah a desolation, a dwelling-place of jackals," seems, however, less appropriate of jackals. The same is true of Isa 34:13; Jer 9:11; 49:33, and 51:37.

The jackal (from Pers shagdāh), Canis aureus, is found about the Mediterranean except in Western Europe. It ranges southward to Abyssinia, and eastward in Southern Asia, to farther India. It is smaller than a large dog, has a moderately bushy tail, and is reddish brown with dark shadings above. It is cowardly and nocturnal. Like the fox, it is destructive to poultry, grapes, and vegetables, but is less fastidious and readily devours the remains of others' feasts. Jackals generally go about in small companies. Their peculiar howl may frequently be heard in the evening and at any time in the night. It begins with a high-pitched, long-drawn-out cry.

This is repeated two or three times, each time in a higher key than before. Finally there are several short, loud, yelping barks. Often when one raises the cry others join in. Jackals are not infrequently confounded with foxes. They breed freely with dogs.

While tannim is the only word tr. "jackal" in EV, the words תִּשְׂנֵּים, tīsim, and אוֹתִים, othim, deserve attention. They, as well as tannim, evidently refer to wild creatures inhabiting desert places, but it is difficult to say for what animal each of the words stands. All four (together with בִּרְוֹד יָאָה, and צְרִים) are found in Isa 13:21,22: "But wild beasts of the desert (tīsim) shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doeful creatures (othim); and ostriches (bīnūth yā’ānāh) shall dwell there, and wild goats (tsīrim) shall dance there. And wolves (tīsim) shall cry in their castles, and jackals (tannim) in the pleasant palaces."

In AV tīsim (Isa 13:23: 34:14; Jer 50:39) is tr. "wild beasts of the islands" (cf tīsim, "island.") AV has merely the transliteration tīsim, RV "wolves," RVm "howling creatures." Gesenius suggests the jackal, which is certainly a howler. While the wolf has a blood-curling howl, it is much more rarely heard than the jackal.

כָּנָּה (Ps 72:9; 74:14; Isa 13:21; 23:13; 34:14; Jer 50:39), has been considered akin to כָּנָה, "howling" (cf אֶשָּׁמַה, "a dry land" (Ps 63:1), and is tr. in RV as follows: Ps 72:9, "that they dwell in the wilderness;" 74:14, "the people inhabiting the wilderness;" Isa 23:13, "them that dwell in the wilderness." RVm "the beasts of the wilderness;" Isa 34:13, "wild beasts of the desert." There would be some difficulty in referring כָּנָה in Ps 72:9 to beasts rather than men, but that is not the case in Ps 74:14 and Isa 23:13. "Wild cats" have been suggested.

כָּנָה, "doeful creatures," perhaps onomatopoetic, occurs only in Isa 13:21. The tr. "owls" has been suggested, and is not unsuitable to the context.

It is not impossible that tannim and tīsim may be different names of the jackals. tīsim, כָּנָה, and tannin occur together also in Isa 34:13,14, and כָּנָּה and tīsim in Jer 50:39. Their similarity in sound may have much to do with their collocation. The recognized word for "wolf," כָּנָה (cf Arab. dhibb), occurs 7 t in the OT. See DRAGON; WOLF; ZOOLOGY.

ALFRED ELY DAY

JACKAL'S WELL (תֶּבֶן), in ha-tannim: LXX has τὴν κάτα, τὸν κάτα, δὶς τὸν κάτα, "fountain of the figs;" AV "dragon well." A well or spring in the valley of Hinnom between the "Gate of the Gai" and the Dung Gate (Neh 2:13). No such source exists in the Wady or Rabbi (see HINNOM) today, although it is very probable that a well sunk to the rock in the lower parts of this valley was of old a certain amount of water trickling down the valley-bottom. G. A. Smith suggests (Jerus, I, ch iv) that this source may have arisen as the result of an
earthquake, hence the name "dragon," and have subsequently disappeared; but it is at least as likely that it received its name from the jackals which haunted this valley, as the parish dogs do to this day the dead bodies which were thrown there. See HINNOM; JACKAL.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

JACOB, jâ'kûb:

I. NAME

1. Form and Distribution
2. Etymology and Associations

II. Etymology

The connection where Etymology undoubtedly (d) the word was received by the Jews is uncertain. From the Syriac the Arabic word ٨٩٢٩٩٩٩ is derived. The root (a) above. Hence there is no ground to deny that even in the patriarchal period this name (like Jacob) was in current use among the Semites, and that the name Jacob lay ready at hand—a name ready made, as it were, for this child, in view of the peculiar circumstances of its birth; we may say that the parents felt they could escape the use of it. (A parallel case, perhaps, is Gen 38:25-30, Zerah; cf. Zerahiah.) The association of the root in everyday use in Jacob's family to mean "to supplant" led to the fresh realization of its appropriate application to his character when he grew (b) above. This construction does not interfere with the connection between the patriarch Jacob and the "Jacob-els" referred to above (under 1. [b]), should that connection on other grounds appear probable. Such a longer form was perhaps for every "Jacob" an alternative form of his name, and under certain circumstances may have been used by or of even the patriarch Jacob.

III. BIOGRAPHY

The place in Canaan
2. To Aram and Back
3. In Canaan Again

IV. CHARACTER AND BELIEFS

1. Natural Qualities
2. Stages of Development
3. Attitude toward the Promise

V. REFERENCES OUTSIDE OF GENESIS

1. In the OT
2. In the NT

VI. MODERN INTERPRETATIONS OF JACOB

1. Of Jacob in the Hebrew Nation
2. Of God and Demi-God
3. Of Character in Fiction

1. Name

The variations of the name "Jacob" are in the plural impf. 3rd asc masc. sing. Like some 50 other Heb. names of this same root, it has no subject for the vb. distribution is varied. But there are a number of independent indications that Jacob belongs to that large class of names consisting of 3 words with suffixing (so Divine name or title (in this case [e]) as the subject, from which the common abbreviated form is derived by omitting the middle word (a) in Ish documents of the period of the Patriarchs, there occur such personal names as Jacob-beli, Jacob-apis, Jacob-beliba (the former two abbreviations of the latter), and Aq-bi-hu (cf. Aq-bi-hu, according to Hilprecht a synecdochal form of A-qbi-ili, all of which may be associated with the same root ٨٩٢٩٩٩٩.

Jacob as appears in Jacob (see H. Ranken, Early Bab. Personal Names, 1905, with annotations by Professor Hilprecht as editor, esp. pp. 67, 113, 98 and 4). (b) In the list of places in Pal conquered by the Pharaoh Thutmose III appears a certain J'qôb, which in Egyptian characters represents the Sem letters ٨٩١٩٩٩٩، ٨٩١٩٩٩، and which therefore seems to show that in the earlier half of the 18th cent. BC (so Petrie, Elam) it was a name of a place (not a tribe; see W. M. Müller, Assyrische und Europa, 163 ff) in Central Pal that bore a name in some way connected with "Jacob." Moreover, aPharaoh of the Hyksos period bears a name that looks like ٨٩١٩٩٩٩٩ (so Philistia). (c) In the Jewish tractate Pir'âbabbîh, II.1, we read of a Jew named "Akebêbêh, which is a name composed of the root ٨٩٢٩٩٩٩ and the word "Am" or "man," in common abbreviated form. It should be noted that the personal names ٨٩٢٩٩٩٩٩٩, Aq-bi-hu and Ya'qib-hu (accent on penult) also occur in the OT, the former borne by no less than 4 different persons; also that in the Palmyrene inscriptions we find a name person ٨٩١٩٩٩٩٩, a name in which this same root ٨٩١٩٩٩٩ is preceded by the name of the god 'Atê, just as in 'Akebêbêh is followed by the name 'Atê.

The distribution and distribution of the name, it remains to inquire: What do we know of its etymology other than what were the associations it conveyed to the Heb ear?

2. ETYMOLOGY

The vb. in all its usages is capable of deduction, by simple association of ideas, from the noun "heal." "To heal" might be "to take hold of by the heel," (so probably Hos 12:8; cf Gen 37:26) (6) "to follow with evil intent," "to supplant," or in general "to deceive," (Gen 37:2) (c) "to follow," (Jer 3:4) (d) "to take," (so in the parallel, "to go about with slanders," is interesting because the word so far is akin to the noun "heal," as "supplant" is to "heal"); (e) "to follow with good intent," whether as a slave (of our Eng. "to heel," of a dog) for service, or as a guest (so Ethic.), "to keep guard over," and thus "to restrain," (so Job 37:4) (d) "to take," (so in the parallel, "to take the place of another") (so Arab., and the Heb noun ٨٩١٩٩٩٩, ٨٩١٩٩٩, "consequence," "recompense," whether of reward or punishment?

We are thus given four significations, which most commends itself as the original intent in the use of this vb. to form a proper name? The answer to this question depends upon the degree of strength with which the Divine name was felt to be the subject of the vb. As Jacob—ei., the complete interpretation of the use of the vb. by Baethgen urges (Beitrag zur sem. Religionsgeschichte, 461), "God rewarded" (id.), "God hath given," etc. But we have already seen that centuries before the time when Jacob is said to have been born, this name was shortened by his father Isaac from "Isaac's slave," to "Jacob." But as the name Jacob lay ready at hand—a name ready made, as it were, for this child, in view of the peculiar circumstances of its birth; we may say that the parents felt they could escape the use of it. (A parallel case, perhaps, is Gen 38:25-30, Zerah; cf. Zerahiah.) The association of the root in everyday use in Jacob's family to mean "to supplant" led to the fresh realization of its appropriate application to his character when he grew older. This construction does not interfere with the connection between the patriarch Jacob and the "Jacob-els" referred to above (under 1. [b]), should that connection on other grounds appear probable. Such a longer form was perhaps for every "Jacob" an alternative form of his name, and under certain circumstances may have been used by or of even the patriarch Jacob.

II. PLACE IN THE PATRIARCHAL SUCCESSION.—In the dynasty of the "heirs of the promise," Jacob takes his place, first, as the ancestor of the race of Isaac. In Isaac's life the most significant event was the birth of Isaac and the notification of his blessing. The blessing was doubtless the work of the divine agent, or of Jacob's own father. It was probably the promise of the exportation of the house of Jacob to Egypt, as a kingdom among kings, and the assurance of the divine favor towards his name. It is not, however, the idea which is here to be considered, but the words of the promise, which are given in the book of Genesis, chapter ii. 12, "and Abraham and his household were in Canaan; and Jacob and Esau were natives of Canaan in the second generation, yet had not a drop of Canaanitish blood in their veins. Their birth was delayed till 20 years after the marriage of their parents. Esau's barrenness had certainly the same effect, and probably the same purpose, as that of Sarah: it drove Isaac to Divine aid, demanded of him his assumption of the title of "faith and patience," through which they "inherited the promises" (He 6 12), and made the children of this pair also the evident gift of God's grace, so that Isaac was the better able "by faith" to "bless Jacob and Esau even concerning things to come" (He 11 21). These twin brothers therefore share thus far the same relation to their parents and to what their parents transmit to them. But here the likeness ceases. "Being not yet born, neither having received any thing of Esau, good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto Rebecca, The elder shall serve the younger" (Rom 9 11 12). In the Gen-narrative, without any doctrinal assertions either adduced to explain it, or deduced from it, the fact is nevertheless made clear as it is in Mal or Rom, that Esau is rejected, and Jacob is chosen as a link in the chain of inheritance that receives and transmits the promise.

With Jacob the last person is reached whose own generation, thus sums up in a single individual "the seed" of promise. He becomes the father of 12 sons, who are the progenitors of the tribes of the 12 people "peculiar people." It is for this reason that this people bears his name, and not that of his father Isaac or that of his grandfather Abraham. The "children of Israel," the "house of Jacob," are the totality of the seed of the promise, the children of Isaac. Ishmaelites equally with Israelites boast of descent from Abraham. But the twelve tribes that called themselves "Israel" were all descendants of Jacob, and were the only de scentants of Jacob on the agnate principle of family-constitution.
III. Biography.—The life of a wanderer (Dt 26 5 RV) such as Jacob was, may often be best divided into four geographical periods. Jacob's career falls into the four distinct periods: that of his residence with Isaac in Canaan, that of his residence with Laban in Aram, that of his independent life in Canaan, and that of his migration to Egypt.

Jacob's birth was remarkable in respect of (a) its delay for 20 years as noted above, (b) that condition of his mother which led to the Divine oracle concerning his future greatness, and (c) the unusual phenomenon that gave him his name: "he holds by the heel" (see above, 1, 2). Unlike his twin brother, Jacob seems to have been free from any physical peculiarities; his smoothness (Gen 27 11) is only predicated of him in contrast to Esau's hairiness.

These brothers, as they developed, grew apart in tastes and habits. Jacob, like his father in his quiet manner of life and (for that reason perhaps) his companionship and favor of his mother, found early the opportunity to obtain Esau's sworn renunciation of his right of primogeniture, by taking advantage of his habits, his impulsiveness and his fundamental indifference to the higher things of the spirit (see ch. 25). This was not until long afterward that the companion-scene to this first "supplanting" (27 36) was enacted. Both sons meanwhile are to be thought of simply as members of Isaac's following, during all that period of his successive sojourns in Gera and in the Valley of Gerar and Beersheba (ch 26). Within this period, when the brothers were 40 years of age, occurred Esau's marriage with two Hittite women. Jacob, remembering his own mother's origin, bid his time to find a wife who should be the mother of his children. The question whether she should be brought to him, as Rebekah was to Isaac, or he should go to find her, was settled at last by a family feud that only his absence could heal.

This feud was occasioned by the fraud that Jacob at Rebekah's behest practised upon his father and brother, when these two were minded to nullify the clearly revealed purpose of the oracle (25 23) and the sanctions of a solemn oath (26 33). Isaac's partiality toward his elder son, brought home to him that this was not his mother's wish. The trick was directly planned by the wife, who had learned to be eyes and ears for a husband's failing senses, detected the secret scheme, counter-plotted with as much skill as unscrupulousness, and while she obtained the paternal blessing for her favorite son, fell nevertheless under the painful necessity of choosing between losing him through his brother's revenge or losing him by absence from home. She chose, of course, the latter alternative, and herself brought about Jacob's departure, by pleading to Isaac the necessity for obtaining a wife as Jacob's wife of a sort different from the Canaanitish women that Esau had married. Thus ends the first portion of Jacob's life.

It is no young man that sets out thus to escape a brother's vengeances, and perhaps to find a wife at length among his mother's kindred.

2. To Aram It was long before this that Esau at and back the age of forty had married the Hittite women (cf 26 34 with 27 40). Yet to one who had high-dignate to his father, indulged by his mother, in awe of a brother's physical superiority, and "dwelling in tents, a quiet [domestic] man" (25 27), this journey of 500 or 600 miles, with no one to guide, counsel or defend, was as new an experience as if he had really been the stripping that he is sometimes said to have been. All the chapters in life awaited him: self-determination, love, marriage, fatherhood, domestic provision and administration, adjustment of his relations with men, and above all a personal and independent religious experience.

Of these things, all were to come to him in the 20 years of absence from Canaan, and the last was to come first; for the dream of Jacob at Beth-el was of course but the opening scene in the long drama of God's direct agency with Jacob. Yet it was the self-determinative scene, for God in His latest and fullest manifestation to Jacob was just "the God of Beth-el" (35 7; 48 3; 49 24).

With the arrival at Haran came love at once, though not for 7 years the consummation of that love. Its strength is naively indicated by the writer in two ways: impliedly in the sudden output of physical power at the well-side (29 10), and expressly in the patient years of toll for Rachel's sake, which "seemed unto him but a few days for the love he had to her" (29 20). Jacob is not primarily to be blamed for the polygamy, which brought struggle into his home-life and sowed the seeds of division and jealousy in the nation of the future.

Although his name was not named up in the rivalry of Leah and Rachel—Judah and Joseph—yet it was not Jacob's choice but Laban's fraud that introduced this cause of schism. At the end of his 7 years' labor Jacob received as wife not Rachel but Leah, and he rejoiced that he had purchased Rachel's name: "the younger daughter before the elder was not the custom of the country. This was the first of the "ten times" that Laban "changed the wages" of Jacob (31 7-41). Rachel became Jacob's wife 7 years later, and married him for 7 other years. During these 7 years were born most of the sons and daughters (37 35) that formed the actual family, the nucleus of that large caravan that Jacob took back with him to Canaan. Dinah is the only daughter named; 30 21 is obviously in preparation for the story of ch 34 (see esp. 34 31).

Four sons of Leah were the oldest: Reuben, with the right of primogeniture, Simeon, Levi and Judah. Next came the 4 sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, the daughter personal slaves of Leah (29 30-33). The sons of Rachel and Leah numbered 14 (33 2; 44 19); the two pairs of sons were probably of about the same age (of order in ch 49). Leah's 5th and 6th sons were separated by an interval of uncertain length from her older group. And Joseph, the youngest son born in Haran, was Rachel's first child, equally beloved by his mother, and by his father for her sake (33 2; cf 44 20), as well as because he was the youngest of the eleven (37 3).

Jacob's years of service for his wives were followed by 6 years of service rendered for a stipulated wage. Laban's cunning in limiting the amount of this wage in a variety of ways was matched by Jacob's cunning in devising means to overreach his uncle, so that the penniless wanderer of 20 years before becomes the wealthy proprietor of countless cattle and of the hosts of slaves necessary for their care (32 10). At the same time the apology of Jacob for his conduct during this entire period of residence in Haran is spirited (31 30-42); it is apparently unanswerable by Laban (ver 49); and it is confirmed, both by the evident concurrence of Leah and Rachel (vs 14-16), and by indications in the narrative that the justice (not merely the partiality) of God gave to each party his due recompense: to Jacob the high returns of spiritual, physical, and national advantage; to Laban rebuke and warning (vs 5-13, 24, 29, 42).

The manner of Jacob's departure from Haran was determined by the strained relations between
his uncle and himself. His motive in going, however, is represented as being fundamentally the desire to terminate an absence from his father's company that had continued for 20 years (Gen 28: 12).—A desire which in fact presented itself to him in the form of a revelation of God's own purpose and command (31: 3). Unhappily, his clear record was stained by the act of another than himself, who nevertheless, as a member of his family, entailed thus upon him the burden of responsibility. Rachel, like Laban her father, was devoted to the superstition that manifested itself in the keeping and consulting of teraphim, a custom which, whether more nearly practised by the Canaanite or ancestor, worship, was felt to be incompatible with the worship of the one true God. (Note that the "teraphim" of 31: 19, 34: 1 are the same as the "gods" of vs 30: 32 and, apparently, of 25: 4.) This theft furnished Laban with a pretext for pursuit. What he meant to do he probably knew but imperfectly himself. Coercion of some sort he would doubtless have brought to bear upon Jacob and his caravan, had he not recognized in a dream the God whom Jacob worshipped, and heard Him utter a word of warning against the use of violence. Laban failed to find his stolen gods, for his daughter was as crafty and ready-witted as he. The whole adventure ended in a formal reconciliation, with the usual sacrificial and messengers (35: 5–5).

After Laban, Esau. One danger is no sooner escaped than a worse threatens. Yet between them lies the pledge of Divine presence and protection in the vision of God's host at Mahanaim: just as a small portion of God's people were about Jacob in his journey to the fabled land. The detail that popular story-telling loves, but the sober record of a tradition to which the supernatural was matter of fact. Even the longer passage that preserves the occurrence at Penuel is conceived in the same spirit. What the revelation of the host of God had not sufficed to teach this faithless, anxious, scheming patriarch, that God sought to teach him in the night-struggle, with its ineffaceable physical memorial of a human impotence that can compass no more than to cling to Divine omnipotence (32: 22–32). The devices of crafty Jacob to disarm an offended and supposedly implacable brother proved as useless as that bootless wrenching of the night before; Esau's peculiar disposition was not of Jacob's making. But God provided the means by which Jacob could own his safety. The practical wisdom of Jacob dictated his insistence upon bringing to a speedy termination the proposed association with his changeable brother, amid the difficulties of a journey that could not be shared by such divergent social and racial elements as Esau's armed host and Jacob's caravan, without discontent on the one side and disaster on the other. The brothers part, not to meet again until they meet to bury their father at Hebron (34: 29).

Before Jacob's arrival in the S. of Canaan where his father yet lived and where his own youth had been spent, he passed through a period of wandering in Central Pal, somewhat similar to that narrated of his grand-father Abraham. To any such nomad, wandering slowly from Aram toward Egypt, a period of residence in the region of Mt. Ephraim was a natural chapter in his book of travels, (48: 1), recorded for stop, (1) at Succoth, E. of the Jordan near Penuel, (2) at Shechem and (3) at Beth-el.

Nothing worthy of record occurred at Succoth, but the stay at Shechem was eventful. Gen 34, which tells the story of Dinah's seduction and Jacob's angry response, throws as much light upon the relations of Jacob and the Canaanites, as does ch 14 or ch 23 upon Abraham's relations, or ch 26 upon Isaac's relations, with such settled inhabitants of the land. There is a strange blending of moral and immoral elements in Jacob and his family as portrayed in this chapter (31: 9–52). There is a tradition of separateness from the Canaanites bequeathed from Abraham's day (ch 24), together with a growing family consciousness and sense of superiority (31: 7–14, 31). And at the same time there is indifference to their unique moral status among the environs tribes, shown in Dinah's social relations with them (ver 1), in the treachery and cruelty of Simeon and Levi (vs 25–29), and in Jacob's greater concern for the security of his possessions than for the preservation of his good name (ver 30).

It was this concern for the safety of the family and its wealth that achieved the end which dread of social absorption would apparently never have achieved—the termination of a long residence where there was moral danger for all. For a second time Jacob had fairly to be driven to Beth-el. Safety from his foes was again a gift of God (35: 5), and in a renewal of the old forgotten ideals of consecration (vs 2–5) he and all his following move from the painful associations of Shechem to the hallowed associations of Beth-el. Here were renewed the various phases of all God's earlier communications to this patriarch and to his fathers with a name of Israel no ill deserved, is henceforth to find realization in his life; his fathers' God is to be his God; his seed is to inherit the land of promise, and is to be no mean tribe, but a group of peoples with kings to rule over them (35: 7–12). But no wonder that Jacob here raises anew his monument of stone—emblem of the "Stone of Israel" (49: 24)—and stumps forever, by this public act, upon ancient Luz (35: 6), the name of Beth-el which he had privately given it years before (23: 19).

Losses and griefs characterized the family life of the patriarch at this period. The death of his mother's Syrian nurse at Beth-el (35: 5; cf 24: 50) was followed by the death of his beloved wife Rachel at Ephrath (35: 18; 48: 7) in bringing forth the youngest of his 12 sons, Benjamin. At about the same time the eldest of the 12, Reuben, forfeited the honor of his station in the family by an act that showed all too clearly the effect of recent experiences (35: 9–12). The death claimed Jacob's aged father, whose latest years had been robbed of the companionship, not only of this son, but also of the son whom his partiality had all but made a fratricide; at Isaac's grave in Hebron the ill-matched brothers met once more, thenceforth to go their separate ways, both in their personal careers and in their descendants' history (35: 29).

Jacob now is by right of patriarchal custom head of all the family. He too takes up his residence at Hebron (37: 14), and the story of the family fortunes is now pursued under the new title of "the generations of Jacob" (37: 2). True, most of this story revolves about Joseph, the youngest of the family save Benjamin; yet the occurrence of passages like ch 38, devoted exclusively to Judah's affairs, or ch 46: 8–27, the enumeration of Jacob's entire family through its secondary ramifications, or ch 49, the blessing of Jacob on all his sons—all these prove that Jacob, not Joseph, is the true center of the narrative until his death. As long as he lives he is the real head of his house, and not merely a superannuated veteran like Isaac. Not only Joseph, the boy of 17 (37: 2), but also the self-willed elder sons, even a score of years later, control at his bidding (chs 42–45). Joseph's dearest thought, as it is his first thought, is for his aged father (43: 7–27; 44: 19; and esp. 46: 3.9.13.23, and 46: 29).
It is this devotion of Joseph that results in Jacob’s migration to Egypt. What honors there Joseph can show his father he shows him: he presents him to Pharaoh, who for Joseph’s sake receives him with dignity, and assigns him a home and sufficient for himself and all his people as honored guests of the land of Egypt (47:7–12). Yet in Beer-sheba, while en route to Egypt, Jacob had obtained a greater honor than this reception by Pharaoh. He had found there, as ready to respond to his sacrifices as ever to those of his fathers, the God of his father Isaac, and had received the gracious assurance of Divine guidance in this momentous journey, fraught with so vast a significance for the future nation and the world (46:1–4): God Himself would go with him into Egypt and give him, not merely the gratification of once more embracing his long-lost son, but the fulfillment of the covenant-promise (15:13–16) that he and his were not turning their backs upon Canaan forever. Though 130 years of age when he stood before Pharaoh, Jacob felt his days to have been “few” as well as “evil,” in comparison with those of his fathers (47:9). And in fact he had yet 17 years to live in Goshen (47:28).

It is not always that events are passed over without record, save of the growth and prosperity of the family. But at their close came the impartation of the ancestral blessings, with the last will of the dying patriarch. After adopting Joseph’s sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, as his own, preferring the younger to the elder as he himself had once been preferred to Esau, and assigns to Joseph the “double portion” of the first-born—that “preeminence” which he denies to Reuben (48:22; 49:26) by that combination of emotion and glowing imagery of its style and the unsurpassed elevation of its diction, a lyrical fervor of religious sentiment which demands for its author a personality that had passed through just such a course of tuition as Jacob had experienced, the last words of Jacob, in ch. 49, mark a turning-point in the history of the people of God. This is a translation of biography into prophecy. On the assumption that it is genuine, we may confidently aver that the proverbs of the future, those who bear the grace. It’s auditors were its theme. Their descendants were its fulfillment. Neither the one class nor the other could ever let it pass out of memory. It was “by faith,” as we are well reminded, that Joseph “waxed greater in the service of Pharaoh” (He 11:21). For he held to the promises of God, and even in the hour of dissolution looked for the fulfillment of the covenant, according to which Canaan should belong to him and to his seed after him. He therefore set Joseph an example, by “giving commandment concerning his bones,” that they might rest in the burial-place of Abraham and Isaac near Hebron. To the accomplishment of this mission Joseph and all his brethren addressed themselves after their father’s death, and in the 70 days of official mourning. Followed by “a very great company” of the notables of Egypt, including royal officials and representatives of the royal family, this Heb tribe carried up to sepulture in the land of promise the embalmed body of the patriarch from whom henceforth they were to take their tribal name, lamented him according to custom for 7 days, and then returned to their temporary home in Egypt, till their children should at length he called to bear the name of Jacob (He 11:1) and inherit his promises to their father Jacob.

IV. Character and Beliefs.—In the course of this account of Jacob’s career the inward as well as the outward fortunes of the man have somewhat appeared. Yet a more comprehensive view of the kind of man he was will not be superfluous at this point. With what disposition was he endowed—the natural nucleus for acquired characteristics and habits? Through what stages did he pass in the development of his beliefs and his character? In particular, what attitude did he maintain toward the most significant things in his life, the promise of God to his house? And lastly, what resemblances may be traced in Israel the man to Israel the nation, of such sort that the one may be regarded as “typical” of the other? These matters deserve more than a passing notice.

From his father, Jacob inherited that domesticity and affectionate attachment to his home circle which appears in his life from beginning to end. He inherited shrewdness, initiative and resourcefulness from his mother, qualities which she shared apparently with her brother Laban and all his family. The conspicuous ethical faults of Abraham and Isaac alike are want of candor and want of courage. It is not so with Jacob, therefore, to find the same failings in Jacob. Deceit and cowardice are visible again and again in the impartial record of his life. Both spring from unbelief. They belong to the natural man. God’s transformation of Jacob was wrought by that patience and nourishing in him a simple trust in the truth and power of the Divine word. For Jacob was not at any time in his career indifferent to the things of the spirit, the things unseen and belonging to the future. Unlike Esau, he was not blind to the touch of God. Whether through inheritance, or as a fruit of early teaching, he had as the inestimable treasure, the true capital of his spiritual career, a firm conviction of the value of what God had promised, with the warm feeling of religious sentiment which demands for its author a personality that had passed through just such a course of tuition as Jacob had experienced, the last words of Jacob, in ch. 49, mark a turning-point in the history of the people of God. This is a translation of biography into prophecy. On the assumption that it is genuine, we may confidently aver that the proverbs of the future, those who bear the grace. It’s auditors were its theme. Their descendants were its fulfillment. Neither the one class nor the other could ever let it pass out of memory. It was “by faith,” as we are well reminded, that Joseph “waxed greater in the service of Pharaoh” (He 11:21). For he held to the promises of God, and even in the hour of dissolution looked for the fulfillment of the covenant, according to which Canaan should belong to him and to his seed after him. He therefore set Joseph an example, by “giving commandment concerning his bones,” that they might rest in the burial-place of Abraham and Isaac near Hebron. To the accomplishment of this mission Joseph and all his brethren addressed themselves after their father’s death, and in the 70 days of official mourning. Followed by “a very great company” of the notables of Egypt, including royal officials and representatives of the royal family, this Heb tribe carried up to sepulture in the land of promise the embalmed body of the patriarch from whom henceforth they were to take their tribal name, lamented him according to custom for 7 days, and then returned to their temporary home in Egypt, till their children should at length he called to bear the name of Jacob (He 11:1) and inherit his promises to their father Jacob.

IV. Character and Beliefs.—In the course of this account of Jacob’s career the inward as well as the outward fortunes of the man have somewhat appeared. Yet a more comprehensive view of the kind of man he was will not be superfluous at this point. With what disposition was he endowed—the natural nucleus for acquired characteristics and habits? Through what stages did he pass in the development of his beliefs and his character? In particular, what attitude did he maintain toward the most significant things in his life, the promise of God to his house? And lastly, what resemblances may be traced in Israel the man to Israel the nation, of such sort that the one may be regarded as “typical” of the other? These matters deserve more than a passing notice.

From his father, Jacob inherited that domesticity and affectionate attachment to his home circle which appears in his life from beginning to end. He inherited shrewdness, initiative and resourcefulness from his mother, qualities which she shared apparently with her brother Laban and all his family. The conspicuous ethical faults of Abraham and Isaac alike are want of candor and want of courage. It is not so with Jacob, therefore, to find the same failings in Jacob. Deceit and cowardice are visible again and again in the impartial record of his life. Both spring from unbelief. They belong to the natural man. God’s transformation of Jacob was wrought by that patience and nourishing in him a simple trust in the truth and power of the Divine word. For Jacob was not at any time in his career indifferent to the things of the spirit, the things unseen and belonging to the future. Unlike Esau, he was not blind to the touch of God. Whether through inheritance, or as a fruit of early teaching, he had as the inestimable treasure, the true capital of his spiritual career, a firm conviction of the value of what God had promised, with the warm feeling of religious sentiment which demands for its author a personality that had passed through just such a course of tuition as Jacob had experienced, the last words of Jacob, in ch. 49, mark a turning-point in the history of the people of God. This is a translation of biography into prophecy. On the assumption that it is genuine, we may confidently aver that the proverbs of the future, those who bear the grace. It’s auditors were its theme. Their descendants were its fulfillment. Neither the one class nor the other could ever let it pass out of memory. It was “by faith,” as we are well reminded, that Joseph “waxed greater in the service of Pharaoh” (He 11:21). For he held to the promises of God, and even in the hour of dissolution looked for the fulfillment of the covenant, according to which Canaan should belong to him and to his seed after him. He therefore set Joseph an example, by “giving commandment concerning his bones,” that they might rest in the burial-place of Abraham and Isaac near Hebron. To the accomplishment of this mission Joseph and all his brethren addressed themselves after their father’s death, and in the 70 days of official mourning. Followed by “a very great company” of the notables of Egypt, including royal officials and representatives of the royal family, this Heb tribe carried up to sepulture in the land of promise the embalmed body of the patriarch from whom henceforth they were to take their tribal name, lamented him according to custom for 7 days, and then returned to their temporary home in Egypt, till their children should at length he called to bear the name of Jacob (He 11:1) and inherit his promises to their father Jacob.
of accepting the Divine will, of realizing the Divine nearness and faithfulness. If there are those admirably graded lessons in the grace of God, that were imparted in the series of Divine appearances to the patriarch, at Beth-el, at Haran, at Peniel, at Beth-el again and at Beersheba. For if the substance of these Divine revelations be compared, it will be found that all are alike in the assurance (1) that God is with him to bless; (2) that the changes of his life are ordained of God and are for his ultimate good; and (3) that he is the heir of the ancestral promises.

It will further be found that they may be arranged in a chronological order, according as one or another of the revelations be viewed as the climax. Thus (1), agreeing with the chronological order, the appearance at Beersheba may well be regarded as the climax of them all. Abraham had gone to Egypt to escape a famine (15 10), but he went without revelation, and returned with bitter experience of his error. Isaac essayed to go to Egypt for the same cause (26 1 f.), and was prevented by revelation. Jacob now goes to Egypt, but he goes with the express approval of the God of his fathers, and with the evident anticipation that the seed of Abraham, the seed of the Deity: of whom He said (35 1), at Beth-el the second time (35 11) and at Beersheba (46 3). But it is never used alone. Like Allah in the Arab. language (=the God), so 'El with the definite article before it serves to designate in Hebraism a particular divinity, not deity in general. Or else 'El without the article is made definite by some genitive phrase that supplies the necessary identification: so in Jacob's case, El-beth-el (35 7; cf 31 13) or El-Elohe-Israel (33 20).

Or, lastly, there is added to 'El some determining suffix, with the form of an adjective, as Shaddai (tr. "Almighty") in 33 11 (cf 43 3). Distinction from this word, 'El, with its archaic or poetic flavor, is the common Heb word for God, Elohim. But while Elohim is used regularly by the narrator of the Jacob-stories in speaking, or in depicting his own attitude to God; while to the monothestic writer is of course the God and his own God, he never puts this word thus absolutely into the mouth of the revealing Deity. Jacob can say, when he awakes from his dream, "This is the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." But he calls the God of the dream, "I am the God [Elohim] of thy father" (28 17 13). At Mahanaim Jacob says, "This is the host of Elohim" (32 2), but at Beersheba God says to Jacob, "I am . . . the God [Elohim] of thy father" (46 3). Such are the distinctions maintained in the use of these words, and all of them used of the same God, yet chosen in each case to fit the circumstances of speaker, hearer and situation. The only passage in the story of Jacob that might appear to be an exception does in fact hasten the proof. At Peniel the angel of God explains the new name of Israel by saying, "Thou hast sinned against God [Elohim] and with men, and hast prevailed." Here the contrast with "men" proves that Elohim without the article is just the right expression, even on the lips of Deity; neither Deity nor humanity has prevailed against Jacob (32 25).

Throughout the entire story of Jacob, therefore, his relations with Jehovah his God, after they were once established (28 13 16), are narrated in terms that emphasize the Divinity of Him who had thus entered into covenant-relationship with him: His Divinity—that is to say, those attributes of Divinity manifested itself in His dealings with Jacob.

From the foregoing, two things appear with respect to Jacob's attitude toward the promise of God. First, with all his faults and failures, toward the Promised Land, and after the reappearance of God in His-divinity manifested itself in His dealings with Jacob.

3. Attitude toward the promise of God concerning things of a value wholly spiritual—future good, moral and spiritual blessings. And second, he was capable of progress in these matters; that is, his reaction to the Divine tuition would appear, if charted, as a series of elevations, separated one from another, to be sure, by low levels and deep declines, yet each one higher than the last, and all taken collectively lifting the whole average up and up. In the last, God has triumphed over sight, the future over present good, a yet unpossessed but Divinely promised Canaan over all the comfort and honors of Egypt, and the aged patriarch lives only to "wait for Jehovah's salvation." (49 18.)

The contrast of Jacob with Esau furnish perhaps the best means of grasping the significance of these two facts for an estimate of Jacob's attitude toward the promise. For in the first place, Esau, who possessed so much that Jacob lacked—directness, manliness, a sort of backbone, that made him superficially more attractive than his brother—Esau shows nowhere any real "sense" for things
spiritual. The author of Hebrews has caught the man in the flash of a single word, "prophane" (προφανής, βέβηλος)—of course, in the older, broader, etymological meaning of the term. Esau's desires dwelt in the world of the non-sacred; they did not aspire to the world of nearness to God, where one must "put off from his feet, because the place whereon he stands is holy ground." And in the second place, there is no sign of growth in Esau. What we see him in his father's encampment, that we see him to the end—so far as appears from the story—is a mere remnant, a shadow, the vices of the man who lives for the present—forgiving when strong enough to revenge, condescending when flattered, proud of power and independent of parental control or family tradition—Esau is as impartially depicted by the sacred historian as if the writer had been an Edomite instead of an Israelite: the sketch is evidently true to life, both from its objectivity and from its coherence.

Now what was Jacob was. His fault in connection with the promulgation of God, the family tradition, the ancestral blessing, lay not in despising them, but in seeking them in immoral ways. Good was his aim; but he was ready to "do evil that good might come." He was always tempted to be his own God and to fulfill the promise of his father Isaac and was clearly directed, both by providential leadings and by gracious discourses, to this corresponding purpose: to enlighten Jacob as to the nature of the promise; to assure him that it was his by grace; to awaken personal faith in His Divine Grace; and to supplement his "faith" by that "patience" without which none can "inherit the promises." The faith that accepts was to issue at length in the faith that waits.

A nation was to take its name from Jacob-Israel, and there are some passages of Scripture where it is uncertain whether that name designates the nation or its ancestor. In their respective relations to God and to the world of men and nations, there is a true sense in which the father was a "type" of the children. It is probably only a play of fancy that would discover a parallel in their respective careers, between the successive stages of life in the father's home (Caanaan), life in exile, a return, and a second exile. But it is not fanciful to note the resemblance between Jacob and Joseph, both as a character and that of his descendants. While a few exceptions the qualities mentioned above (IV, 2) would distinguish a Hebrew, its spirit was equally applicable to the nation of Israel. And even that curriculum in which the patriarch learned of God may be viewed as the kernel in which the Hebrew people—after all of them, or even the mass, but the "remnant" who applied himself to his calling as Israel of the prophets, as "servant of Jehovah"—were taught the lessons of faith and patience, of renunciation and consecration, that appear with more or less emphasis on the pages of Isaiah, of Hosea and of Malachi. This is apparently Hosea's point of view in 12 3—4, 12. A word of caution, however, is needed at this point. There are limits to this equation. Even critics who regard Jacob under his title of Israel as merely the eponymous hero, created by legend to be the forefather of the nation (cf. below, VI, 1), must confess that Jacob as Israel is no such neutral creature, dressed only in the colors of his children's racial qualities. There is a large range of contradiction, after all the parallelisms have been traced, that refuses to fit the lines of Hebrew national character, whether in his typical life in the direction of the covenants-inheritance, after the fashion of Malachi's allusion (Mal 1 2), interpreted by Paul (Rom 9 10—13).

V. References Outside of Genesis.—Under his two names this personage Jacob or Israel is more frequently mentioned than any other in the whole of sacred history. Yet in the vast majority of cases the nation descended from him is intended by the name, which in the form of "Jacob" or "Israel" contains not the slightest, and in the form of "children of Jacob" "house of Jacob" "house of Israel" and the like, only the slightest, if any, allusion to the patriarch himself. But there still remain many passages in both Testaments where the Jacob or Israel of Gen is clearly alluded to. There is a considerable group of passages that refer to him as the last of the patriarchal triumvirate—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: so particularly of Jeh as the "God of the OT Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," and of the covenant-oath at Sinai, when "sworn unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." And naturally the nation that is known by his name is frequently called by some phrase, equivalent to the formal בַּנְהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, yet through its unusualness lending more significance to the idea of their derivation from his virtues as well as the vices of the man who lives for the present—forgiving when strong enough to revenge, condescending when flattered, proud of power and independent of parental control or family tradition—Esau is as impartially depicted by the sacred historian as if the writer had been an Edomite instead of an Israelite: the sketch is evidently true to life, both from its objectivity and from its coherence.

4. How Far a "Type" of Israel. In their respective relations to God and to the world of men and nations, there is a true sense in which the father was a "type" of the children. It is probably only a play of fancy that would discover a parallel in their respective careers, between the successive stages of life in the father's home (Caanaan), life in exile, a return, and a second exile. But it is not fanciful to note the resemblance between Jacob and Joseph, both as a character and that of his descendants. While a few exceptions the qualities mentioned above (IV, 2) would distinguish a Hebrew, its spirit was equally applicable to the nation of Israel. And even that curriculum in which the patriarch learned of God may be viewed as the kernel in which the Hebrew people—after all of them, or even the mass, but the "remnant" who applied himself to his calling as Israel of the prophets, as "servant of Jehovah"—were taught the lessons of faith and patience, of renunciation and consecration, that appear with more or less emphasis on the pages of Isaiah, of Hosea and of Malachi. This is apparently Hosea's point of view in 12 3—4, 12. A word of caution, however, is needed at this point. There are limits to this equation. Even critics who regard Jacob under his title of Israel as merely the eponymous hero, created by legend to be the forefather of the nation (cf. below, VI, 1), must confess that Jacob as Israel is no such neutral creature, dressed only in the colors of his children's racial qualities. There is a large range of contradiction, after all the parallelisms have been traced, that refuses to fit the lines of Hebrew national character, whether in his typical life in the direction of the covenants-inheritance, after the fashion of Malachi's allusion (Mal 1 2), interpreted by Paul (Rom 9 10—13).
him "our father." Stephen's speech, as Luke reports it, includes in its rapid historical flight a hint or two about Jacob beyond the bare fact of his place in the national narrative. Moved by the famine prevailing in Egypt and Canaan, Jacob twice dispatches his sons to buy grain in Egypt, and the second time Joseph is made known to his brothers, and his race becomes manifest to Pharaoh. At Joseph's behest, Jacob and all the family move to Egypt. There all remain until their death, but the "fathers" (Joseph and his brethren; cf Jerome, Epistola viiii, ed. Migne) are buried in the family possession near Shechem. Here emerges one of those divergencies in the OT tradition that is a notable feature of Stephen's speech, and that have furnished occasion for much speculation upon their origin, value and implications. See comm. on Acts.) Paul's interest in Jacob appears in connection with his discussion of Divine election, where he calls attention to the oracle of Gen 25:23 and to the use already made of the passage by Malachi (1:2f), and reminds his readers that this choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau was made by God before these twin sons of Isaac and Rebecca were born. Finally, the author of Heb, when charting the heroes of faith, focuses his glass for a moment upon Jacob: first, as sharing with Abraham and Isaac the promise of God and the life everlasting (He 11:9); and second, as receiving from Isaac, and at his death transmitting to his grandsons, blessings that had value only for one who worships and believes a God with power over "things to come" (vs 20f). VI. Modern Interpretations of Jacob.—1. Those who see in the patriarchal narratives anything—myth, legend, saga—rather than true biography, there is, of course, a different interpretation of the characters and events portrayed in the familiar Gen-stories, and a different value placed upon the stories themselves. A past from the allegorizing treatment accorded them by the Jew and early Christian writers of like mind (see specimen in Abraham), these views belong to modern criticism. To critics who make Heb history begin with the settlement of Canaan by the nomad Israelites fresh from the desert, even the Mosaic age and the Egypt residence are totally unhistorical—much more so these tales of a pre-Mosaic patriarchal age; yet to admit the broad outlines of a residence of the tribes in Egypt, an exodus of some sort, and a founder of the nation named Moses, are for the moderns much of the same as allowing and fortunes in a remote age, with its nomads wandering in deserts, states and Canaan, and to add in Canaan, its circumstantial acquaintance with the names and relationships of each individual through some 4 long patriarchal generations, and its obvious foreshadowing of so much that the later tribes were on this same soil to act out cent. later. This, we are told, is not history. Whatever else it may be, it is not a reliable account of some memorable events as compel their reality in the memories and through the written records of mankind. The commonest view held, collectively of the entire narrative, specifically of Jacob, is that which sees here the precipitate from a pure solution of the national character and fortunates. Wellhausen, e.g., says (Pro- the Hebrew legend, 310): "The material here Nation is not mythical, but national; there- fore clearer [viz. than in Gen 1:1-11] and in a certain sense historical. To be sure there is no historical knowledge to be gained here about the real general generation, is better drawn than the other two [Abraham and Isaac]." In section IV, 4, above, we observed that, while many of Jacob's personal qualities pre-figured the qualities of the later Heb people, there were some others that did not at all fit this equation. Wellhausen himself remarks this, in regard to the contrast between the patriarchal and the Israelite ancestors they invented for themselves. In his attempt to account for this contrast, he can only urge that a nation condemned to eternal wars could naturally look back upon, as well as forward to, a golden age of peace. (An alternative explana- tion he states, only to reject.) He fails to observe that this plea does not in the least alter the fact—his plea is indeed but, a restatement of the fact—that this phenomenon is absolutely at variance with his hypothesis of how these stories of Jacob and the rest came to be what they are (see Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, 250ff). This general view, which when carried to its extreme implications (as by Steuernagel, Die Ein- wanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan, 1901) comes perilously near the reduc- tio ad absurdum that is its own refuta- Demi-God, has been rejected by that whole group of critics, who, following Nöldeke, see in Jacob, as in so many others, an original deity (myth), first abused to the grade of a hero (heroic legend), and at last degraded to the level of a clown (tales of jest or marvel). Adherents of this trend of interpretation differ widely among themselves as to details, but Jacob is generally regarded as a Canaanitish deity, whose local shrine was at Shechem, Beth-el or Peniel, and whose cult was taken over by the Hebrews, their own object of worship being substituted for him, and the outstand- ing feature of his personality being transferred over into a hero that Israel appropriated as their national ancestor, even to the extent of giving him the secondary name of Israel. Stade attempted a combination of this 'mythological' view with the "national" view in the interest of his theory of primitive animism, by making the patriarch a "mythological figure revered as an eponymous hero." This theory, in any form, requires the assumption, which there is nothing to support, that Jacob (or Jacob-el) is a name given by the Canaanites or Egypt to a deity and framed to fit his supposed character. At first, then, it meant "El deceives" or "El recompenses" (so B. Luther, ZATW, 1901, 20f; cf also the same writer, as well as Meyer himself, in the latter's Die Familie, 3, p 246); Luther proposes the monstrosity of a nominal sentence with the tr, "He deceives is 'El. Thus the first element of the name Jacob came to be felt as the name itself ("Jacob is God"), and it was launched upon its course of evolution into the human person- ageon that Gen knows. It suffices to say with regard to all this, that in addition to its being inherently improbable—not to say, unproven—it goes directly in the face of the archaeological evidence adduced under 1, 1, above. The example fact that Jacob-el was a personal name for men, of every- day occurrence in the 24-3d millenniums BC, is quite enough to overthrow this whole hypothesis; for, as Luther himself remarks (op. cit., 65), the above evolution of the name is essential to the "mythical" theory: "when this alteration took place cannot be told; yet it has to be postulated, since otherwise it remains inexplicable, how personal names could arise out of these formations [like Jacob-el]." The inadequacy of the two theories hitherto advanced to account for the facts of Gen being thus evident, Gunkel and others have ex- 3. Character plenitiously rejected them and enunciated of Fiction a theory which is generally called the saga-theory. According to Gunk- nel, "to understand the persons of Gen as nations
is by no means a general key to their interpretation”; and, “against the whole assumption that the principal patriarchal figures are originally gods is this fact first and foremost, that the names Jacob and Abraham are shown by the Bab to be customary personal names, and furthermore that the tales about them cannot be understood at all as scenes of original myths.” In place of these discredited views Gunkel (cf also Gressmann, ZATW, 1910, 1 ff) makes of Jacob simply a character in the stories (marvelous, humorous, pathetic and the like) current in ancient Israel, esp. on the lips of the professional story-teller. Whereas much of the material in these stories came to the Hebrews from the Babylonians, Canaanites or Egyptians, Jacob himself is declared to have belonged to the old Heb saga, with its flavor of nomadic desert life and wish-fulfilling. “The sly shepherd Jacob, who fools the hunter Esau; another tale, of the deceit of a father-in-law by his son-in-law, was added to it—the more naturally because both are shepherds; a third cycle, about an old man that loves his youngest son, was transferred to this figure, and that youngest son received the name of Joseph at a time when Jacob was identified with Israel’s assumed ancestor ‘Israel.” Thus our result is, that most important of patriarchs are creations of fiction” (Schriften des AT, Ste Lieferung, 42).

It is so obvious that this new attitude toward the patriarchs lends itself to a more sympathetic criticism of the narrative of Gen, that critics who adopt it are at pains to deny any intention on their part of rehabilitating Jacob et al. as historical figures. “Saga,” we are told, “is not capable of preserving through so many cents a picture of the real character or deeds of its heroes, even supposing that persons bearing these names once actually lived; and we are reminded of the contrast between the Etsel of saga and the Attila of history, the Dietrich of saga and the Theodie of history. But as against this we need to note, first, that the long and involved course of development through which, ex hypothesi, these stories have passed before reaching their final stage (J, 9th cent. BC; Gunkel, op. cit., S. 46) involves a very high antiquity for the core stages, and thus reduces to a narrow strip of time those “so many cents,” that are supposed to separate the actual Jacob from the Jacob of saga (cf JUABHAM, VII, 4); and second, that the presuppositions as to the origin, nature and value of saga with which this school of criticism operates are, for the most part, only an elaborate statement of the undisputed major premise in a syllogism, of which the minor premise is: the Gen-stories are saga. Against this last proposition, however, there lie many weighty considerations, that are by no means counterbalanced by those resemblances of a general sort which any student of comparative literature can easily discern (see also Baethgen, op. cit., 185).

JAMES OSCAR BOYD

JACOB (יהוֹSusan, יִשְׂרָאֵל; יַעֲקֹב, יַאֲקָב): (1) The patriarch (see preceding art.). (2) The father of Joseph the husband of Mary (Mt. 1:15-16). (3) Patronymic denoting the Israelites (Isa 10:11; Jer 10:1).

JACOB, TESTAMENT OF. See Apocalyptic Literature.

JACOB'S WELL (πηγή τοῦ Ιακώβ, πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ): In Jn 4:3 ff we read that Our Lord “left Judea, and departed again into Galilee. And he must needs pass through Samaria. So he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph: and Jacob's well was there.” When Jacob came to Shechem on his return from Paddan-Aram (Heb 33:18f).

1. Position of Well: 1. The “well” as an E. of the city, and bought the land on which he had spread his tent (Gen 33:18f). This is doublets the “portion” (Heb 33:18f) spoken of in Gen 48:22; although there it is said to have been taken with sword and bow from the Amorites. Where the pass of Shechem opens to the E., near the northern edge of the valley, lies the legendary tomb of Joseph. On the other side of the vale, close to the base of Gerizim, is the well universally known as Bir Ya'qub, “the well of Jacob.” The position meets perfectly the requirements of the narrative. The main road from the S. splits a little to the E., one arm leading westward through the pass, the other going more directly to the N. It is probable that these paths follow pretty closely the ancient tracks; and both would be frequented by Jesus’ day. Which of them He took we cannot tell; but, in any case, this well lay in the fork between them, and could be approached with equal ease from either. See Sychar.

In the chapter quoted, it is said that Jacob dug the well (ver 15). The OT says nothing of this. With the copious springs at Ain 'Askot and Balata, one might ask why a well should have been dug here at all. We must remember that in the East, very strict laws have always governed the use of water, esp. when there were large herds to be considered. The purchase of land here may not have secured for Jacob such supplies as he required. There was danger of strife between rival herdsmen. The patriarch, therefore, may have dug the well in the interests of peace, and also to preserve his own independence.

Jew, Samaritan, Moslem and Christian agree in associating this well with the patriarch Jacob.

This creates a strong presumption in favor of the tradition: and there is no good reason to doubt its truth. Standing at the brink of the well, overshadowed by the giant bulk of Gerizim, one feels how naturally it would be spoken of as “this mountain.” For long the well was unprotected, opening among the ruins of a vaulted chamber some feet below the surface of the ground. Major Anderson describes it (Recovery of Jesus, 465) as having “a narrow opening, just wide enough to allow the body of a
man to pass through with arms uplifted, and this narrow neck, which is about 4 ft. long, opens into the well itself, which is cylindrically shaped, and about 7 ft. 6 in. in diameter.

4. Description

The mouth and upper part of the well are built of masonry, and the well appears to have been sunk through a mixture of alluvial soil and limestone fragments, till a compact bed of mountain limestone was reached, having horizontal strata which could be easily worked; and the interior of the well presents the appearance of having been lined throughout with rough masonry. The depth was doubtless much greater in ancient times; but much rubbish has fallen into it, and now it is not more than 75 ft. deep. It is fed by no spring, nor is the water conducted to it along the surface, as to a cistern. Its supplies depend entirely upon rainfall and percolation. Possibly, therefore, the water may never have approached the brim. The woman says "the well is deep." Pēgā, "spring," does not, therefore, strictly apply to it, but rather "tank" or "reservoir," or pehōr, the word actually used in vs 11 f. The modern inhabitants of Nōbēśa, highly esteem the "light" water of the well as compared with the "heavy" or "hard" water of the neighboring springs. It usually lasts till about the end of May; then the well is dry till the return of the rains. Its contents, therefore, differ from the "living" water of the perennial spring.

From the narratives of the pilgrims we learn that at different times churches have been built over the well. The Moslems probably demolished the last of the five churches over the well of the Crusaders in 1187. A description of the ruins with drawings, as they were 30 years ago, is given in PEF, II, 174, etc. A stone found in 1881 may have been the original cover of the well. It measures 3 ft. 9 in. x 2 ft. 11 3/4 in. x 1 ft. 6 in. The aperture in the center is 13 in. in diameter; and in its sides are grooves worn by the ropes used in drawing up the water (PEFS, 1881, 212 f).

Some years ago the plot of ground containing the well was purchased by the authorities of the Or church, and it has been surrounded by a wall. A chapel has been built over the well, and a large church is erected beside it.

W. Ewing

JACOBUS, ja-kō'bus (Tācōḇōs, Tākōḇōs; B reads Tārōḇōs): In 1 Esd 9 48 = "Akūb" in Neh 8 7, a Levite who helped in the exposition of the law.

JADA, ja'â'dâ (יָדָה, "the knowing one"): Son of Onam and grandson of Jerahmeel by his wife Atarah (1 Ch 2 26-28,32).

JADAH, ja'dâ' (יָדָה יָדָה, Kētābīh; יָדָה, yēḏāy, Kēś AV; but RV IDDO): In Ex 10 43, one of those who had married foreign wives. RV has "Jadai" (= "Edos," 1 Esd 9 35). See IDDO.

JADDAI, ja'dâ, ja'dâ'i. See IDDO; JADDAI.

JADDAU, ja'dō'a, ja'dâ' (יָדָא יָדָא, "known"): (1) One of the "chiefs of the people" who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant, thus signifying their voluntary acceptance of the law and their compliance to submit to its yoke (Neh 10 21 [Heb 22]).

(2) Son of Jonathan or Johanan, and great-grandson of Elijahb, the high priest in Nehemiah's time (Neh 12 11). He is the last of the high priests mentioned in the list of Darius the Peræ, i.e., Darius I; the first, Darius Codomannus, the last king of Persia (336-332 BC), who was overthrown by Alexander the Great. It is doubtless to him that Jos refers in his romance of the account of Alexander's entrance into Jerusalem (Ant, XI, viii, 4, 5; vii, 2, vii, 7). James Chrichton

JADDUS, ja'dûs (B, Tā'ā'ōsos, Tāddōsas; A, Tā'ōsōs, Tāddōsas): AV has "Addus" = Barzillai (Exr 2 41; Neh 7 63). J. was removed from the office of the priesthood because he could not prove his right to it after the return to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 38). He is called Barzillai in the OT, because he married Augia, the daughter of Zorzelus (Barzillai the Gileadite, in the OT). Cf Barzillai.

JADON, ja'dôn (יָדוֹן, yādōn, perhaps "he will judge" or "plead"): One who helped to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem in company with the men of Gibeon and of Mizpah (Neh 3 7). He is called the "Meronomite" and another Meronomite is referred to in 1 Ch 27 30, but there is no mention of a place Meronoth. Jadon is the name given by Jos (Ant, III, viii, 5; ix, 1) to "the man of God" from Judah who confronted Jeroboam as he burned incense at the altar in Bethel, and who was afterward deceived by the lie of the old prophet (1 K 13). Jos may probably have meant Iddo the seer, whose visions concerning Jeroboam (2 Ch 9 29) led to his being identified in Jewish tradition with "the man of God" from Judah. James Chrichton

JAEEL, ja'ē-ēl (יָאֵעֵל, "wild or mountain goat," as in Ps 104 18; 2Sa 15, 31): The wife of Heber the Kenite and the slayer of Sisera (Jgs 4 17-22; 5 2-31). Jaël emerges from obscurity by this single deed, and by the kindest construction can hardly be said to have reached an enviable fame. The history of this event is clear. For years Jabin the king of Canaan had oppressed Israel. For twenty years the Israelites had been subject to him, and, in largest measure, the instrument of their subjugation had been Sisera, the king's general, the "man of the iron chariots." Deborah, a prophetess of Israel, by her passion for freedom, had roused the tribes of Israel to do battle against Sisera. They defeated him at "Taanach by the waters of Megiddo," but Sisera sought in flight to save himself. He came to the tents of the wanderers, where the tribe of Heber lived. Here he sought, and was probably invited, to take shelter in the tent of Jaël (4 17-18). There are two accounts of the subsequent events—one a prose narrative (4 19-22), the other a poetic one, found in Deborah's song of triumph (5 21-27). The two accounts are as nearly in agreement as could be expected, considering their difference in form.

It is evident that the tribe of Heber was regarded by both parties to the struggle as being neutral. They were descendants of Jethro, and hence were in no way a part of Israel, but the confidence of the Israelites. Though they had suffered somewhat at the hands of the Canaanites they had made a formal contract of peace with Jabin. Naturally Sisera could turn to the tents of Heber in Edom-naphtali with some confidence. The current laws of hospitality gave an added element of safety. Whether Jaël met Sisera and urged him to enter her tent and rest (4 18), or only invited him after his appeal for refuge, the fact remains that he was her guest, was protected by the sacred sheltering of her home, and protected by the laws of hospitality. She gave him milk to drink, a mallet for covering, and apparently acquiesced in his request that she should stand guard at the tent and deny his presence to any pursuers. When sleep came to the weary fugitive, she took a wicker pole, took a hammer in hand, and went softly unto him,
and amote the pin into his temples" (ver 21), and having murdered him, goes forth to meet Barak the Israelitish general and claims the credit for her deed. Some critics suggest that Sisera was not asleep when murdered, and thus try to convert Jael's treachery into strategy. But to kill your guest while he is drinking the milk of hospitality is little less culpable than to murder him while asleep. There is no evidence that Sisera offered Jael any insult or violence, and but little probability that she acted under any spiritual or Divine suggestion. It is really impossible to justify Jael's act, though it is not impossible to understand it or properly to appreciate Deborah's approval of the act as found in 5 24. The motive of Jael may have been a mixed one. She may have been a sympathizer with Israel and with the religion of Israel. But the narrative scarcely warrants the interpretation that she felt herself as one called to render "stern justice on an enemy of God" (Expositor's Bible). Jael was unquestionably prudential. Sisera was in flight and Barak in pursuit. Probably her situation was very way with Barak, but certainly reflection would show her that it would not be wisdom to permit Barak to find Sisera in her tent. She knew, too, that death would be Sisera's portion should he be captured—therefore she would kill him, and thus cement a friendship with the conqueror.

As to Deborah's praise of Jael (5 24), there is no call to think that in her hour of triumph she was either capable of or intending to appraise the moral quality of Jael's deed. Her heart's enemy was dead and that at the hand of a woman. The woman who would kill Sisera must be the friend of Israel. Deborah had no question of the propriety of meting out death to a defeated persecutor. Her times were not such as to raise this question. The method of his death mattered little to her, for all the laws of peace were abrogated in the times of war. Therefore Jael was blessed among women by all who loved Israel. Whether Deborah thought her also to be worthy of the blessing of God we may not tell. At any rate there is no need for us to try to justify the treachery of Jael in order to explain the words of Deborah.

C. E. SCHENK


JAH, jâ. See God, Names of.

JAHATH, jâ'hath (גת, yâhath, perhaps for נת, yâheth, נתת, yâhâthâh, "he [God] will snatch up"): (1) Son of Reiah, son of Shobal, a descendant of Judah, and father of Ahumai and Lahad, the families of the Zorathites (1 Ch 4 2).
(2) A frequent name for a descendant of Levi: (a) Son of Libni, son of Gershon, the eldest son of Levi (1 Ch 6 20 43 [Heb 6 5 28], where "son of Libni" is omitted).
(b) Son of Shimel, son of Gershon (1 Ch 23 10).
(c) One of the "sons" of Shelomoth, a descendant of Libni, son of Kohath, the second son of Levi (1 Ch 24 22).
(d) A descendant of Merari, the third son of Levi, and an overseer in the repairing of the temple in the reign of Josiah (2 Ch 34 12). JAMES C. CRICHTON

JAHAZ, jâ'hâz (גָאָז, yâhâz, Isa 16 4; Jer 48 34, הָאָז, yâhâzâh, or יָהָז, yâhâzâh, Nu 21 23; Dt 2 32; Jos 13 18; 21 36, AV "Jahazah"); Jgs 11 20; Jer 48 21; 1 Ch 6 78, "Jahazah"): This is the place where in a great battle Israel overwhelmed Sihon king of the Amorites, and then took possession of all his territory (Nu 21 23, 33). It is named along with Beth-Hea-al-men and Kedemoth (Josh 13 18), with Kedemoth (21 37) pointing to a position in the S.E. of the Amorite territory. It was given to Reuben by Moses, and was one of the cities in the portion of that tribe assigned to the Merarite Levites. Mesha (Ms, ll. 18 ff) says that the king of Israel dwelt in Jahaz when at war with him. Mesha drove him out, and the city passed into the hands of Moab. It is referred to as a city of Moab in Isa 16 4; Jer 48 21, 48. Cheyne thinks that either Jahaz or Kedemoth must be represented today by the important ruins of Umm er-Rasâs, about 2 1/2 hours N. of Dibon toward the desert (EB, s.v.). No certain identification is possible.

W. EWING

JAHAZIAH, jâ-hâ-zi'a: AV for Jahzeiah (q.v.).

JAHAZIEL, jâ-hâ'zî-ĕl (יֶהְזִיאֵל, yâhâzi'âl, "God sees"): (1) In 1 Ch 12 4 (Heb ver 5), one of David's recruits at Ziklag, a Benjamite or maybe a Judean.
(2) In 1 Ch 16 6, one of two priests appointed by David to sound trumpets before the ark on its journey to Jerusalem. 1 XX B, A, reads "Azziel".
(3) In 1 Ch 23 19; 24 23, a Levite, "son" of Hebron, a Kohathite. Kittel, following LXX, reads "Uziel".
(4) In 2 Ch 20 14, an Asaphite, son of Zechariah. He encouraged King Jehoshaphat of Judah and his subjects to fight against the Moabite and Ammonite invaders.

(5) In Ezr 8 5, an ancestor of one of the families of the Restoration. Read probably "the sons of Zattu, Sheconiah the son of J." following 1 Esd 23 (= Jezeulus). DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JAHDAI, jâ'dâ'i, jâ'dî (יהדai, yâhdayy, "Jeh leads" [?]; Baer reads יִהְדַּי, yêhaday): In 1 Ch 2 47, where six sons of J. are mentioned. "The name has been taken as that of another wife or concubine of Caleb; more probably Jahdai is a descendant of Caleb, whose name, in the original connection, has fallen from the text!" (Curtis, Ch. 96).

JAHIEL, jâ'di-ĕl (יהיֵל, yâhî'âl, "God gives joy"): In 1 Ch 25 24, head of a Manassite family.

JAHDO, jâ'dô (יהד, yâhô, meaning uncertain; Kittel suggests יִהְדָּה, yêhaday = Jahdai): In 1 Ch 6 14, a Gileadite.

JAHHEEL, jâ'hî-ĕl (יהָהֵל, yâhî'âl, "wait for God!"): In Gen 46 14; Nu 26 26, a "son" (i.e. clan) of Zebulun.

JAHHEELITES, jâ'hî-ĕl-îtes, THE (יהָהליטֵים, yâhîlîtîm, coll. with art.): In Nu 26 26, the descendants of the clan of Jahel.

JAHMAL, jâ'mâl, jâ'mî (יהמָל, yâmâl, "Sorek"
perhaps יָהְמָל, yâmâlâh, "may Jeh protect!"): In 1 Ch 7 2, head of a clan of Issachar.

JAHWEH, yâ'weh. See God, Names of.

JAHZAH, jâ'za. See Jahaz.

JAHZEEL, jâ'zê-ĕl (יהזֶאֵל, yâhze'âl, "God divides", "apportions"): In Gen 46 24; Nu 26 48; and 23 MSS in 1 Ch 7 13; and JAHZIEL (יהזֶיֵל, yâhze'âl, same meaning as above): 1 Ch 7 13, a "son" (clan) of Naphtali.
JAHZEELITES, ja'se-él-its, THE (יַשֵּׁלֶת, ha-
yanah'-éth, coll. with art.): In Nu 26 48, descendants of the clan of Jahzeel.

JAHZIAH, ja'zé-ya, ja'zé-ya (יהזיה, yahzé-
yah, "Jehovah's possession"), "Jehovah's place"): In Ezr 10 15, son of Tikvah, and a contemporary of Ezra. It is disputed whether he and Jonathan opposed or supported Ezra in the matter of prosecuting those who had married foreign wives—Ezeldias, 1 Ezs 9 14, or Ezzias. See JONATHAN, 9.

Two translations of the Heb phrase (יהזיה, yahzé'ya), are given: (1) "stood over this matter," i.e. supported Ezra: so AV ("were employed in this matter"), and so LXX, 1 Ezs 9 14, RVm. This is supported by ver 4. Let now our princes be appointed for all the assembly, where the same phrase is found. (2) RV "stood up against this matter," so BDB, Gesenius, Bertheau, Stade. Both translations can be supported by is in Heb. The context is better suited by the former rendering.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS
JAHZERAH, ja'zé-ra, ja'zé-ra (יהצרה, yahzé-
ra'ah, meaning unknown): In 1 Ch 9 12, an ancestor of Masseai and apparently ="Ahazi" of Nch 11 13.

JAHZIEL, ja'zé-el. See JAHZEEL.

JAILOR, jai'ler. See PRISON.

JAI'R, jai'ér. (1) Jair (יהייר, ya'ér, "he enlightens" or "one giving light"): (a) Son, i.e. descendant of Manasseh (Nu 32 41; Dt 3 14); Jos 13 30; Jgs 1 2 21). According to 1 Ch 2 21 I he was the son of Segub, son of Horon, a descendant of Judah, who married the daughter of Machir, son of Manasseh. He was thus descended both from Judah and Manasseh. At the time of the conquest he distinguished himself by taking the town-villages Havvuth-Jair (q.v.). The accounts of his exploit are difficult to harmonize (see ICC on above passages). Some would identify him with the Jair of Jgs 10 3, holding that Manasseh's settlement in Northern Gilead and Bashan took place, not before Israel's passage of the Jordan, but after the settlement of the tribe on the W. For a criticism of this view see GHHL, 577, n.

(b) One of the judges. He is said to have had 30 sons, who rode on 30 ass colts, and who had as many cities, known as Havvuth-Jair (Jgs 10 34). One tradition identifies (a) and (b). Others reconcile the two narratives by interpreting the word "son" in a non-literal sense.

(c) The father of Mordecai (Est 2 5). In the Apoc (Ad Est 11 2) his name is given as "Jairus" (יָאָרַע, Iairus), Iairus"

(2) Jair (K'r ר'י, ya'ér, "he arouses"; Kh- thinh ר'י, ya'ér; a different name from [1] above): The father of Elhanan, the giant-slayer (1 Ch 20 5). In the (parallel passage (2 S 21 19) his name is given as "Jaare-oregim," but the text should be corrected to Jair, "oregim" (מִשְׁפָּחל) having crept in from the line below through a copyist's error.

JAMES CRICHTON
JAIRITE, ja'ér-it (יהירת, ya'er-it, "of Jair"): In 2 S 20 26, Ira the Jairite is "chief minister unto David." He was a descendant of Jair who was a Manassite (Nu 32 41, etc) and whose territory was in Gilead. LXX Luc and Syr suggest רבי, yattir, "Jattirite," i.e. a native of Jattir mentioned in 1 S 30 27 as one of the towns friendly to David when he was in Ziklag. It is not improbable that a native of Jattir would be given such a post by David. See Ira, and of 2 S 25 38.

JAI'RUS, ja'i-rus, ja'i-rus (יָאֶרְוּס, Idoros: 1 Ezs 5 31; Ad Est 11 2). See AHIRU; JAIR.

JAI'RUS, ja'i-rus, ja'i-rus (יָאֶרְוָס, Idoros): A ruler in a synagogue near Capernaum whose only daughter, aged about 12 years, was raised from the dead by Jesus (Mt 9 18 26; Mk 5 22 43; Lk 8 41 56). The accounts of the miracle are substantially the same, but vary in detail. According to Mk and Lk the arrival of Jairus in Capernaum fell immediately after the return of Jesus from Gadara, but according to Mt the sequence of events was that Jesus had returned to Capernaum, had called Matthew, had joined the feast of the publicans, and had just finished His discourse on fasting when Jairus came to Him. Mt and Mk both testify to the great faith of Jairus, who besought of Jesus that He should but lay His hand upon the maid and she should live. According to Mt she was already dead when Jairus came to Capernaum; according to Mk she was on the point of death; but all agree as to her death before the arrival of Jesus and His followers at her abode. Mt implies that Jesus alone was present at the actual raising; Mk and Lk state that Peter, James, John and the parents were also there. The healing of the woman with the issue of blood by Jesus on the way is given by all.

C. M. KERR
JAKAN, ja'kan (גָּאָן, ya'dân). See JAKAN.

JAKEH, ja'ke (גָּאֶה, ya'eh, perhaps from Arab. root meaning "carefully religious"; נָאֶה, n'eh, as if from נָאֶה, n'eh): The father of Agur, the author of the sayings recorded in Prov 30 1. Nothing is known of either Jakeh or Agur. The immediate connection in the Heb text of ha-massah, "the pasture" or "burden" (AV "even the prophecy," RV "the oracle") with נָאֶה, n'eh, "oracle," (AV "spake," RV "saith") is quite exceptional, while the ver is unintelligible and the text, as the LXX shows, is evidently corrupt. The best emendation is that which changes ha-massah, "the prophecy," into ha-massah; "the Massaite," or into mimmassah, "of Massa (RVm), Massa being the name of the country of an Ishmaelite tribe (of Gen 25 14, 1 Ch 1 30; Prov 31 1 RVm). See AGUR.

JAMES CRICHTON
JAKIM, ja'kim (גַּקֵימ, ya'kim, "he [God] lifteth up"); cf ELIAKIM:

(1) A Benjamite, a son of Shimei (1 Ch 8 19). Either a priest, the head of the 12th of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided (1 Ch 24 12).

JALAM, ja'lam (גַּלֹם, ya'lam, according to BDB following LXX 'Igalom, Iglom, in Gen, from יָלֹם, ya'lam, meaning "to conceal"; according to Gunkel, Gen 1, 390, from יָלֹם, ya'lam, "mountain-goat"); see HPN, 90, n. 5; AV Jaalam): In Gen 36 5 14 18; 1 Ch 1 35, a son of Esau, mentioned as the 2d son by Oholibamah; probably an Edomite clan.

JALON, ja'lôn (גַּלון, ya'lon, meaning unknown): In 1 Ch 4 17, a son of Ezrah, a Judahite.

JAMBRES, ja'mbres. See JANNES AND JAM-
BRER.

JAMBRI, ja'mbri (אִ֫בִּר, Iabibir, hoi huios Jambrii; 1 Mace 9 36 41): The sons of Jambri are said to have come out of Medeba (originally Med`ba), a city of the Moabites, and subsequently a possession of the Amorites, and to have carried off John, the brother of Jonathan, who pretended Judas Macabeaeus as leader of the Jews. The
James

Israeleites got possession of the place and assigned it to the tribe of Reuben. No mention is made elsewhere of the Jambri. In Jos (Ant, XIII, 1, 2), they are called "sons of Amaranus."

JAMES, Ἰάκωβος (Iâkobos, Iâdchô): English form of Jacob, and the name of several men noted:

1. The Son of Zebedee, one of the Twelve Apostles (ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, ὁ τῶν Ζεβεδαίων):

I. In NT.—To the Synoptists alone are we indebted for any account of this James. He was the son of Zebdeee and the brother of John (Mt 4:21; Mk 1:19; Lk 5:10). The Synoptists generally place the name of James before that of John, and allude to the latter as "the brother of James." It is inferred that James was the elder of the two brothers. His name was probably Salome, the sister of the mother of Jesus (cf Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40; Jn 19:25), but this is disputed by some (cf Brethren of the Lost). J. was a fisherman by trade, and worked along with his father and his brother (Mk 1:17). These are partners in Simon (5:10), and this is also implied in Mk (1:19). As they owned several boats and employed hired servants (Lk 5:11; Mk 1:20), the establishment they possessed must have been considerable. The call to J. to follow Christ (Mt 4:18-22; Mk 1:16-20; Lk 5:1-11) was given by Jesus as He was walking by the sea of Galilee (Mt 4:18). There He saw "James the son of Zebedee," and Jesus called His name, and also that of his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and called them. And they straightway left the boat and their father, and followed Him (Mt 4:21-22). The account of Lk varies in part from that of Mk, and contains the additional detail of the miraculous draught of fishes, at which J. and John also were amazed. This version of Lk is regarded by some as an amalgamation of the earlier accounts with Jn 21:1-8.

As the above incident took place after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, when Jesus had departed into Galilee (Mt 4:12; Mk 14), and as there is no mention of J. among those who received the preaching of the Baptist, it is improbable that he was called by the Baptist at this time. The call recorded by Jn (Jn 21:30) is probably that while Peter and Andrew made the pilgrimage to Bethany, J. and the other partners remained in Galilee to carry on the business of their trade. The accounts of the departure of Peter and Andrew, the inquiries of J. must have been eager concerning what they had seen and heard. His mind and imagination became filled with their glowing accounts of the "new-born" Lamb of God (Jn 1:30) and of the preaching of John the Baptist, until he inwardly dedicated his life to Jesus and only awaited an opportunity to declare his allegiance openly. By this is the apparently abrupt nature of the call, as recorded by the Synoptists, to be explained.

2. First Call of James (Mt 4:18).—"James the son of Zebedee." This name of Jesus is given to his brother, and that of James and John are used in the earlier accounts with Jn 21:1-8.

3.Probation and Ordination (Jn 21:30).—It is probable that while Peter and Andrew made the pilgrimage to Bethany, J. and the other partners remained in Galilee to carry on the business of their trade. The accounts of the departure of Peter and Andrew, the inquiries of J. must have been eager concerning what they had seen and heard. His mind and imagination became filled with their glowing accounts of the "new-born" Lamb of God (Jn 1:30) and of the preaching of John the Baptist, until he inwardly dedicated his life to Jesus and only awaited an opportunity to declare his allegiance openly. By this is the apparently abrupt nature of the call, as recorded by the Synoptists, to be explained.

From this time onward he occupied a prominent place among the apostles, and, along with Peter and John, became the special confidant of Jesus. These three alone of the Twelve Apostles were present at the raising of Jairus' daughter ( Mk 5:37; Lk 8:51), at the Transfiguration (Mt 17:1-8; Mk 9:2-8; Lk 9:28-36), and at the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26:36-46; Mk 14:27-31). Shortly after the Transfiguration, when Jesus, having "eisdeinos" set his face to go to Jerusalem (Lk 9:51), was passing through Samaria, the ire of J. and John was kindled by the ill reception accorded to Him by the populace (Lk 9:53). They therefore asked of Jesus, "Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" (Lk 9:54). "But he turned, and rebuked them" (ver 55). It was probably this hot-headed impetuosity and fanaticism that won for them the surname "Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder," bestowed on them by the Twelve (Mk 3:17). Yet upon this last occasion, there was some excuse for their action. The impression left by the Transfiguration was still deep upon them, and they felt strongly that their Lord, whom they had lately beheld "in his glory," with "countenance altered," and "glistening raiment," should be subjected to such indignities by the Samaritans. Upon the occasion of Jesus' last journey to Jerus (Mk 10:32), the two brothers gave expression to this presumptuous impetuosity in a more selfish manner (Mt 10:40). They were seeking on their intimacy with Jesus, they made the request of Him, "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory" (Mk 10:37). In the account of Mt 20:20-28, the words are put in the mouth of their mother. The request drew forth the rebuke of Jesus (Mk 10:38), and moved the ten with indignation (Mk 10:40); but by the words of their Lord peace was again restored (Mk 10:41-45).

After the arrival of James in Jerusalem, when He "sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple," J. was one of the four who put the question to Him concerning the last things (Mk 13:3). He was also present when the risen Jesus appeared for the 3rd time in Jerusalem, and was one of the 11 who were present when He said to His disciples, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. . . . He shall be Lord both of Jews and of Gentiles" (Acts 1:8).

J. was the first martyr among the apostles, being slain by King Herod Agrippa I about 44 AD, shortly before Herod's own death.

5. Death (Acts 12:2).—The account says nothing concerning his death. This point is left to be filled in by the legend of him as the patron saint of Spain. The legend of his martyrdom there, of his death in Judea, of the trans-
James is generally identified with James the Little or the Less, the brother of Joses and son of Mary (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40). In Jn 19:25 this Mary is called the wife of Cleophas (AV) or Clopas (RV), who is thus in turn identified with Alpheus. There is evidence in apocryphal lit. of a Simon, a son of Clopas, who was also one of the disciples (cf. Nathanael). If this be the same Simon Zelotes, why it he and James (i.e. being brothers) were coupled together in the apostolic lists of Lk and Acts. Some have applied the phrase “his mother’s sister” in Jn 19:25 to Mary the wife of Clopas, instead of to a separate person, and have thus attempted to identify James the son of Alpheus with James the brother of Our Lord. For a further discussion of the problem, see Buretm of the Lord.

(3) James, “the Lord’s brother” (ο δεσδέφος τοῦ Κριου του Κυριου). I. NT References.—This James is mentioned by name only twice in the Gospels, i.e. when, on the visit of Jesus to Nazareth, the countrymen of Our Lord referred in contemptuous terms to His earthly kindred, in order to disparage His preaching (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3). As J was one of “His brethren,” he was probably among the group of Christ’s relatives who sought to interview Him during His tour through Galilee with the Twelve (Mk 1:28). By the same reasoning he accompanied Jesus on His journey to Capernaum (Jn 2:12), and joined in attempting to persuade Him to depart from Galilee for Judaea on the eve of the Feast of Tabernacles (Jn 7:3). At this feast J. was present (7:10), but was at this time a non-believer in Jesus (cf. 7 5, “Even his brethren did not believe on him”).

Yet the seeds of conversion were being sown within him, for, after the crucifixion, he remained in Jesus with his mother and brethren, and formed one of that earliest band of believers (Acts 1:14). While there, he probably took part in the election of Matthias to the vacant apostleship (Acts 1:25). J. was one of the earliest witnesses to the resurrection, for, after the risen Lord had manifested Himself to the five hundred, “he was seen of James” (1 Cor 15:7 AV). By this his growing belief and prayerful expectancy received confirmation, and it was then that he received the name of “James, the Lord’s brother” (Gal 1:19), was still in Jesus, and had an interview there for the first time with Paul, when the latter returned from his 3 years’ sojourn in Damascus to visit Cephas, or Peter (Gal 1:18; cf Acts 22:15). Hence, according to the genealogy he has the same name as J. was coupled with that of Peter. Thus, when Peter escaped from prison (about 44 AD), he gave instructions to those in the house of John Mark that they should immediately inform “James and the brethren” of the matter of his escape (Acts 12:17). By the time of the Jerus convention, i.e. about 51 AD (cf Gal 2 1), J. had reached the position of first overseer in the church (cf Acts 16 13). Previous to this date, during Paul’s ministry at Antioch, he had dispatched one of his men thither to further the mission, and the teaching of these had caused dissension among the newly converted Christians and their leaders (Acts 16 1.2; Gal 2 12). The conduct of Peter, over whom J. seems to have had considerable influence, was the principal matter of contention (cf Gal 2 11-12). However, at the Jerus convention the dispute was amicably settled, and the pillars of the church, J., John and Cephas, gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (Gal 2 9). The speech of J. on this occasion (Acts 15:12-20), his sympathy with the religious needs of the gentile world (ver 17), his desire that formalism should raise no barrier to their moral and spiritual advancement (vs 19.20.28-29), and his large-hearted tributes to the beloved Barnabas and Paul (ver 25) show that J. was a leader in whom the church was blessed, a leader who loved peace more than faction, the spirit more than the law, and who perceived that religious communities with different forms of observance might still live and work in common allegiance to Christ. One more (58 AD), J. was head of the council at Jerus when Paul made report of his labors, this time of his 3d missionary journey (Acts 21 17 ff). At this meeting Paul was admonished for exceeding his authority, as he had received at the first council, in that he had endeavored to persuade the converted Jews also to neglect circumcision (Acts 21 21), and was commanded to join in the vow of purification (Acts 21:22-26). There is no Scriptural account of the death of J. From 1 Cor 9:5 it has been inferred that he was married. This is, however, only a conjecture, as the passage refers to those who “lead about a sister, a wife” (AV), while, so far as we know, J. remained throughout his life in Jerus.

This J. has been regarded as the author of the Ep. of Jas, “a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ”; cf James, Epistle of. Also, for details concerning his relationship to Christ, cf Buretm of the Lord.

II. References in Apocryphal Literature.—J. figures in one of the miracles in the apocryphal account of “the Gospel of the Infancy, by Thomas the Israelite philosopher,” being cured of a snake-bite by the infant Jesus (cf Hennock, Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 78). According to the Gospel of the Hebrews (cf ib, 11-21), J. had also partaken of the cup of the Lord, and refused to eat till he had seen the risen Lord. Christ acknowledged this tribute by appearing to him. In the Acts of Peter (cf Budge, Continuations of the Apocryphal Acts, 11, 475), it is stated that “three days after the ascension of Our Lord into heaven, James, whom our Lord called his brother in the flesh, consecrated the Offering and we all drew nigh to partake thereof; and when ten days had passed after the ascension of our Lord, we all assembled in the holy fortress of Zion, and we stood up to say the priestly prayer. Then we made supplication unto God and besought Him with humility, and James also entreated Him concerning the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Offering.” (J. The Preaching of St. James the Just (cf Budge, 11, 78-81), tells of the appointment of J. the brother of the Lord to the office of his preaching, healing of the sick and casting out of devils there. This is confirmed by the evidence of Eusebius (Ecclesiast., viii, 11), who reports that the martyrdom of St. James the Just (cf Budge, 11, 82-89), J. was there. It is stated that J., “the Lord’s brother,” was martyred to death, by his preaching. Pibiasa from her husband Ananus, the governor of Jerus. Ananus therefore named the Jews against J. and they hurled him from off the pinnacle of the temple. Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius (H.E. 11, 22), and Jos (Ant. x. x. 1), testify to the general truth of this. It is said by Hegesippus that James was martyred about 62 or 63 AD.

Besides the ep. which bears his name, J. was also the reputed author of the Protevangelium Jacobi, a work
which originated in the 2d cent. and received later additions (cf. Henn, N.A., 47-63; also Joseph, Husband of Mary).  

C. M. Kerr
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LITERATURE  
1. Characteristics of the Epistle.—The Ep. of Jas is the most Jewish writing in the NT. The Gospel characterizes the Jews for the Jews. The Ep. to the He is addressed explicitly to them. The Apocalypse is full of the spirit of the OT. The Ep. of Jude is Jewish too. Yet all of these books have more Jewish characteristics than this ep. which, more than any but one written in the NT, is Jewish. The whole epistle might find its place just as properly in the (Canos of the OT) as in that of the NT, as far as the substance of doctrine and contents is concerned. That could not be said of any other book in the NT. There is no mention of the incarnation or of the resurrection, the two fundamental facts of the Christian faith. The word “God” does not occur in the ep. The word “Messiah” is not used in the ep. There is no suggestion that the Messiah has appeared and no presentation of the possibility of redemption through Him. The teaching throughout is that of a lofty morality which aims at the fulfillment of the requirements of the Mosaic law. It is not strange therefore that Spitta and others have thought that we have in the Ep. of Jas a treatise written by an unconverted Jew which has been adapted to Christian use by the interpolation of the two phrases containing the name of Christ and the names of the apostles. Spitta thinks that this can be the only explanation of the fact that we have here an ep. practically ignoring the life and work of Jesus and every distinctively Christian doctrine, and without a trace of any of the great controversies in the early Christian church or any of the specific features of its propaganda. This judgment is a superficial one, and rests upon superficial indications rather than any appreciation of the underlying spirit and principles of the book. The spirit of Christ is here, and there is no need to label it. The principles of this ep. are the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. There are more is to that Sermon in this ep. than can be found anywhere else in the NT in the same space. The ep. represents the idealization of Jewish legalism under the transforming influence of the Christian motive and life. It is not a theological discussion. It is an ethical appeal. It has to do with the outward life for the most part, and the life it pictures is that of a Jew informed with the spirit of Christ. The spirit is invisible in the ep. as in the individual man. It is the body which appears and the outward life with which that body has to do. The body of the ep. is Jewish, and the outward life to which it exhorts is that of a Jew informed with the spirit of Christ. The Jews familiar with the OT would read this ep. and find its language and tone that to which they were accustomed in their sacred books. Jas is evidently written by a Jew for Jews. It is Jewish in character throughout. This is apparent in the following particulars: (1) The ep. is addressed to the 12 tribes which are of the Dispersion (1 1). The Jews were scattered abroad through the ancient world. From Babylon to Rome, wherever any community of them might be gathered for commercial or social purposes, these exhortations could be carried and read. Probably the ep. was circulated mostly in Syria and Asia Minor, but it may have gone out to the ends of the earth. And there in the ghettos of the Rom Empire, groups of the Jewish exiles would gather and listen while one of their number read this letter from home. All of its terms and its allusions would recall familiar home scenes. (2) Their meeting-place is called “your synagogue” (2 2). (3) Abraham is mentioned as “our father” (2 21). (4) God is given the OT name, “the Lord of Sabaoth” (5 4). (5) The law is not to be spoken against nor judged, but reverently and loyally obeyed. It is a royal law to which every loyal Jew will be subject. It is a law of liberty, to be fully obeyed (2 15-16; 4 11). (6) The sins of the flesh are not inveighed against in the ep., but those sins to which the Jews were more conspicuously liable, such as the love of money and the distinction which money may bring (2 2-4), worldliness and pride (4 6-7), impatience and impatience of being (5 7-11), and other sins of the temper and tongue (3 1-12; 4 11.12). (7) The illustrations of faithfulness and patience and prayer are found in OT characters, in Abraham (2 21), Rahab (2 25), Job (6 11), and Elijah (6 17.18). The whole atmosphere of the ep. is Jewish.  

The writer of this ep. speaks as one having authority. He is not on his defence, as Paul so often is. There is no trace of apology in his presentation of the truth. His position is the most solemnly recognized and unquestioned. He is as sure of his standing with his readers as he is of the absoluteness of his message.  

No OT lawyer or prophet was more certain that he spoke the word of the Lord. He has the vehemence of Elijah and the assured meekness of Moses. He has been called “the Amos of the NT.” and there are paragraphs which recall the very expressions used by Amos and which are full of the same fiery eloquence and prophetic fervor. Both fill their writing with metaphors drawn from the sea and the sky, from natural objects and domestic experiences, and they are both men who have been tried and to be in sympathy with simplicity and poverty. Both inveigh against the luxury and the cruelty of the rich, and both abhor the pretentiousness of his which are substituted for individual righteousness. Malachi was not the last of the OT prophets. The Baptist was not the last prophet of the Old Dispensation. The writer of this ep. stands at the end of that prophetic line, and he is greater than John the Baptist or any who have preceded him because he stands within the borders of the kingdom of Christ. He speaks with authority as a messenger of God. He belongs to the goodly fellowship of the prophets and of the apostles. He has the authority of both. There are 84 imperatives in the 108 verses of this ep.  

The ep. is interested in conduct more than in creed. It has very little formulated theology, less than any other ep. in the NT; but the same principles are present throughout. It begins and it closes with exhortation to patience and prayer. It preaches a gospel of good works, based upon love to God and love to man. It demands liberty, equality, fraternity for all. It enjoins humility and justice and peace. It preaches singlehood of purpose and simplicity of soul. It requires obedience to the law, control of the passions, and control of the tongue. Its ideal is to be found in a good life, characterized by the meekness of wisdom. The writer of the ep. is a bishop of the epistle of the ancient prophets, but the lessons that he teaches are taken, for the most part, from the Wisdom lit. of the OT and the Apoc. His direct quotations
are from the Pentateuch and the Book of Prov; but it has been estimated that there are 10 allusions to the Book of Prov, 8 to the Book of Job, 5 to the Book of Woes and 5 to the Book of Ecclesiastes. This wisdom lit. furnishes the staple of his meditation and the substance of his teaching. He has little or nothing to say about the great doctrines of the Christian church.

He has much to say about the wisdom that cometh down from above. It is pure, peaceful, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, without hypocrisy (Jas 1:17-18). The whole ep. shows that the author had stored his mind with this rich treasure of the ancient wisdom, and his material, which often makes his ep. both bold and new. The form is largely that of the Wisdom lit. of the Jews. It has more parallels with Jesus the son of Sirach than with any writing of the earlier books.

The substance of its exhortation, however, is to be found in the Synoptics and more particularly in the Sermon on the Mount. Its wisdom is the wisdom of Jesus the son of Joseph, who is the Christ.

These are the three outstanding characteristics of this ep. In form and on the surface it is the most Jewish and least Christian of the writings in the NT, yet the simple Christian morality, faithful in its observance of all the ritual regulations of the Jewish faith. Hegesippus tells us that he was holy from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor strong drink. He ate no flesh. He alone was permitted to enter with the priests into the holy place, and he was found there frequently upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, and his knees became hard like those of a camel in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God and asking forgiveness for the people (Euseb., HE, II, 23). He was called the James the Just. All had confidence in his sincerity and integrity, and many were persuaded by him to believe in the Christ. This Jovianus, as Christianity is latent and not apparent. Yet it is the moral authority that speaks to us in the ep. in the NT, unique to those of the apostle John. Jesus had occupied a position of undisputed primacy in the Christian church. This primacy John must have found when he wrote his ep. It is noteworthy that the writer of this ep. assumed a position of like authority with that of John. John was the apostle of love, Paul, of faith, and Peter of hope. This writer is the apostle of good works, the author of wisdom which manifests itself in peace and purity, mercy and morality, and in obedience to the royal law, the law of liberty. In its union of Jewish form, authoritative tone, and insistence, upon practical morality, the ep. is unique among the NT books.

II. Author of the Epistle.—The address of the ep. states that the writer is "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" (1:1). The tradition of the church has identified this James with the brother of Our Lord. Clement of Alexandria says that Peter and James and John, who were the three apostles most honored of the Lord, chose James, the Lord's brother, to be the bishop of Jerusalem after the Lord's ascension (Euseb., HE, II, 1). This tradition agrees well with all the notices of James in the NT books. After the death of James the brother of John, Peter was thrown into prison, and having been miraculously released, he asked that the news be sent to James and to the brethren. This James is in evidence in authority in the church at this time. In the apostolic conference held at Jerusalem, after Peter and Paul and Barnabas had spoken, this same James sums up the whole discussion, and his decision is adopted by the assembly and formulated in a letter which has some very striking [as in its phrasingology to this ep. (Acts 15:6-29). When Paul came to Jerusalem for the last time he reported his work to James and all the elders present with him (Acts 21:18). In the ep. to the Gal Paul says that at the time of one of his visits to Jerusalem he saw none of the apostles save Peter and James and the Lord's brother (Gal 1:18). At another visit he received the right hand of fellowship from James and Cephas and John (Gal 2:9). At a later time certain who came from James to Antioch led Peter into backsliding from his former position of tolerance of the Gentiles as equals in the Christian church (Gal 2:12).

All of these references would lead us to suppose that James held a position of supreme authority in the mother-church at Jerusalem, the oldest church of Christendom. He presides in the assemblies of the church. He speaks the final and authoritative word. Peter and Paul defer to him. Paul mentions his name before that of Peter and John. When he was excited to this leadership we do not know, but all indications seem to point to the fact that at a very early period James was the recognized executive authority in the church at Jerusalem. This was the church of Pentecost and the church of the apostles. All Jews looked to Jesus as the chief seat of their worship and the central authority of their religion. All Christian Jews would look to Jesus as the primitive source of their religion and faith, and the head of the church at Jerusalem would be recognized by them as their chief authority. The authoritative tone of this ep. comports well with this position of primacy ascribed to James.

All tradition agrees in describing James as a Hebrew of the Hellenists, a man of great piety, of vast knowledge, and morality, faithful in his observance of all the ritual regulations of the Jewish faith. James, as a scribe of the Law, is well equipped to judge of the numerous and subtle questions, which had been raised about the law. James was a man of authority and of great wisdom, of whom enough has been said. If the wise and good advice, which is given here, be intended to be a commentary on the Law, we may be justified in concluding that the author was a Hebrew, a more rigid adherence to the Law, and a more ardent love of the Jewish religion. But if the advice is also to be understood as a commentary upon the Christian religion, and a regulation of the conduct of Christians, we may as well conclude that the author was a Christian, a man of great ability and wisdom. He is not the author of the Epistle of Jude, but he was in the line of Jude. His advice is, however, of a more practical character than that of Jude. He argues all the positions for which he contends. He is not the same man as the James of the Epistle of Jude; but he was a member of the same family. He was likely the son of one of the apostles, and the brother of James the Lord's brother. James 1:1 is the address of the epistle of James. The epistle is signed James 1:1, but it is not possible to determine to whom it was written, whether to the church at Jerusalem, to the church of Antioch, or to some other church.

I. Its Plausibility.

Plausibility. There is usually no good reason for misunderstanding anything James says. He puts his truth plainly, and the words he uses have no hidden or mystical meanings. His thought is transparent as his life. It is somewhat surprising to find that the Gr. of the Ep. of Jas is better than that of the other NT writers, with the single exception of the author of the Ep. to the Hebrews. Of course this may be due to the fact that James had the same amanuensis who was a Gr scholar, or that his own MS was revised by such a man; but, although unexpected, it is not impossible that James himself may have been capable of writing such Gr as this.

It is not the good Gr of the classics, and it is not the poor and provincial Gr of Paul. There is no literary form than in the uncooked periods of the gentlest apostle, and the vocabulary would seem to indicate an acquaintance with the literary Gr. 11:29-31, and the conversational Gr. "Galilee was studded with Gr towns, and it was certainly in this Gr region that James learned to gain a knowledge of Gr. ... We may reasonably suppose that our author would not have scoured the Gr classics to avail himself of the opinions of such men as... It is present, not so much to master the Gr language, and learn something of Gr philosophy. This would be natural, even if we think of James as impelled only by a desire to gain wisdom and
knowledge for himself; but if we think of him also as the principal teacher of the Jewish believers, many of whom were Hellenists, instructed in the wisdom of Alexandria, then the epistle as a whole (1:12) would be, "he would be a student of Gr in order that he might be a more effective instructor to his own people" (Mayor, The Ep. of James, p. 25). The Gr of the ep. is the study to which Or of one who was not a native to it, but who had familiarized himself with its literature. James could have done so and the ep. may be proof that he did.

James is never content to talk in abstractions. He always sets a picture before his own eyes and those of his readers. He has the 3. Its Vividness of sustained interest. He is not diluting things in general but things in particular. He is an artist and believes in concrete realities. At the same time he has a touch of poetry in him, and a fine sense of the analogies running through all Nature and all life. The doubling vision like the two sides (1:6). The rich man fades away in his goings, even as the beauty of the flower falls and perishes (1:11). The synagogues scene with its distinction between the rich and the poor before us with the clear-out impressiveness of a cameo (2:1-4). The Pecksniffian philanthropist, who seems to think that men can be fed not by bread alone but by the words that proceed magnificently from his mouth, is pilloried here (2:15,16). The sword that is set on fire of hell is put in the full blaze of its world of iniquity, and the damage it does is shown to be like that of a forest fire (3:1-12). The picture of the wisdom that comes from above with its sevenfold excellences of purity, peaceableness, gentleness, mercy, fruitfulness, impartiality, sincerity, is worthy to hang in the gallery of the world's masterpieces (3:17). The vaunting tradesmen, whose lives are like vanishing vapor, stand there before the eye conducted in the later (3:18). The rich, whose luxuries he describes even while he denounces their cruelties and prophesies their coming day of slaughter, are the rich who walk the streets of his own city (5:1-6). His short sentences go like shots straight to the mark. We feel the impact and the impress of them. There is an energy behind them and a reality in them that makes them live in our thought. His abrupt questions are like the quick interrogations of a cross-examining lawyer (3:5-11, 12, 13). His parentheticals have the intensity of the accumulated and compressed wisdom of the ages. They are irreducible minimums. They are memorable sayings, treasured in the speech of the world ever since his day.

Sometimes James adds sentence to sentence with the repetition of some leading word or phrase (1:1-6,19-24; 3:2-8). It is the painful style of one who is not altogether at home with the language which he has chosen as the vehicle of his thought. It is the method by which a dislocation could be consumed indissolubly. Nothing but the vividness of the imagery and the intensity of the thought saves James from fatal monotony in the use of this device.

James has a keen eye for illustrations. He is not blind to the beauties and wonders of Nature. He sees what is happening on every hand, and he is quick to catch any homiletical suggestion it may hold. Does he stand by the seashore? The surge of St. James, 1:4. The surging and tossing reminds him of the man who is unstable in all his ways, because he has no anchorage of faith, and his convictions are like driftwood on a sea of doubt (1:6). Then he notices that the great ships are turned about by a small rudder (2:1). But the tongue is a small member but it accomplishes great things (3:4,5). Does he walk under the sunlight and rejoice in it as the source of so many good and perfect gifts? He sees in it an image of the goodness of God that is never eclipsed and never exhausted, unvarying for evermore (1:17). He uses the natural phenomena in which he lives to make his meaning plain at every turn: the flower of the field that passes away (10:11), the forest fire that sweeps the mountain side and like a living torch lights up the whole land (3:5), the leaves and salt springs (1:11), the fig trees and the olive trees and the vines (3:12), the seed-sowing and the fruit-bearing (3:18), the morning mist immediately lost to view (4:14), the early and the latter rain for which the husbandman waiteth patiently (6:7).

There is more of the appreciation of Nature in this one short ep. of James than in all the ep. of Paul put together. Human life was more interesting to Paul than natural scenery. However, James is interested in human life just as profoundly as Paul. He is constantly endowing inanimate things with living qualities. He represents sin as a harlot, conceiving and bringing forth death (1:15). The word of truth has a like power and conceives and brings forth those who live to God's praise (1:15). Pleasures are like gay hosts of enemies in a tournament, who deck themselves bravely and ride forth with singing and laughter, but whose mission is to wage war and to kill (4:1,2). The laborers may all be dumb in the day of the time of the Lord (5:1), but dependence and their fear, but their wages, fraudulently withheld, have a tongue, and cry out to high heaven for vengeance (5:4). What is friendship with the world? It is adultery, James says (4:4). The rust of unjust riches testifies against them (4:7). They have accumulated them, and then turns upon them and eats their flesh like fire (5:3). James observed the man who glanced at himself in the mirror in the morning, and saw that his face was not clean, and who went inward and washed it for that whole day, and he found in him an illustration of the one who heard the word and did not do it (1:22-24). The ep. is full of these rhetorical figures, and they prove that James was something of a poet at heart, even as Jesus was. He writes in prose, but there is a marked rhythm in all of his speech. He has an ear for harmony as he has an eye for beauty everywhere.

The Pauline epistles begin with salutations and close with benedictions. They are filled with autobiographical touches and personal mentions. None of these things appear here. The ep. begins and ends with the one person. It has an address, but no thanksgiving. There are no personal messages and no indications of any intimate personal relationship between the author and his readers. They are his "beloved brethren." He knows their needs and their sins, but he may never have seen their faces or visited their homes. The ep. is more like a prophet's appeal to a nation than a personal letter.

Both the substance of the teaching and the method of its presentation remind us of the discourses of Jesus. James says less about the Master than any other writer in the NT, but his speech is more like that of the Master than the speech of any one of them. There are at least ten parallels to the Sermon on the Mount in this short ep., and for almost everything that James has to say we can recall some statement of Jesus which might have suggested it. When the parallels fail at any point, we are inclined to suspect that James may be repeating some unrecorded utterance of Our Lord. He seems absolutely faithful to his memory of his brother's teaching. He is the exponent of Jesus in all his unrecorded and persuasion.

Did the Master shock His disciples' faith by the, loftiness of the Christian ideal He set before them in His great sermon, "Ye therefore shall be perfect,
as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Mt 5:48)? James sets the same high standard in the very forefront of his ep.: “Let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing” (1:4). Did the Master say, “Ask, and it shall be given you” (Mt 7:11)? James says, “If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God ... and it shall be given him” (1:5). Did the Master add a condition to His sweeping promise to prayer and say, “Whosoever ... shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith, he shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he asketh” (Mt 16:23)? James hastens to add the same condition, “Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting: for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed” (1:6). Did the Master close the great sermon with His parable of the Wise Man and the Foolish Man, saying, “Every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth not them, shall be likened unto a foolish man” (Mt 7:26)? James is much concerned about wisdom, and therefore he exhorts his readers, “Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, defiling your own selves” (1:22). Had the Master declared, “If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them” (Jn 13:17)? James echoes the thought when he says, “A doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing” (1:25). Did the Master say to the disciples, “Blessed are ye poor: for theirs is the kingdom of God” (Lk 6:20)? James has the same sympathy with the poor, and he says, “Hearken, my beloved brethren; did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him?” (2:5). Did the Master inveigh against the rich, as he says, “Woe unto you, ye rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep” (Lk 6:24-25)? James bursts forth into the same inverte and prophetizes the same sad reversal of fortune, “Come now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you” (5:1). “Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded. Be offended with your iniquities; and turn away from them; turn to mourning, and your joy to heaviness” (4:9). Had Jesus said, “Judge not, that ye be not judged” (Mt 7:1)? James repeats the exhortation, “Speak not one against another, brethren. He that speaketh against his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh against the law; ... but who art thou that judgest thy neighbor?” (4:11,12). Had Jesus said, “Whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted” (Mt 23:12)? We find the very words in James, “Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you” (4:10). Had Jesus said, “I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet. ... But let your speech be, Yes, yes; Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one” (Mt 5:34-37)? Here in James we come upon the exact: “But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yes be yes, and your nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these is the evil one!” (Mt 5:34-37). We remember how the Master began the Sermon on the Mount with the declaration that even those who murdered and were persecuted and reviled and reproached were blessed, in spite of all their sufferings, because they were blessed as their Master was, “Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God” (Mt 5:9). James begins his ep. with the same paradoxical putting of the Christian faith, “Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold trials” (1:2 ARV). We remember how Jesus proceeded in His sermon to set forth the spiritual significance and the assured permanence of the law; and we notice that James treats the law with the same respect and puts upon it the same high value. He calls it “the perfect law” (1:25), “the royal law” (2:8), the “law of liberty” (2:12). James is always willing to forgive others in order that we ourselves may be forgiven; and we know where James got his authority for saying, “Judgment is without mercy to him that hath showed no mercy” (2:13). In the parable of the sower, James amplifies the trees and corrupt trees being known by their fruits, “Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?” (Mt 7:16-20). Then in the Ep. of Jas we find a like question, “Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?” (3:12). We remember that the Master said, “Know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors” (Mt 24:33). We are not surprised to find the statement here in James, “Behold, the judge standeth before the doors” (5:9). These reminiscences of the Master have been quoted to us on every page. It may be that there are many more of them than we are able to identify. Their number is sufficiently large, however, to show us that James is steeped in the truths taught by Jesus, and that they have so often stirred his soul that their phraseology constantly reminds us of Him.

IV. Date of the Epistle.—There are those who think that the Ep. of Jas is the oldest ep. in the NT. Among those who favor an earlier date are Mayer, Plummer, Alford, Starry, Renan, Weiss, Zahn, Beyschlag, Neander, Schneckenburger, Thiersch, and Dods.

The reasons assigned for this conclusion are: (1) the general Judaic tone of the ep., which seems to antedate the admission of the Gentiles into the church; but since the ep. is addressed only to Jews, why should the Gentiles be mentioned in its text? and (2) the fact that Paul and Peter are supposed to have quoted from Jas in their writing; but this reading of quotation in the ep. is so involved that it has been ably argued that the quotation has been the other way about.

Others think that the ep. was written toward the close of James’s life. Among these are Kern, Wiesinger, Schmidt, Brückner, Wordsworth, and Farrar.

These argue (1) that the ep. gives evidence of a considerable lapse of time in the history of the church, sufficient to allow of the composition of Jas by James as one of the Twelve in a later position; (2) that Pentecost and the establishment of distinctions among the brethren; but any of the sins mentioned in the ep. could have been observed among the Jews in any decade of its history. (2) James has a position of established authority, and those to whom he writes are not recent converts, but long standing; but the position of James may have been established from a very early date, and in an encyclical of this sort we could not expect any indication of shorter or longer membership in the church. Doubtless some of those addressed were recent converts, while others may have been members for many years. (3) There are references to persecutions and trials which fit the later rather than the earlier date; but all that is said on this subject might be suitable in any period of the presidency of James at Jerusalem. (4) There is no indication of a long and ap- pointing delay in the Second Coming of the Lord in the repeated exhortation to patience, but the same is no more than the other hand James says, “The coming of the Lord is at hand,” and “The judge standeth before the doors” (5:9). The same passage is cited in the belief that the immediate appearance of the Lord was expected, as in the earliest period of the church, and in proof that there had been a disappointment of this earlier belief and that it had been succeeded by a feeling that there was need of patience in waiting for the coming so long delayed.

It seems clear to us that there are no decisive proofs in favor of any definite date for the ep. It must have been written before the martyrdom of James in the year 63 AD, and at some time during his presidency over the church at Jerusalem; but there is nothing to warrant us in coming to any more definite conclusion than that Davidson, Hilgenfeld, Baur, Zeller, Haushaupt, von Soden, Jülicher, Har-
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nack, Bacon and others date the ep. variously in the post-Pauline period, 69-70 to 140-50 AD. The arguments for any of these dates fall far short of proof. James is said to be the author of the first of the so-called Catholic Epis. But it is to be observed that it is disputed; at least, not many of the ancients have mentioned it, as is the case likewise with the ep. that bears the name of Jude, which is also referred to by Eusebius the 2d cent. Nevertheless, we know that these also, with the rest, have been read publicly in most churches” (HE, II, 23). Eusebius himself, however, quotes Jas 4:11 as Scripture and Jas 5:13 as spoken by the holy apostle. Personally he does not seem disposed to question the genuineness of the ep. There are is in phraseology which make it possible that the ep. is quoted in Clement of Rome in the 1st cent., and in Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, the Ep. to the Diognetus, Irenaeus, and Hermas in the 2d cent. It is omitted in the canonical list of the Muratorian Fragment and was not included in the Old Lat. version. Orig. seems to be the first writer to quote the ep. explicitly as Scripture and to assert that it was written by James the Lord. It appears in the Fesh version and seems to have been generally recognized in the East. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Epiphanius of Edessa, Dalmus of Alexandria, received it as canonical. The writer must accept Carthage 301 AD finally settled its status for the Western church, and from that date in both the East and the West its canonicity was unquestioned until the time of the Reformation.

Erasmus and Cajetan revived the old doubts concerning it. Luther thought it contradicted Paul and therefore banished it to the appendix of his Bible. “James,” he says, “has aimed to refute those who relied on faith without works, and is too weak for his task in mind, understanding, and words, mutilates the Scriptures, and thus directly contradicts Paul and all Scriptures, seeking to accomplish by enforcing the law what the apostles successfully effect by love. Therefore I will not place his Ep. in my Bible among the proper leading books, Colos. 4:14, Eph. 6:23, 2d cent. It was a downright strawy ep., as compared with such as those to the Rom and to the Gal, and it had no real evangelical character. This judgment of Luther is a very hasty and regrettable one. The modern church has refused to accept it, and it is generally conceded now that Paul and James are in perfect agreement with each other, though their presentation of the same truth from opposite points of view brings them into apparent contradiction. Paul says, ‘By grace have ye been saved through faith’ (Eph 2:8-9). ‘We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law’ (Rom 3:24). James says, ‘Faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself’ (2:17). ‘Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith’ (2:24). With these passages before him Luther said, ‘Many have toiled to reconcile Paul with James. . . but to no purpose, for they are contrary, Faith justifies; Faith does not justify; I will not reconcile these prop. and if he succeeds he may call me a fool’ (Colloquia, II, 202).

It would be difficult to prove Luther a fool if Paul and James were using these words, faith, works, and glory, in the same sense, or else if each were writing with full consciousness of what the other had written. They both use Abraham for an example, James of justification by works, and Paul of justification by faith. How can that be possible? The faith meant by James is the faith of a dead orthodoxy, a forced assent to the dogmas of the church which does not result in any practical righteousness in life, such as a faith as the demons have when they believe in the being of God and simply tremble before Him. The faith meant by Paul is intellectual and moral and spiritual, affects the whole man, and leads him into conscious and vital union and communion with God. It is not the faith of demons; it is the faith that redeems. Again, the works meant by Paul are the works of a professed legalism, the severe mundane impulsion or from a feeling of duty, the works done in obedience to a law which is a taskmaster, the works of a slave and not of a son. These dead works, he declares, can never give life. The works meant by James are the works of a believer, the fruit of the faith and love born in every believer’s heart and manifest in every believer’s life. The possession of faith will insure this evidence in his daily conduct and conversation; and without this evidence the mere profession of faith will not save him. The justification meant by Paul is the initial justification of the Christian life. No doing of meritorious deeds will make a man worthy of salvation. He comes into the kingdom, not on the basis of merit but on the basis of grace, of the throne of God. He cannot buy his way in by good works; he cannot earn his way by faith. It is the gift of God’s free grace. The justification meant by James is the justification of any after-moment in the Christian life, and the final justification before the judgment throne. Good works are inevitable in the Christian life. There can be no assurance of salvation without them.

Paul is looking at the root; James is looking at the fruit. Paul is talking about the beginning of the Christian life; James is talking about its continuance and consummation. With Paul, the works he renounces precede faith and are dead works. With James, the faith he denounces is apart from works and is a dead faith.

Paul believes in the works of godliness just as much as James does. Paul says that God will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gr; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gr” (Rom 2 6-10). This is the final justification discussed by James, and it is put as clearly a judgment by works with Paul as with him.

On the other hand James believes in saving faith as well as Paul. He begins with the statement that the proving of our faith works patience and purification, because of the burning desire of the prayer of faith will bring the coveted wisdom (1 6). He describes the Christian profession as a holding
“the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory” (2 1). He says that the poor as to the world are rich in faith, and therefore heirs to the kingdom (2 5). He quotes the passage from Gen, “Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness” (2 5), and he explicitly asserts that Abraham’s “faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect” (2 22). The faith mentioned in all these passages is the faith of the professing Christian; it is not the faith which the non-exercising in aspiring salvation. James and Paul are declaring that faith, which must go hand in hand in the Christian life, and that in the Christian’s experience both faith without works is dead and works without faith are dead works. They both believe in faith working through love as that which alone will avail in Christ Jesus (Gal 5 6). Fundamentally they agree. Superficially they seem to contradict each other. That is because they are talking about different things and using the same terms with different meanings for those terms in mind.

VI. The Message of the Epistle to Our Times.—

There are those who talk holiness and are hypocrites; those who make profession of perfect love and yet cannot live peaceably with their brethren; those who are full of pious phraseology but fall in practical philanthropy. This ep. was written for them. It may not give them much comfort, but it ought to give them much profit. The mystery that constitutes itself with pious frames and phrases and comes short in actual service and devoted service will find its antidote here. The antinomianism that professes great confidence in free grace, but does not recognize the necessity for conformity of life, needs to ponder the practical wisdom of this ep. The quietists who are satisfied to sit and sing themselves away to everlasting bliss ought to read this ep. until they catch its bugle note of inspiration to present activity and continuous good deeds. All who are long on theory and short on practice ought to keep themselves in the spirit of James; and since there are such people in every community and in every age, the message of the ep. will never grow old.

The old sociological problems are to the front today. The old problems were social reformers, and James is most like them in the NT. Much literature of the age says that he is applicable to present-day conditions. He lays down the right principles of practical philanthropy, and the proper relationships between master and man, and between man and man. If the teachings of this ep. were put into practice throughout the church it would mean the revitalization of Christianity. It would prove that the Christian religion was practical and workable, and it would go far to establish the final brotherhood of man in the service of God.

The life of Our Lord is the most important life in the history of the race. It will always be a subject of the deepest interest and study. Character of Jesus is one of the most enduring of all knowledge; they might add to our store of information concerning the Christ. We suggest that there is a field here to which conscientious attention has not been sufficiently directed. James was the brother of the Lord. His ep. tells us much about himself. On the supposition that he did not exhort others to be what he would not furnish them an example in being, we read in this ep. his own character writ large. He was like his brother in so many things. As we study the life and character of James we come to know more about the life and character of Jesus.

Jesus and James had the same mother. From her they had their inheritance. They reproposed their mother’s characteristics they were alike. They had the same home training. As far as the father in that home could succeed in putting the impress of his own personality upon the boys, they would be alike. It is inconceivable in the context that Joseph is said in the Gospel to have been “a just man” (Mt 1 19 AV), and that James came to be known through all the early church as James the Just, and that in his ep. he gives this title to his brother, Jesus, when he says of the unjust rich of James, “he condemned and killed the just” (6 4 AV). Joseph was just, and James was just, and Jesus was just. The brothers were alike, and they were like the father in this respect. The two brothers seem to think alike and talk alike to a most remarkable degree.

They represent the same home surroundings and human environment, the same religious training and inherited characteristics. Surely, then, all that we learn concerning James will help us to better understand Jesus.

They are alike in their poetical insight and their practical wisdom. They are both fond of figurative speech, and it seems always natural and unforced. The discourses of Jesus are filled with birds and flowers and winds and clouds and all the sights and sounds of rural life in Pal. The writings of James abound in reference to the field flowers and the meadows, grass and the meek, fountains and the burning wind and the early and the latter rain. They are alike in their emotional attitude and spiritual alertness. They have much in common in the material equipment of their thought. James was well versed in the apoe aorist that Jesus was just as familiar with these books as he? James seems to have acquired a comparative mastery of the Gr language and to have had some acquaintance with the Gr philosophy. Would not Jesus have been as well furnished in these lines as James was?

What was the character of James? All tradition testifies to his personal purity and persistent devotion, commanding the reverence and the respect of all who knew him. As we trace the various elements of his character manifesting themselves in his ep., and his exhortations in this ep., we find rising before us the image of Jesus as well as the image of the Lord, a single-minded man, stedfast in faith and patient in trials. He is slow to wrath, but very quick to protect any sins of speech and hypocrisy. He is full of humility, ready to champion the cause of the oppressed and the poor, and he loves wisdom, and he believes in prayer and practice it in reference to both temporal and spiritual good. He believes in the absolute necessity in the church of brotherly love. He is opposed to anything that will establish any distinctions between brethren in their place of worship. He believes in practical philanthropy. He believes that the right sort of religion will lead a man to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. A pure religion in his estimation will mean a pure man. He believes that we ought to practise all that we preach.

As we study these characteristics and opinions of the younger brother, does not the image of his and our Elder Brother grow ever clearer before our eyes?


DoreMIS Alm Hayes

JAMES, PROTEVANGELIUM, pro- teen-jél’ i-un, OF. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

Jamin, ja’mín ( render, “right hand”): (1) In Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15; Nu 26 12; 1 Ch 4 24, a “son” (Dan) of Simeon.
(2) In 1 Ch 2 27, a Judahite, “son” of Ram and grandson of Jerahmeel.

(3) In Neh 8 7, a Levite (?), one of those who “caused the people to understand” the Torah when Ezra enforced it “in Iadunus” in 1 Esd 9 48.

JAMNITES, jâm'ni-ts (יוֹנָה, ha-yanim, coll. with art.): In Nu 26 12, descendants of Jamin (J above).

JAMLECH, jâm'lék (יוֹנָה, yamâlîkh, “may he [God] cause to reign”: A “prince” or chief of the tribe of Simeon (1 Ch 4 24). If ver 41 refers to the preceding list, he lived in the time of Hezekiah.

JAMNIA, jâm'ni-a. See JABNEEL.

JAMNITIC, jm-nî-tîk (יוֹנָה, metâkolosia, materiaology, “vain discourse,” “babbling”): This word is not found in AV; once only in AV (1 Tim 1 6). ARV has “vain talking,” instead of “vain jangling,” and evidently means proud, self-conceited talking against what God has revealed and against God Himself.

JANIM, jânîm (יוֹנָה, yânîm; AV Janum): A place in the Hebron uplands named with Eshan and Beth-tappuah (Josh 15 55); unidentified.

JANNAI, jân'î-î (יוֹנָה, Iannâth, Tisch., Tre., WÌ; †Tavô, Iannô, Tâb; AV Janna): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk’s genealogy, the 5th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lk 3 24).

JANES, jân'ês, AND JAMBRES, jm-brês (יוֹנָה, Iannês kal Iâmbôss, Iannês kal Iambôres, 2 Tim 3 8): These are the names of two magicians in ancient Egypt, who withstood Moses and Aaron. “Then Pharaoh also called for the wise men and the sorcerers: and they also, the magicians of Egypt, did in like manner with their enchantments.” Jannes and Jambres were evidently two of the persons referred to in this passage. It should be observed that the word tr † here “magicians” occurs also in Gen 41 8 in connection with Pharaoh’s dreams: Pharaoh “sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof.” RVm reads for “magicians,” “or sacred scribes.” The Heb word is hârûmûnûm, and means sacred scribes who were skilled in the sacred writing, that is in the hieroglyphics: they were a variety of Egypt priests. J. and J. were doubtless members of one or other of the various classes spoken of in the passages in Ex and Gen, the midrashim, the sorcerers, and the magicians or sacred scribes.


Japheth, jâ-fêth (יוֹנָה, yepheth; יָפְחֵ, yapheth; Iâphô, Iâpheth): This name, in Gen 9 27, seems to be explained by the phrase Ibyt “may God make wide [yapheth, ARV mologie of ‘enlarge’] for Japheth,” where yapheth Japheth and Japheth are represented by the same consonants, but with different vowel-points. The root of yapheth is yâphâh, “to make wide.” This etymology, however, is not universally accepted, as the word-play is so obvious, and the association of Japheth with Shem (“dark”) and Ham (“black”) suggests a name on similar lines —either gentile, or descriptive of race. Japheth has therefore been explained as meaning “fair,” from yâphâh, the non-Semitic and non-Hamitic races known to the Jews being all more or less whiteskinned. The Tg of Onkelos agrees with the EV, but that of Jonathan has yâpheth, “God shall beauty Japheth,” as though from yâphâh.

The immediate descendants of J. were seven in number, and are represented by the nations designated Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Tiras; or, according to some, by the descendants of the Armenians, Lydians, Medes, Greeks, Tigranes, and Moscheans, the last, Tiras, remaining still obscure. The sons

There are many curious Jewish traditions regarding J. and J. These traditions, which are found in the Tg and elsewhere, are full of contradictions and impossibilities.

3. Traditions. They are to the effect that J. and J. were sons of Balsam, the soothsayer of Pethor. Notwithstanding this impossibility the date of J. and J., they were said to have withstood Moses 40 years previously at the court of Pharaoh, to whom they had so impressed a dread of that king, as to foretell the birth of Moses and cause the oppression of the Israelites. They are also said to have become proselytes, and it is added that they left Egypt at the Exodus, among the mixed multitude. They are reported to have instigated Aaron to make the golden calf. The traditions of their death are also given in a varying fashion. They were sometimes said to have been slain in a battle against the Medes, and others to have been put to death after the making of the golden calf, or during the slaughter connected with the name of Phinehas.

According to Origen (Comm. on Mt 27 8) there was an apocryphal book—not yet rediscovered—called “The Book of J. and J.”

4. Origen’s statement is that in 2 Tim Statement 3 8 Paul is quoting from that book.

In the Targumic lit. “Jambres occurs as a vari- ant reading instead of ‘Jambres.’” It is thought that Jambres is derived from an Aram. root, meaning “to oppose,” the partic- iple of which would be Mambres. The meaning of either “who opposes” Jannesis perhaps a corruption of Joannes or Johannes (John).
of Gomer (Ashkenaz, Riphat and Togarmah) were all settled in the West Asian tract; while the sons of Javan (Elamish, Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim or Rodanim) occupied the Mediterranean coast and the adjacent islands.

In Gen 9 27, as in other passages, Japheth occupies the 3d place in the enumeration of the sons of Noah, but he is really regarded as the 2d son, Ham being the youngest. In the genealogical table, however (Gen 10 1 ff), the descendants of Japheth and Noah are given first, and those of Shem last, to set forth their qualities at greater length. Though this would seem to indicate that the fair races were the least known to the Jews, it implies that the latter were well disposed toward them, for Japheth was (ultimately) to dwell in the tents of Shem, and therefore to take part in Shem's spiritual privileges.

It seems unlikely that the Greek giant-hero, Iapetus, father of Prometheus, who was regarded by the Greeks as the father of the human race, had any connection with the Heb and Iapetos Japheth. The original of the Heb record probably belongs to a date too early to admit borrowing from the Gr, and if the name had been borrowed by the Greeks from the Hebrews, a nearer form might be expected. See SHEM; HAM; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. PINCHES

JAPHETH, ja'feth (Τάδας, Ιαπεθῆ): A region mentioned only in Jth 2 25, where no particulars are given which may lead to identification. Holofernes "came unto the borders of Japheth, which were toward the south, over against Arabia."

JAPHIA, ja-f'ia, ja-f'i-a (גּאפִּיה, יָפֵחָה), perhaps "tall," or Arab.; Ἰάφης, Ἰαφήθη: (1) King of Lachish, one of the 5 "kings of the Amorites" who allied themselves together in an expedition against Gibeon on account of its treaty with the Israelites (Josh 10 4-5). After their discomfiture by Joshua in the battle of Beth-horon (ver 10), "one of the most important in the history of the world" (Stanley), they fled and hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah (ver 16). As Joshua passed, he was informed of this, but, unwilling to delay his pursuit of the fugitives, he ordered great stones to be rolled unto the mouth of the cave leaving a guard in charge (vs 17 f). On the completion of his victory, Joshua returned to Makkedah and commanded the Israelites to bring forth the imprisoned kings, and summoned the chiefs of his army to plant their feet upon their necks. Then he put them to death; and after he had hung their bodies on 5 trees, he ordered the Israelites in the evening to take them down and cast them into the cave (vs 22-27).

(2) (LXX Ἰαφης, Ἰαφιθῆς, Ἰαφετ, Ἴαφης) Japheth: One of the sons of David who were born to him at Jerusalem (2 S 5 15; 1 Ch 3 7; 16 6). JAMES Crichton

JAPHIAH, ja-f'ia, ja-f'i-a (גּאפִּיה, יָפֵחָה): A town on the southern boundary of Zebulun named with Chiloh-tabor and Daberath (Josh 19 12). It is represented by the modern Yāfā, about 1½ miles S.W. of Nazareth, near the foot of the hills. It was one of the places fortified by Jos (Vita, 45; BJ, II, xx, 6).

JAPHLET, ja-f'let (גּאפִלֶת), yaphlet, "he escapes" [?]" : In 1 Ch 7 32,33, a "son of" Heber, an Asherite.

JAPHLETH, ja-f'leth, ja-f'lē-th: AV in Josh 16 3, where Heb is גּאפִלֶת, ha-yaphleth, "the Japhlethites," RV, a clan said to border on the territory of Joseph, but not mentioned elsewhere.

JAPHO, ja-f'ō: AV and AVM in Josh 19 46 for Joppa (q.v.).

JAR, jār. See BARREL.

JARAH, ja'raḥ (תֵּרָה, yārāh, "honey-comb" [?]): A descendant of King Saul (1 Ch 9 42); but LXX B, A, have "Ιασά, Ταδα = תֵּרָה, yā'raḥ, a name found in LXX of 1 Ch 8 36, where MT has וְּרָה, yē'orah, Jehoadah. Some Heb MSS have yā'raḥ in 9 42, and it should probably be accepted as the correct reading there, for yā'raḥ = Jehoadah yā'raḥ, linguistically; cf Jonathan and Jehonathan, etc.

JAREB, ja-reb, ja-reb (גּאֶרֶב, yā'reb, "let him contend"; LXX Ἰαρεῖς, Jarwmos): Is mentioned twice in Hos (5 13; 10 6) as an Assyrian king who received tribute from Israel, of the We do not know, however, of an Assyrian Name king of that name, or of such a place as is indicated by "the king of Jareb" (5 13 AVM). Sayce (HCM 417) thinks Jareb possibly be the earlier name of Sargon who took Samaria in 722 BC, as the passages in which it appears seem to relate to the last struggles of the Northern Kingdom. This conjecture he bases on the probability that the specific name Monon in IV, following the example of other usurpers of the Assyrian throne before him, assumed the name of Sargon. Those who hold that Hosea's prophecies are probably not later than 734 BC reject this view.

If we take the text in 5 titl stand (yārēḇ yāręḇ), Jareb cannot be regarded as the name of a person, owing to the absence of the King, "king," which is of the Word always inserted in such a case. It is probably an epithet, nickname given to the Assyrian, as is suggested by RVM ("a king that should contend") and AVm ("the king that should plead"), being derived from the yāḇ, "to strive." The rendering would then be "King Combat," "King Contentious," indicating Assyria's general hostility to Israel and the futility of applying for help to that quarter against the will of Jehovah. Some suggest that for mēlek yārub we should read mēlek rāḇ, (being the old nominative termination), or melek rāḇ, "Great King," a title prefixed to names applied to Assyrian monarchs. Others, following the LXX, would read melek rāḇ, "High King.

The historical reference, if it be to any recorded incident, may be to the attempt of Menahem, king of Israel in 738 BC, to gain over the Assyrians by a large subsidy to Puli, who assumed the name of Tiglath-pileser (2 K 15 19). In this case, as both Ephraim and Judah are mentioned in the prophet, we have to suppose that Ephraim made application on behalf of both kingdoms. If "Judah" be inserted before "sent" to complete the parallel, then the clause would be interpreted of Ahaz, king of Judah, who offered a heavy bribe to Tiglath-pileser to help him to withstand the combined attack of Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel (2 K 15 7 f). But perhaps there may be no particular allusions in the two clauses of the apodosis, but only a reference to a general tendency on the part of both kingdoms to seek Assyrian aid. Cheyne would make a violent change in the verse. He would substitute "Israel" for "Judah" as warranted by Hos 12 2, insert "Israel" before "sent," and change asheker, "Assyria," Views into miṣyār, the North Arabian land of Mugri, "refuge." The references to which many passages in the OT, and for melek yārub, he would read melek 'ārāḇ, "king of Arabia." For other views see ICC. JAMES Crichton
JARED, jā'red (מִבְּרְדָה, yereth, "descent"); a usual form, דָּרֶד, yēreth, in Gen 5 15; 1 Ch 1 2, hence EV "Jared" for "Jered"; [1aḇêl, Iarêd]: In Gen 5 15-20; 1 Ch 1 2; Lk 3 37, son of Mahalaleel and sister of Enoch. AV has "Jered" in 1 Ch 1 2.

The name is leashed by Vulc. to denote a degeneration of the human race, the first five generations being righteous, their successors not, except Enoch and Noah. The name has been identified with that of Idrâd (מִבְּרְדָה, īrôḏ), Gen 4 18. See Skinner, Gen, 117, 129, 131.

JARESIAH, jar-ē-se'a: AV for JARASHEBAH (q.v.).

JARHA, jār'ha (גָּרְחָ, yārâ'h), meaning unknown: An Egyptian slave of Sheshan, about El's time (of HPN, 235), who married his master's daughter, and became the founder of a house of the Jereshmedites (1 Ch 2 94 ff).

JARIB, jār'îb (גָּרְבֵּ, yārîb, "he contents, or takes [our] part, or conducts [our case]"); (1) In 1 Ch 4 24, a "son" (clan) of Simeon = "Jachin" of Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15; Nu 26 12. (2) In Ezr 3 16, one of the "chief men" for whom Ezra sent, and dispatched by him to Casiphia to fetch ministers for God's house = "Joribah" (1 Esd 8 44).

(3) In Ezr 10 18, a priest who had married a foreign wife = "Joribah" (1 Esd 9 10).

JARMUTH, jār'moth (גָּרְמָות, lārāmōth): 1 Esd 9 28; called "Jerometh" in Ezr 10 27.

JARMUTH, jār'muth (גָּרְמָה, yārâmāh); (1) A city of the Canaanites in the Shephelah (Josh 15 35) of Judah whose "king," Piram, joined the league of the "five kings" against Joshua (Josh 10 2-5), was defeated at Gibeon and slain at Makelath (ver. 23). One of the 31 "kings" defeated in Joshua's campaign (Josh 11 11). In Josh 16 35 it is mentioned in conjunction with Adullam, Socoh and Azekah, and in Neh 11 29 with Zorah, Jarakoth and Adullam. Cheyne (ED) suggests that the "Maroth" of Mic 1 12 may be a copyist's error for Jarmuth. In Onom (OS 132 31; 266 35) mention is made of a לֹאֶדְמוֹן, loṣermohām, or Jermuhām, 10 Rom miles N.E. of Éleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin). The site of this once important place is Khirbat el-Yarmuk, a ruin, with many old wells and cisterns, on the top of a hill 1,465 ft. above sea-level. It is nearly 2 miles N.W. of Beit Natîf, from which it is visible, and 83 miles, as measured on map, N.N.E. of Beit Jibrin. Cf PEF, III, 129, Sh XVII.

(2) A city of Issachar belonging to the "children of Gershon, of the families of the Levites" (Josh 21 29); in the duplicate list in 1 Ch 6 73 we have Ramoth, while in the LXX version of Josh 21 29 we have, in different YSS, Rhemmoth or Rhamoth. In Josh 19 21 "Remeth" occurs (in Heb) in the lists of cities of Issachar; in the LXX Rhêmmas or Rhamāth. The name was probably "Remeth" or "Rameth," but the place has never been identified with any certainty. See RAMOTH.

E. W. G. Masterman

JAROAH, ja-rō'a (גָּרְאָ, yārōḇ, meaning unknown): A Gadite chief (1 Ch 5 14). But the text is doubtful; see Curtis, Ch, 124.

JASELAUS, jas-e'lus (גָּרְלֹס, lāroısūs; B. Aṣdotēs; V. Jassel, jaṣtē-el [1 Esd 9 30]): Called "Sheel" in Ezr 10 29.

JASHER, jā'shahr, jash'ar: BOOK OF (גָּשַּהְר, yēgāḇ ha-ŷāsār): AV Book of Jasher, m "the book of the upright"): The title of an ancient Heb national song-book (lit. "book of the righteous one") from which two quotations are made in the OT: (1) Josh 10 12-14, the command of Joshua to the sun and moon, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon... Moon, recoil on Jachin..." (see BETH-HORON; LXX in this place omits the reference to Jashar); and (2) 2 S 1 18 ff., "the song of the bow," or lament of David over Saul and Jonathan. (3) Some conjecture a third extract in 1 K 5 2. "Then spake Jonathan, Jeheb hath said that he would dwell in the thick darkness." The words of Jeh are quoted by LXX in ver 53 as "written in the book of the song" (en bibliō tēs òdēs), and it is pointed out that the words "the song" (in Heb שָׂדִי, ha-šār) might easily be a corruption of שָׂדִי, ha-šārāh. A similar confusion ("song" or "righteous") may explain the fact that the Psalms of Job has for a title "the book of prayers or hymns." The book evidently was a well-known one, and may have been a gradual collection of religious and national songs. It is conjectured that it may have included the Song of Deborah (Josh 5), and older pieces now found in the Pent (e.g. Gen 4 23 24; 9 25-27; 27 27-29); this, however, is uncertain. On the curious theories and speculations of the rabbis and others about the book (that it was the Book of the Law, of God, etc), with the fantastic and reconstructive theory of Dr. Donaldson in his Jas, see the full art. in HDB.

James Orr

JASHEN, jā'shen, jash'en (גָּשֶׁן, yāshēn, "asked") [cf.]: Seemingly the father of some of David's thirty valiant men (2 S 23 32). The MT reads "Eliahba the Shaalbonite, the sons of Jashen, Jonathan, Shamshah the Hararite, ..."). 1 Ch 11 33 f. has "Eliahba the Shaalbonite, the sons of Hasem the Gizonite, Jonathan the son of Shagee the Hararite..." It is clear that "sons of" are a dittography of the last three consorants of the previous word. LXX, Luc in 2 1 and Ch 1 has ὡς Ἵλλον, ho Ĥul, the "Gumite," for the "Gizonite," perhaps correctly (cf. Gen 46 24; Nu 26 48 for "Guni," "Gumite"). So 2 S 23 32 may be corrected thus: "Eliahba the Shaalbonite, Jashen the Gumite, Jonathan the son of Shamash the Hararite." Jashen thus becomes one of the thirty = "Hashem" of 1 Ch 11 34.

David Francis Roberts

JASHER, jā'shēr, jash'ēr: BOOK OF: AV for JASHAR (q.v.), and see BETH-HORON, BATTLE OF.

JASHEBEAM, ja-shē'be-am (גָּשֶׁבָה, yāshēbāh), probably "people will return": see discussion of names compounded with ב, "am, in HPN, 41-59): Jashebeam is mentioned in three passages (1 Ch 11 11; 13 6 [Heb 7]; 27 2 f.), but opinions vary as to the number of persons referred to. In 1 Ch 11 11 he is called "the son of a Haunchmite" (reference unknown) and "the chief of the three" ("three," the best reading; RV "thirty"); AV, RVm "captains"), mighty men of David. He is said to have slain 300 (800 in 2 S 23 8) at one time, i.e. one after another.

The gēḇōḇī, or heroes, numbered 600 and were divided into bands of 200 each and subdivided into small bands of 20 each, with a captain for each company large and small. Jashebeam had command of one of the three bands of 300 (see Ewald, III, 140; Stanley, HTS, II, 78). From the indefiniteness of the description, "three of the thirty chief," he was regarded as one of the three mighty men who broke through the ranks of the Phil's, and brought water from the well of Bethlehem to David on the hill of Adullam (1 Ch 11 15-17), and the fact that "the thirty" have not yet been mentioned would seem to show this story is not in its proper place. But "Jashebeam," here (1 Ch 11 11) is probably an error for "Ishbabeal," the reading of many of the MSS of the OT.

In the ] passage (2 S 23 8) he is called "Jasheb- bassheboth, a Tahechomite," This verse, however,
JASON, jas'oun (Τάρων, Ἰάσδον): A Gr name assumed by Jews who bore the Heb name Joshua. This name is mentioned twice in the NT. (See also preceding article.)

(1) Jason was the host of St. Paul during his stay in Thessalonica, and, during the uproar organized by the Jews, who were moved to jealousy by the success of Paul and Silas, he and several other 'brethren' were severely handled by the mob. When the mob failed to find Paul and Silas, they dragged Jason and "certain brethren" before the magistrates, accusing Jason of treason in receiving into his house those who said "There is another king, one Jesus." The magistrates, being troubled, took security from them, and let them go.

There are various explanations of the purpose of this security. By this expression it is most probably meant that a sum of money was deposited with the magistrates, and that the Christian community of the Jews made themselves responsible that no attempt should be made against the supremacy of Rome, and that peace should be maintained in Thessalonica itself. (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller) thinks that the security was given to prevent Paul from returning to Thessalonica and that St. Paul refers to this in 1 Thess 2 18.

The immediate departure of Paul and Silas seems to show the security was given that the strangers would leave the city and remain absent (Acts 17 5–9).

(2) Jason is one of the companions of St. Paul who unite with him in sending greetings to the Rom Christians (Rom 16 21). He is probably the same person as (1). Paul calls him a kinsman, which means a Jew (cf Rom 9 3; 16 11, 21).

JASPER, ja'sp'er, JASPIS, ja'spis. See STONES, PRECIOUS.

JASUBUS, ja'-shub-us (Ἰάσουβος, Ἰάσωβος): An Israelite who in the time of Ezra had to put away his foreign wife (1 Esd 9 30), called "Jashub" in Ear 10 29.

JATAH, ja'tal (1 Esd 5 28). See ATAR.

JATHAN, ja'than (Ládôn, Iathôn; N, Nathôn): For "Jonasathas" in AV, which is the Lat form for the Heb "Jonathan." Jonathan was brother of Amanias and "son of that great Sammaías" (Tob 5 13).

JATHBATH, jath'beth. See JOTHATHAAN.

JATHNIEL, jath'ni-ıel (יהוניאל), yathan'ıel, "God lives"): Fourth "son" of Meshelemiah, a Korahite (1 Ch 26 2).

JATTIR, jat'ér (גַּטִיר, yattîr, and דְּגָי, yattîr): A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned in conjunction with Shamir and Sooch (Josh 15 48); one of the cities given to the "children of Aaron the priest" (Josh 21 14; 1 Ch 6 57). David after his victory over the Amalekites sent a present of the spoil from Ziklag "to them that were in Jattir" (1 S 30 27).

It is now Khîrbet 'Attîr, an important ruin, in the extreme S. of the hill country, 5 miles S.E. of
edh Dhartyeh and 20 miles S.E. of Beit Jibrin. This must be confused with the "very large city of Judah" which is mentioned in Onom (119:27; 133:3; 134:24, etc.) as 20 miles S.E. of Eleutheropolis (i.e. Beit Jibrin). The site is full of caves. See PEF, III, 408, Sh XXV.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

JAVAN, jë-van (טיון), yevion, meaning unknown:
(1) In Gen 10:24 = 1 Chr 1:57 (LXX Διωντα, Diwda); Isa 66:19; Ezek 12:13 (LXX Εἴδολα, Hiddás, Greece); Dtel 8:21 m.; 10:20; 11:2; Zec 9:13; Joel 3:6 (Heb 4:6) (LXX of ἐιδολαι, hoii Hellenes, i.e. "Greeks"); son of Japheth, and "father" of Elisah, Tareshiah, Kittim, and Rodarim, i.e. Rhodes (incorrectly "Dodanim" in Gen 10:4). Javan is the Gr Ιαον, or Ιαον, Ιαον, and in Gen and 1 Ch = the Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor, probably here = Cyprus. The reference in Ezek 12:13 (from which that in Isa 66:19 is copied) is the country personified. In Joel the pl. Δύον, yevionim, is found. In Dnl the name is extended to the Greeks generally. Corroboration of the name is found in Assy (KB II, 43). The Pers Yauna occurs in the same dual role, but from the tiwm of Aesh. Persa, 176, 562 (Skinner, Gen. 198). In Ezek the word is said to be yevion (n)a; in the Am. Tab Wiyana is mentioned as being in the land of Tyre. See HDB, II, 552b.

(2) Place (Ezek 12:19) name wanting in LXX.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JAVELIN, jav’lin, jav’-e-lin. See Armor; Arms.

JAW, jo (גָּבֹה), gbô, "cheek (bone)," "jaw (bone)"); JAWBONE, jô’dôn, JAW TEETH; In Job 4:21, RVR reads "pierce his jaw through with a hook" for AV "bore his jaw through with a thorn" (see Hook; Leviathan). Ps 22:15, "My tongue cleaveth to my jaws [malkôr]," is descriptive of the effect of a fever or physical torture, a dryness and a horrible clamminess.

Malkôr or Malkôrign is an ancient dual form meaning the two jaws, and, metaphorically, malkôr indicates that which is caught between the jaws, booty, prey, including captives (Nu 31:11-26; 32:19).

Figurative:
(1) Of the power of the wicked, with a reference to Divine restraint and discipline: "I brake the jaws [Heb "great teeth"] of the unrighteous" (Job 29:17; Prov 30:14); cf Ps 56:6, "Break out the great teeth [malkôr, "jaws teeth"] of the young lions, O Jeh."

Let the wicked be despised, or evil let them be divided, and let them be put into mischief. LXX reads "God shall break," etc. (cf Edmund Prys’s Metrical Parallel of the Ps, in loc.) "A bridle . . . in the jaws of the people" (Isa 20:28; cf 2 K 19:28) is descriptive of the ultimate check of the Assyry power at Jerusalem, "as when a bridle or lasso is thrown upon the jaws of a wild animal when they wish to catch and tame him." (G. A. Smith, Isa, 1, 235). Cf Ezek 29:4 (concerning Pharaoh); 36:4 (concerning Gog), in which "will put hooks in [into] thy jaws." (2) Of human labor and toils, with a reference to the Divine gentleness: "I was to them as they that lift up the yoke on their jaws" (Hos 11:4), or "take the yoke off their jaws," as the humane driver eased the yoke with his hands or lifted it forward and placed it on the neck to the jaws; or it may perhaps refer to the removal of the yoke in the evening, when work is over.

Jawbone (Jgs 15:15 fl). See RAMATHE-LEH.

M. O. EVANS

JAZER, jaz’er (גזר or גזר), yazer; LXX Ιαζερ, Ιαζεθ in A; Ιαζήθ in B; JASTHY; In some cases, e.g. Nu 21:32, AV reads "Jazer." This was a city of the Amorites of the Jordan taken, along with its towns, by Moses, and occupied by the tribe of Gad (Nu 21:32; 32:35). The country was very fertile, and its spacious pasture-lands attracted the flockmasters of Gad (32:1), the southern border of whose territory it marked (Josh 13:25). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (Josh 21:39; 1 Chr 6:81).

The place was reached by Joab when taking the census (2 S 24:5). In the 40th year of King David mighty men of valor were found here to whom he intrusted the oversight in Reuben and Gad "for every matter pertaining to God, and for the affairs of the king" (1 Chr 26:31). The fruitfulness of the country is alluded to in Isa 16:8; Jer 46:32. Note: "Sea of Jazer" (Job 41) verse has arisen through accidental repetition of yam, "sea," from the preceding clause.) The city was taken from the Ammonites by Judas Maccabaeus, and burned (1 Macc 5:75; Ant, XII, viii, 1).

W. Ewing

JAZIZ, jaz’iz (גזר), yazô, meaning uncertain: The Hagrite who was over David’s flocks (1 Ch 27:30 [Heb 31]).

JEALOUSY, jel’us-i (.pickle), kín’âh; ἱλικος, zelous): Doubtless, the root idea of both the Gr and the Heb tr = "jealousy" is "warmth," "heat." Both are used in a good and a bad sense—to represent right and wrong passion.

When jealousy is attributed to God, the word is used in a good sense. The language is, of course, anthropomorphical; and it is based upon the feeling in a husband of exclusive right in his wife. God is conceived as having wedded Israel to Himself, and as claiming, therefore, exclusive devotion. Disloyalty on the part of Israel is represented as adultery, and as provoking God to jealousy. See, e.g., Dt 32:20; 1 K 14:22; Ps 78:58; Ezek 8:3; 16:38:42; 23:25; 36:5; 38:19.

When jealousy is attributed to men, the sense is sometimes good, and sometimes bad. In the good sense, it refers to an ardent concern for God’s honor. See, e.g., Nu 25:11 (cf 1 K 19:10; 2 K 20:16); 2 Cor 11:2, "who will put in [into] thy jaws." In the bad sense, it is found in Acts 7:9; Rom 13:13; 1 Cor 3:3; 2 Cor 12:20; Jas 3:14:16. The "law of jealousy" is given in Nu 5:11-31. It provided that, when a man suspected his wife of conjugal infidelity, an offering should be brought to the priest, and the question of her guilt or innocence should be subjected to a test there carefully. The test was intended to be an appeal to God to decide the question at issue. See ABSERV.; SACRIFICE.

E. J. Forrester

JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF. See Images.

JEALOUSY, WATER OF. See Adultery, (2).

JEARIM, ji’ah’rim, jê’-är’im, MOUNT (עֶרֶם, har-gé’ärâm): A mountain by the side of which passed the border of Judah (Josh 15:10). It is mentioned here only, and is identical with CASSALON (q.v.).

JEATHERAI, jê-thér’-â (RV), JEURATAI, jê’-äth’r-â (AV) (עֶרֶם, yé’-áthrây, meaning unknown): A descendant of Gershom, "son" of Levi (1 Chr 6:21 [Heb 6]), and probably an ancestor of Asaph (so
commentators); in vs 39–43 the corresponding name is "Ethni." The difference in the Heb words is not great.

**JEBERACHIAH**, je-ber-ə-khə-ə (יִבְרֶךְ הַיָּהָ, "Jeh blesses"); The father of the Zech-ariah whom Isaiah (8:2) took as a witness of his prophecy against Syria and Ephraim (c. 734 BC).

**JEBUS**, jɛ-bu's (יֵבָע, ybhūs; יִבְוֹס, 'Ibō'so, Ibe'oda): In Jgs 19:10.11, "Jebus (the same is Jerus"); 1 Ch 11:4.5, "Jerus (the same is Jebus"). It was once thought that this was the first name of Jerus, as indeed might be suggested by the Bib, references, but it is now known from the Am Tab that Uru-

**JEBUSITE**, jɛ-bu'sit (יֵבָע הַיָּה הַיָּה ה יֵבָע ה יֵבָע ה יֵבָע ה יֵבָע ה יֵבָע ה יֵבָע H, ybhūs-hāy-hāy, ha-ybhūs-hāy): "Jebus-") is an old name for Jerus (Jgs 19:10.11; 1 Ch 4:5 2 S 5 6–9, "the same is Jerus"); see preceding article). "Jebusit" (lit. "Jebusite") is also used as a name for the city in AV (Josh 16:18.28, c 15:8; RV correctly renders "Jebusite" (see JEBUSALM). "Jebusites" for the people (in AV Gen 16:21; Ex 3:8.17, etc), does not occur in Heb in the pl.; hence in RV is always rendered in the sing., "Jebusite"). The "Jebusite" is said in Gen 10:16; 1 Ch 1:14 to be the 3d son of Canaan, i.e. of the country of Canaan. Elsewhere he represents the Canaanites as a separate people.

**JEDAIAH**, je-de'ə'yə, je-de'-ə (יֶדֶתֹאיה, y'de-tə'yə; "Jeh knows"): (a) A priest in Jerus (1 Ch 9:10; 24:7).

The original name of Jerus was Bab, Uru-Salim, "the city of the face," shortened into Salem in Gen 14:18 and in the inscriptions of the Egyptian kings Ramses II and Ramses III. In the Am Tab (1400 BC) Jerus is still known as Urusalim, and its king is a Hittite name, implying that it was at the time in the possession of the Hittites. His enemies, however, were closing around him, and one of the tablets shows that the city was eventually captured and its king slain. These enemies would seem to have been the Jebusites, since it is after this period that the name "Jebus" makes its appearance for the first time in the OT (Jgs 19:10.11).

The Jebusite king at the time of the conquest was Adoni-zedek, who met his death at Beth-horon (Josh 10:1 f; in ver 3 the word "Amorite" is used in its bibl sense to denote the inhabitants of Canaan generally). The Jebusites were a mountain tribe (Nu 13:29; Josh 11:3). Their capital "Jebus" was taken by the men of Judah and burned with fire (Jgs 1:8), but they regained possession of, and held, the fortress till the time of David (2 S 6:6 ff).

When Jerus was taken by David, the lives and property of its Jebusite inhabitants were spared, and they continued to inhabit the temple- hill, David and his followers settling in the new City of David on Mt. Zion (15:8.63; 1 Ch 1:21; 19:11). And as Araunah is called "king" (2 S 24:23), we may conclude that their last ruler also had been allowed to live. His name is non- Sem, and the various spellings of it (cf 1 Ch 21:15, "Ornan") indicate that the Heb writers had some difficulty in pronouncing it. The Jebusites seem ultimately to have blended with the Israelitish population.

**JEDDIKHIAH**, jɛ-də-khəh, jɛ-də-khəh (יֶדֶדְיָה, y'de-də'həh, "Jeh has been able"); The mother of King Uzziah (Azariah) of Judah. RV has "Jeholiah" in 2 K and so AV in 2 Ch.

**JECHONIAS**, jɛ-kə-nə'as (יֶהוֹכִינָס, Iechohantas, AV; Gr form of "Jechoniah," RV): (1) The altered form of Jehoiachin (Ad Est 11; Bar 1:39; Mt 1:11.12). The last but one of the kings of Judah.

(2) The son of Zedas (1 Esd 8:92), called "Shecaniah" in Ezr 10:2.

**JECOLIAH**, jɛ-kə-lə-hə (יֵכְו לִיה, y'kə-lə'hə): 2 K 15:2; 2 Ch 36:3 AV; see JECHELIAH; JECOLIAH.

**JECONIAH**, jɛ-kə-ni'ə (יֶהוֹכִינָה, Iechonias, AV): See JEHOACHIN.

**JECONIAS**, jɛ-kə-nə's (יֶהוֹכִינָס, Iechohantas): (1) One of the chalites who made great gifts of sheep and calves at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esd 1:9); called "Conaniah" in 2 Ch 36:9.

(2) One reading makes Jeconias (not Joachaz) son of Josiah in 1 Esd 1:34.

**JEDAIHIAH**, je-de'ə'yə, je-de'-ə (יֶדֶתֹאיה, y'de-tə'yə; "Jeh knows"): (a) A priest in Jerus (1 Ch 9:10; 24:7).

(b) Ezr 2:26 = Neh 7:39, where "children of Jedaihia" are mentioned = "Jeddiu" in 1 Esd 5:24.

(c) J. is among the "priests and the Levites" that returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 11:10; 12:6.19). (d) Another priest of the same name (Neh 12:71).

(e) One of the exile whom Zechariah was commanded to send with silver and gold to Jerus. LXX does not take the word as a proper name (Zec 6:10.14)

(2) (יַעְוַדְיָה, y'də'dyhəh, "Jeh throws"?) (a) Father of a Simeon prince (1 Ch 4:37). (b) One of the repairers of the wall of Jerus (Neh 3:10).

**JEDDAH**, je-də'ə (יֶדֶדָא, Yədə'dāh, "Jeh does not know"): Called Jedaih (q.v. 1, [b]) in canonical books (1 Esd 5:24).

**JEDDIKHIAH**, jɛ-də-khəh (יֶדֶדְיָה, y'de-də'həh, "God makes known"?): (1) A "son" of Benjamin or probably of Zebulun (1 Ch 7:6.10.11). See Curtis, Ch. 145–49, who suggests emending the name to יַעְוַדְיָה, y'də'dyhəl, Jahleel, in agreement with Gen 46:24.

(2) One of David's mighty men (1 Ch 11:45), probably = the Manasseh who deserted to David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:20 [Heb 21]).

(3) A Korahite doorkeeper in David's reign (1 Ch 26:2).

**JEDDIKHIAH**, jɛ-də-khəh (יֶדֶדְיָה, y'de-də'həh, "be-loved"); Mother of King Josiah of Judah, daughter of Adaihiah of Bozkath (2 K 22:1).
JEDIDIAH, jed-i-d' th (יְדִיָּה, yēdīyā, “the beloved of Jeh”): The name conferred by God through Nathan upon Solomon at his birth (2 S 12 25).

JEDUTHUN, jē-dūth'un. See ASAPEL.

JEELI, jē-ē'lī (יְעֵלִי, Ye'elī): Called “Jaalah” in Ex 2 56 and “Jala” in Neh 7 88 (1 Esd 5 33).

JEELUS, jē-ē'lūs (יְעֵלוּס, Ye'elūs; RV IEZER): The name of a clan of Gilead (Nu 26 30), but read יָאשָר, ya-as'har, i.e. “of Abiezer” (cf Josh 17 2). See ABIEZER.

JEZERITES, jē-ē'zar-its. See ABIEZER.

JEGAR-SAHAR-DUTHA, jē-gār-sā-hā-dū′tha, (ירגארסֶהדרותה, yē-gār-sā'hā-dū' thā; LXX Bovdēs μαχαθρητέων, Boudēs marturēlōn, “the mouth of witnesses”): The name given by the Aramaean, Laban, to the “carn of witness,” called by Jacob Galere (q.v.) (Gen 31 47). The rest of the second part of this name appears again in Job 16 19, where יָשָׁהְהוּ, sāḥāhū, should be rendered with RV, “he that voucheth for me,” i.e. “my witness.”

JEHALLEL, jē-hal-lēl (רַעְלָל, yē-hal-lēl), jē-ha-lēl (רְעָל, yē-ha-lēl; AV) (םְרָל, yē-hā- rāl; RV), “he shall praise God”:
1. A Judahite (1 Ch 4 16).
2. A Levite, a descendant of Merari (2 Ch 29 12).

JEHOBIAH, jē-hō-ē'yā, jē-de-ya (יְהוֹבִיאָה, yē-hō-bi'ā), “may Jeh give joy!”:
1. A Levite, head of the family of Shubael (1 Ch 24 20).
2. An officer of David “over the assay” (1 Ch 27 30).

JEHEZKEL, jē-hez'kēl (יהֶזְכֵל; RV) , JEHEZKEL, jē-hez'kēl (יְהֶזֶקֶל, yē-hez'kēl; “God strengthens”):
1. A priest of David’s time (1 Ch 24 16).
2. Jehezekel in 1 K 3 4 Am, for Ezekiel (q.v.).

JEHIAH, jē-hi'ā (יהִיָּה, yē-hi'āh, “may Jeh live!”): Keeper of the ark where Oded (1 Ch 15 24), but in verse 18 the name is יִהְיָה, yē-hī'āh, IIEZIR (q.v.).

JEHIEL, jē-hi'ēl (יְהִיֵּל, yē-hī'ēl), “may God five!”:
1. A Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the bringing up of the ark by David (1 Ch 15 18 20; 16 5): Jehiel, jē-hi'ē-lī (יִהְיֵלִי, yē-hī'ē-lī): A patronymic of this name (1 Ch 26 21 22), but Curtis (Ch, 286-87) reads “Jehiel [ver 21] and his brethren Zetham and Joel” (ver 22); cf 23 8, where the three seem to be brothers. See above.
2. A Gershonite, head of a Levitical house (1 Ch 23 8; 29 8).
3. Son of a Hachmonite; he was “the king’s [David’s] sons,” i.e. their tutor (1 Ch 27 32).
4. A son of King Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 21 2).
5. In 2 Ch 29 14 AV, where KR is יְהִיֵּל, yē-hī'ēl, RV “Jehiel,” a Hermonite Levite who took part in cleansing the temple in Hezekiah’s reign.

(6) An overseer in Hezekiah’s reign (2 Ch 31 13).
(7) One of the three “rulers” of the temple in Hezekiah’s reign (2 Ch 35 8).
(8) Father of Obadiah, a returned exile (Ezr 8 9) = “Jezreelus” of 1 Esd 3 35.
(9) Father of Shecaniah (Ezr 10 2) = “Jezreelus” of 1 Esd 8 92. He was a “son” of Elam, and so probably the same as “Jehiel” in Ezr 10 28, one of those who had married foreign wives = “Jezreelus” of 1 Esd 9 27.
(10) A “son” of Harim, and one of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 21) = “Hrieel” of 1 Esd 9 21.
(11) AV in 1 Ch 9 35 = JIEZEL (q.v. [2]).
(12) AV in 1 Ch 21 14 = JIEZEL (q.v. [3]).

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JEHIZKIAH, jē-hiz-kī'a (יְהִזְקִיָּה, yē-hiz'kīyāh, “Jeh strengthens”): One of the Ephraimite chieftains of (2 Ch 28 12) who with Obed are said to have opposed the enslavement of the Judahites, taken captive by Pekah in his war against Ahaz (2 734 BC).

JEHOADDAD, jē-hō-ā'dā (RV), JEHOADDAH, jē-hō'-ā-da (אִדָּא, yē-hō'-ādā, “Jeh has deposited” or “numbered”): A descendant of King Saul (1 Ch 8 30), called “Haddad” in 1 Ch 9 43, where LXX has ולאד, ladā = יָדָה, yādā. See JARAH.

JEHOADDAN, jē-hō-ad'ān (יָדָה, yē-hō-adān, meaning unknown): In 2 Ch 25 1, and Kēv, AV in 2 K 14 2, where Kēthub and RV are “Jehoddin” (יָדוֹד, yē-hō'dōdā), the mother of King Azaiah of Judah.

JEHOADDIN, jē-hō-ād'īn. See JEHOADDAN.

JEHOAHAZ, jē-hō-ā-hāz, jē-hō'-ā-hāz (יְהוֹהַח, yē-hō'-āhāz, “Jeh has grasped”): “Lōégās, Tōōchēs; 2 K 13 1-9):
1. (Son of Jehu, and 11th king of Israel. He is stated to have reigned 17 years.

Jos was already aware (Ant, IX, viii, 9) of the chronological difficulty involved in the cross-references in vs 1 and 10, the former of which states that Jehoahaz began to reign in the 23rd year of Jehoash of Judah, and reigned 17 years; while the latter gives him a successor in Jehoash’s 37th year, or 14 years later.

Jos alters the figure of ver 1 to 21; and, to meet the same difficulty, the LXX changes 37 to 39 in ver 10. The difficulty may be met by supposing that Jehoahaz was associated with his father Jehu for several years in the government of the country before the death of the latter, and that these years were counted as a part of his reign. This view has in its favor the fact that Jehu was an old man when he died, and may have been incapacitated for the full discharge of administrative duties before the end of his reign. The accession of Jehoahaz as sole ruler may be dated about 825 BC.

When Jehoahaz came to the throne, he found a discouraged and humiliated people. The territory beyond Jordan, embracing 2/3 tribes, or one-fourth of the whole kingdom, was lost in warfare with the Syrian king, Hazael (2 K 10 22 33).

A heavy annual subsidy was still payable to Assyria, as by his father Jehu. The neighboring kingdom of Judah was still unfriendly to any member of the house of Jehu. Eliahu the prophet, though then in the zenith of his influence, does not seem to have done anything toward the stability of Jehu’s throne.

Specially did Israel suffer during this reign from the continuance of the hostility of Damascus (2 K 12 17 3 4 22). Hazael had been selected, 2. Low Condition of the Kingdom A heavy annual subsidy was still payable to Assyria, as by his father Jehu. The neighboring kingdom of Judah was still unfriendly to any member of the house of Jehu. Eliahu the prophet, though then in the zenith of his influence, does not seem to have done anything toward the stability of Jehu’s throne.

Specially did Israel suffer during this reign from the continuance of the hostility of Damascus (2 K 12 17 3 4 22). Hazael had been selected,
greatly related. The great conqueror, Shalmaneser II, had died, and his son Samsi-Rammann IV had to meet a revolt within the empire, and was busy preparing again Babylon and Media during the 12 years of his reign (824–812 BC). During these years, the kingdoms of the seaboard of the Mediterranean were unmolested. They coincide with the years of Jehoahaz, and explain the freedom which Hazael had to harass the dominions of that king.

Particulars of the several campaigns in which the troops of Damascus harassed Israel are not given. The life of Elisha extended through the 3 reigns of Jehoram (12 years), Jehu (28 years) and Jehoahaz (12 or 13 years). It is therefore probable that in the memoirs of his life in 2 K 4–6, now one and now another king of Israel should figure, and that some of the episodes there recorded belong to the reign of Jehoahaz.

There are evidences that the chronological order is not observed in the narrative of Elisha, e.g. Gehazi appears in waiting on the king of Israel in 8 nearest the account of his infancy in 5:27. The terrible siege of Samaria in ch 7 is generally referred to the reign of Jehoram, and no atmosphere is so suitable to it as that of the reign of Jehoahaz. In one of the later years of his life, which governmental authority or school of thought is also implied is recorded in 13: 7 where Jehoram is said to have made them the like the dust in threshing; and the statistics there given of Jehoahaz, would correspond with the states of things that Jehoahaz implies. In this case the Ben-hadad of 2 K 6 64 would be the son of Hazael (15: 24).

Jehoahaz, like his father, maintained the calf-worship in Bethel and Dan, and revived also the cult of the Asherah, a form of Canaanitish idolatry introduced by Ahab.

1. His Idolatry (1 K 16 33). It centered round a sacred tree or pole, and was probably connected with phallic worship (cf 1 K 15 13, where Maacah, mother of Asa, is said to have made an abominable image for an Asherah in Jerusalem).

The close of this dark reign, however, is brightened by a partial reform. In his distress, we are told, "Jehoahaz besought Jeh, and Jeh heard him" (2 K 13 4).

2. Partial Reform If the siege of Samaria in ch 6 belongs to his reign, we might connect this with his wearing "both upon his head and upon his flesh" (ver 30)—an act of humiliation only accidentally discovered by the rending of his garments. Ver 5 goes on to say that "Jeh gave Israel a saviour, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians" (cf 1 K 15 29). The question of the deliverance was under whom the deliverance began (13 25), or to Jeroboam II, of whom it is declared that by the Syrians was "saved" (14 27). Others take it to refer to Ramman-nirari III, king of Assyria, whose conquest of Damascus made possible the victories of these kings. See Jehoahaz.

3. Jehoiakim and the Punic War (2 K 23 30–35). The story of his reign is told in 2 K 23 30–35, and in a brief account in 2 Ch 36 1–3. The historian of 2 K characterizes his reign as evil; 2 Ch passes no verdict upon him. On the death of his father in battle, which threw the realm into conflict with the sacred city of Jerusalem (cf 2 K 22 14 with 23 36; 1 Ch 3 15 makes him the fourth son of Josiah), was raised to the throne by "the people of the land," the same who had secured the accession to his father; see under Josiah. Perhaps, also, the scrupulous desire of the Levites to maintain the purity of the temple, which his father had carried out so well, they saw in him a better hope for its integrity than in his elder brother Jehoiakim (Eliakim), whose tyrannical tendencies may already have been too apparent. The prophets, it is said, had set store by him, if we may judge by the sympathetic mentions of him in Jer 22 11 and Ezek 19 3.4. His career was too short, however, to make any marked impression on the history of Judah.

Jehoahaz's ill-advised meddling with the designs of Pharaoh-nechoh (see under Josiah) had on him, in fact, the ill effect of plunging Judah again into the vortex of oriental politics, from which it had long been comparatively free. The Egypt king immediately concluded that so presumptuous a state must not be left in his rear unpunished. Arrived at Riblah on his Mesopotamian expedition, he put Jehoahaz in bonds, and later carried him prisoner to Egypt, where he died; raised his brother Je- hoiakim to the throne as a vassal king; and imposed on the realm a fine of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. So the fortunes of the Judean state, so soon after Josiah's good reign, began their melancholy change for the worse.

[Signature]
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3. In 2 Ch 21 17; 22 23 = Ahaziah, king of Judah (q.v.) (2 K 8 25 ff; 2 Ch 22 1 ff.).

Jehoash, jeh'-o-ahsh, the uncontracted form of Josiah (צֵיוֹאָשׁ, yə'ō'-āsh; צֵיוָאָשׁ, yē'-ō-āsh, "Jeh has bestowed"); c.f. Syr. يَا-سُيُوَّد, Is 11 22; 12 1 19; 2 Ch 24 1, etc.; Ιωάννα, Iōánna: (1) The 9th king of Judah; son of Ahaziah and Zibiah, a woman of Beersheba (2 K 11 12–12; 2 Ch 22 10–24 27). Jehoash was 7 years old at his accession, and reigned 40 years (cf 2 K 11 12). His possessions may be placed in 852 BC. Some include in the years of his reign the 6 years of Athaliah's usurpation.

When, on Athaliah's usurpation of the throne, she massacred the royal family, her son, who had been concealed in the house of Jehoiada, which adjoined the temple, hence is said to have been "hid in the house of Jeh"—a perfectly legitimate use of the phrase according to the idioms of the time.

During these formative years of J's early life, he was under the moral and spiritual influence of Jehoiada—a man of lofty character and devout spirit. At the end of 6 years, a counter-revolution was planned and carried out on a Sabbath, at one of the great festivals. The accounts of this revolution in K and Ch supplement each other, but though the Levitical interest of the Chronicler is apparent in the details to which he gives prominence, the narratives do not necessarily collide, as has often been represented. The event was prepared for by the young king being privately exhibited to the 5 captains of the "executioners" (RV "Carites") and "runners" (2 K 11 14; 2 Ch 23 1). These entered into covenant with Jehoiada, and, by his direction, summoned the Levites from Judah (2 Ch 23 2), and made the necessary arrangements for guarding the palace and the person of the king. In these dispositions both the royal body-guard and the Levites seem to have had their parts.

J. next appears standing on a platform in front of the temple, the law of the testimony in his hand and the crown upon his head. Amid acclamations, he is anointed king. Athaliah, rushing on the scene with upraised sword, is driven forth and slain. A new covenant is made between Jeh and the king and people, and, at the conclusion of the ceremony, a great procession is formed, and the king is conducted with honor to the royal house (2 K 11 19; 2 Ch 23 20). Thus auspiciously did the new reign begin.
Grown to manhood (cf. the age of his son Amaziah, 2 K 14:25), J. married two wives, and by them had sons and daughters (2 Ch 24:3).

3. Repair His great concern at this period, however, was the repair of the temple. The King and the High Priests had removed the sacred furniture of the sanctuary, and had appropriated and dispersed it among themselves (2 K 12:10; 2 Ch 24:7). To meet the expense of its restoration, the king gave orders that all monies coming into the temple, whether dues or voluntary offerings, should be appropriated for this purpose (2 K 12:4), and from the account in Ch would seem to have contemplated a revival of the half-shekel tax appointed by Moses for the construction of the tabernacle (2 Ch 24:5; cf. Ex 30:11–16; 38:25). To enforce this impost would have involved a new census, and the memory of the judgments which attended David's former attempt of this kind may well have had a deterrent effect on Jehoida and the priesthood. "The Levites hastened it not," it is declared (2 Ch 24:5).

Time passed, and in the 23rd year of the king's reign (his 30th year), it was found that the breaches of the house of God had still been repaired.

4. A New A new plan was adopted. It was expedient to erect a chest with a hole bored in its lid should be set up on the right side of the altar in the temple-court, under the care of two persons, one the King's scribe, the other an officer of the high priest, and that the people should be invited to bring voluntarily their half-shekel tax or other offerings, and put it in this box (2 K 12:9; 2 Ch 24:8.9). Gifts from worshippers were received by priests at the gate, and brought to the box. The expedient proved brilliantly successful. The people cheerfully responded, large sums were contributed, the money was honestly expended, and the temple was thoroughly renovated. There remained even a surplus, with which gold and silver vessels were made, or replaced, for the use of the temple. Jehoida's long and useful life seems to have taken a new turn in view his wisdom and success.

With the death of this good man, it soon became evident that the strongest pillar of the state was removed. It is recorded that "J. did what was right in the eyes of Jeh all his days wherein Jehoida the High Priest instructed him" (2 K 12:2), but after Jehoida had been honorably interred in the sepulchres of the kings (2 Ch 24:16), a sad declension became manifest. The princes of Judah came to J. and expressed their wish for greater freedom in worship than had been permitted them by the aged priest. With weak complaisance, the king "hearkened unto them" (ver 17). Soon idols and Asherahs began to be set up in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah. Unnamed prophets raised their protests in vain. The high priest Zechariah, a worthy son of Jehoida, testified in his place that as the nation had forsaken Jeh, he also would forsake it, and that disaster would follow (ver 20). Wroth with the rebels, the king gave orders that Zechariah should be stoned, with stones in the temple-court (ver 21). This was done, and the act of sacrilege, murder, and ingratitude was perpetuated to which Jerusalem seems to refer in Mt 23:35; Lk 11:51 ("son of Barachiiah" in the former passage, probably a gloss through confusion with the prophet Zechariah).

The high priest's dying words, "Jeh look upon it, and require it," soon found an answer. Within a year of Zechariah's death, the armies of Haszel, the Syrian king, were ravaging and laying waste Judah. The city of Gath fell, and a battle, the place of which is not given, placed Jerus at the mercy of the foe (2 K 12:17; 2 Ch 24:23.24). To save the capital from the indignity of foreign occupation, J., then in dire calamities and sickness, collected all the gold and all the gold of the palace, and sent them to Hazael (2 K 12:17.18). This failure of his policy, in both church and state, excited such popular feeling against J., that a conspiracy was formed to assassinate him. His physical sufferings won him no sympathy, and two of his own officers slew him, while asleep, in the fortress of Millo, where he was paying a visit (ver 20). He was buried in the city of David, but not in the royal sepulchres, as Jehoahaz had been (2 Ch 24:25).

J. is mentioned as the father of Amaziah (2 K 14:1; 2 Ch 25:25). His contemporaries in Israel were Jehoahaz (2 K 13:1) and Jehosh - (2 K 13:10).

(2) The son of Jehoahaz, and 12th king of Israel (2 K 13:10–25; 14:8–16; 2 Ch 25:17–24). Jehoshaphat reigned for 16 years. His accession and reign were almost simultaneous changes in the political condition of Syria—Amaziah succeeding to the throne of Judah in the 2d year of J., and Ramman-nirari III coming to the throne of Assyria in 811 BC—which had important effects on the history of Israel in this reign.

During the three previous reigns, for half a century, Elisha had been the prophet of Jeh. He was now aged and on his deathbed.

2. Elisha Hearing of his illness, the young king came to Dothan, where the prophet was, and had a touching interview with him. His affectionate exclamation, "My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof" (2 K 13:14; cf 2:12), casts a pleasing light upon his character. On his lips the words had another meaning than they bore when used by Elisha himself at Elijah's translation. Then they referred to the "appearance" which parted Elisha from his master; now they referred to the great service rendered by the prophet to the kingdom. Not only had Elisha repeatedly saved the armies of Israel from the ambushes prepared for them by the Syrians (2 K 6:8–23), but he had given assurance of the relief of the capital when it was at its worst extremity (5:15–19). The prophet's presence was indeed in place of chariots and horse. The truth was anew demonstrated by the promise which the dying prophet now made to him. Directing J. in the symbolic action of the shooting of certain arrows, he predicted three victories over the Syrians—the first at Aphek, now Fik, on the E. of the Lake of Galilee—and more would have been granted, had the faith of the king risen to the opportunity then afforded him (6 15–19).

An interesting light is thrown by the annals of Assyria on the circumstances which may have made these victories of J. possible. Ramman-nirari III, who succeeded to the throne in 811 BC, made an expedition against Damascus, Edon and Philistia, in his account of which he says: "Tesht up the king of Syria in his chief city, Damascus. . . . He clapped my feet, and gave himself up. . . . His countless wealth and goods I seized . . . He was broken during the remainder of this ruler's reign of 27 years, it may be understood how J. should be able to recover, as it is stated he did, the cities which Ben-hadad had taken from his father Jehoahaz (2 K 13:23). Schrader and others see in this Assyrian the "saviour" of Israel alluded to in
thing is told at the end of the Book of Jer (62:31-34). Neither for this reign nor for the succeeding is there the usual reference to state annals; these seem to have been discontinued after Jehoiakin. In Jer 22:24-30 there is a final pronouncement of the king, not so much upon the man as upon his inevitable fate, and a prediction that no descendant of his shall ever have prosperous rule in Judah.

Of the brief reign of J. there is little to tell. It was rather a historic landmark than a reign; but his year, 597 BC, is important as the 2. His date of the first deportation of Jewish Captives to Babylon (unless we except the company of hostages carried away in Jehoiakin's 5th [4th] year, 11, 1-7). His coming to the throne was just at or near the time when Nebuchadnezzar's servants were besieging Jerusalem; and when the Chaldean king's arrival in person to superintend the siege made apparent the futility of resistance, J. surrendered to him, with all the royal household and the court. He was carried prisoner to Babylon, and with him ten thousand captives, comprising all the better and scarcer element of the people from prince to craftsman, leaving only the poorer sort to constitute the body of the nation under his successor Zedekiah. With the prisoners were carried away also the most valuable treasures of the temple and the royal palace.

Ever since Isaiah fostered the birth and education of a spiritually-minded remnant, for him the vital hope of Israel, the growth and influence MANASSEH, as in its fiber of song and prose. It is as if a sober sanity of reflection were curing the people of their empty idolatries. The feeling is well expressed in such a passage as Hab 2:15-20. Hitherto, however, the power of this spiritual Israel has been latent, or at best mangled and pervasive among the various occupations and interests of the people. The surrender of Jehoiachin brings about a segmentation of Israel on an unheard-of principle: not the high and low in wealth or social position, but the weight and worth of all the other side, who are marked for deportation, and the refuse element of all classes on the other, who are left at home. With which element of this strange shifting Jeremiah's prophetic hopes are identified appears in his parable of the Good and Bad Fig Trees, which he predicts spiritual integrity and upbuilding to the captives, and to the home-staying remainder, shame and calamity. Later on, he writes to the exiles in Babylon, advising them to make themselves at home and be good citizens (Jer 29:1-10). As for the hapless king, "this man Coniah," who is to be their captive chief in a strange land, Jeremiah speaks of him in a strain in which the stern sense of Jeh's inexorable purpose is mingled with tender sympathy as he predicts that this man shall never have a descendant on David's throne (Jer 22:24-30). It is as if he said, All as Jeh has ordained, but—the pity of it!

In the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's successor, perhaps by testamentary edict of Nebuchadnezzar himself, a strange thing occurred. 4. Thirty—J., who seems to have been a kind of seven Years hostage prisoner for his people, was Later released from prison, honored above all the kings, and thenceforth to the end of his life had his portion at the royal table (2 K 25:27-30; Jer 52:31-34). This act of clemency may have been due to some such good influence at court as is described in the Book of Dan; but also it was a tribute to the good conduct of that letter element of the people of
which he was hostage and representative. It was the last event of Judæan royalty; and suggestive for a glimpse it seems to afford of a people whom the Second Isaiah could address as redeemed and forgiven, and of a king taken from durance and judgment (of Isa 53 8), whose career makes strangely vivid the things that are said of the mysterious "Servant of Jehovah." John Franklin Gugen

JEHOIADA, jē-hoi'-a-da (חָוָיָדָה, yôhôyâ'dâh), "Jeh is the Jehoiada not John 18; K J Ch 2 "they (Josh palace. tion to above revolt and if the revolt took place at the close of the Sabbath, and that the doublisioned guard was kept by J. even after the usual-sized one had come to take their place. It should be added that Wellhausen proposed to read הָבַּתָּה (v. "sabbath, "army") (cf Isa 13 22), and in ver 19 the words "and all the people of the land" are held to be an addition.

(b) The 2d narrative (vs 13–15a) begins suddenly. Presumably its earlier part was identical with the earlier part of the 1st narrative, unless ver 6 was a part originally of this 2d account. Athaliah hears the noise of the people (ver 13, where "the guard" is a gloss and so to be omitted), and comes to the temple, where she witnesses the revolt and cries, "Treason! treason!" J. orders her to be put forth (omit "between the ranks" in ver 15), so that she should not be slain in the temple, and she is murdered at one of the gates of the temple. J. changed the following LXX of 2 Ch 23 15, οἶδαν (the first sentence wrongly: it should be "So they laid hands on her"). J. then makes the king and the people enter into a solemn covenant to be Jeh's people, and the result is the designation of the temple and the altar of Mattan, its priest (vs 17b). This 2d narrative gives a religious significance to the revolt, but it is incomplete. The other narrative presents a very natural sequence of events, for it was absolutely necessary for J. to secure the allegiance of the royal foreign body-guard.

(c) The account in 2 Ch 23 1–21, though following that of 2 K in the main, differs from it considerably. The guardian who succeeds in the place of Jehoash and for which she would have made preparations, no doubt, Ch makes it a wholly religious movement, while 2 K gives two points of view. The value of the Chronicler's account depends largely on one's estimate of the Books of Ch and one's views as to the development of the Jewish priestly system. A. Van Hoonacker, Le sacre des lévites dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux, 93–100, defends the account in 2 Ch.

The part which J. played in the restoration of the temple buildings is described in 2 K 11 21–12 16 (Heb 12 1–17) | 2 Ch 24 1–14. Here

2. Jehoiada again the narratives of 2 K and 2 Ch differ to a large extent.

Restoration—(i) According to Leviticus 22 K (i) the priests of the Temple are commanded by Jehoash to devote the dues or free-will offerings of the people to repairing the breaches in the temple. They fail to do so, and (ii) J. is summoned by the king and rebuked. Then (iii) a new regulation is put into force: the offerings, except the guilt offerings and sin offerings, are no longer to be given to the priests, but to be put into a chest provided in the temple for the purpose. (iv) The money got in this way is devoted to repairing the temple, but (v) none of it is used to provide temple vessels.

(b) Ch, on the other hand, (i) relates that the priests and Levites are commanded to go through Judah to collect the necessary money. They "fastened it" (vs 2). Then (ii) J. is not only to the king for this disobedience, and (iii) a chest is put outside the temple to receive the tax commanded by Moses. (iv) This the people pay willingly, and the temple is repaired. There is such a surplus that (v) there is money left over, and J. gives it as "a testimony" in ver 12, and in ver 19 the words "and all the people of the land" are held to be an addition.
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narrative, although Van Hoonacker (op. cit., 101-14) defends the former.

1. According to 2 Ch 24 15, J. lived to be 130 years old, and was buried among the kings—a unique distinction.

(3) AV in Neh 3 6=Joiada (q.v.).

(4) There is a Joiada, the priest mentioned in Jehoahaz, 26, in whose stead Zephaniah was declared priest by Shemaiah in a letter.

Giesbrecht takes him to be the same priest of Athaliah’s time (see [2] above), but Duhm says that now he is a different person. In any case, Zephaniah could not have been the direct successor of the well-known Jehoiada, and so the reference can scarcely be to him if it is to have any meaningful bearing.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JEHOIAKIM, jē-hō'-ā-kīm (ךְֹֹֹֹ, יָהוַּּדְמַּ), y’hōyā’ām, “Jeh will establish”; ’Ibāsīyâ, ’Ibākēm): The name given him by Pharaoh-nechoh, who raised him to the throne as vassal king in place of his brother Jehoahaz, is changed from Eliakim (ךְֶֶֶֹ, תָּלְדַּשְּא), “God will establish”). The change compounds the name, after the royal Judaean custom, with that of Jeh; it may also imply that Necho claims Jeh’s authorization for his act, as in a similar way Senacherib had claimed it for his invasion of Judah (2 K 18 35). He represented the conquests of which Jehoahaz was hasty, and used to yoke the nation. This is the first time we hear of Nechoh at all. He represented the conquests of which Jehoahaz was hasty, and used to yoke the nation.

1. Sources for His Life and Time.—The circumstances of his accession and raising of the indemnity to Pharaoh-nechoh, followed by a brief account of his reign, are narrated in 2 K 23 34—24 6. The naming of the source of the “rest of his acts” (24 5) is the last reference we have to “the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.” The account in 2 Ch 36 5-8, though briefer still, mentions Nebuchadnezzar’s looting of the temple at some uncertain date in his reign. Neither account has any good to say of J.; to the writer of 2 K, however, his ill fortunes are due to Jeh’s retributive justice for the sins of Manasseh, while to the Chronicler the sum of his acts, apparently connected with the desecration of the sanctuary, is characterized as “the abominations which he did.” For “the rest of his acts” we are referred, also for the last time, to the “book of the kings of Israel and Judah.”

2. The King’s Character. As to policy, he was an unprincipled opportunist: vainly he sought to whet the appetites of those to whom he owed his throne, until Nechoh himself was defeated; enforced vassal to Nebuchadnezzar for 3 years along with the other petty kings of Western Asia; then rebelling against the latter as soon as he thought he could make anything of it. As to responsibility of administration, he had simply the temper of a despotic self-indulgent Oriental. He raised the immense fine that Nechoh imposed upon him by a direct taxation, which he farmed out to unscrupulous officials. He indulged in extravagance, erecting costly royal buildings, employing for the purpose enforced and unpaid labor (2 K 22 13-17); while all just interests of his oppressed subjects went wholly unregarded. As to religion, he let matters go on as they had been under Manasseh, probably introducing also the still more strange and heathenish rites from Egypt and the East of which we see the effects in Ezk 8 5-17. And meanwhile the reformed temple-worship which Josiah had introduced seems to have become a more formal and perfunctory matter, to which, if we may judge by his conspicuous absence from fast and festal occasions (e.g. Jer 26 36), the king paid no attention. His impious act of cutting up and burning Jeremiah’s roll (36 23), as also his vindictive pursuit and murder of Uriah for prophesying in the spirit of Jeremiah (26 20-23), reveal his antipathy to any word that does not prophesy “smooth things” (of Isa 30 10), and in fact a downright perversity to the name and will of Jeh.

With the onset of the Chaldaean power, prophecy, as represented in the great works of Isaiah and Jeremiah, reached a crisis which only time and the consistent sense of its larger issues could enable it to weather. Isaiah himself, who had stood for the inviolability of Zion, and the miraculous deliverance and triumphant upheld his sublime faith. But with Jeremiah, conditions had changed. The idea thus engendered, that the temple was bound to stand and with it Jerus,
an idea confirmed by Josiah's centralizing reforms, had been a superstition (cf Jer 26:6). And Jeremiah had reached the conviction that it, with its strange rites and glaring shows, must go: that nothing short of a clear sweep of the old religious fortunes could inaugurate the invariable uprightness of the nation. This conviction seems to many like an inconsistency—to set prophecy against itself. And the Chaldaean appeared on the scene, his counsel of subjugation and prediction of conquest would seem a double inconsistency: not only a traversing of a tested prophecy, but the latter purpose, in the situation, that he had to encounter; and for it he gave his tender feelings, his liberty, his life. It is in this reign of J. that, for the sake of Jehovah's word and purpose, he is engulfed in a deep tragedy of his career. And in this he must be virtuous. Nebuchadnezzar is described with him in a holy path; but his vision is not so clear; he must weather disheartening doubts, and cherish the faith of the righteous (2:4), and wait until the vision of J.'s secret purpose clears (2:2-3). If the prophets themselves are thus having such an equivocal crisis, so can we imagine how far is the plight of J.'s "remnant," who are dependent on propitious faith and courage to guide them through the depths. The humble nucleus of the true Israel, which is some day to be the nation's redeeming element, is undergoing a stern seasoning.

After Syria fell into Nebuchadnezzar's power, he seems to have established his headquarters for some years at Riblah; and after J. attempted to revolt from his authority, he sent against him guerilla bands from the neighboring nations, and detachments from his Chaldaean garrisons, who harassed him with raids and depredations. In 2 Ch 36:6,7, it is related that Nebuchadnezzar carried some of the vessels of the temple to Babylon and bound the king in fetters to carry him also to Babylon, the latter purpose apparently not carried out. This was in J.'s 4th year. In Dn 1 1.2, though ascribed to Jehoiakim's 3rd year, this same event is related as the result of a siege of Jerusalem. It is ambiguously intimated also that the king was deported; and cabling "the seed royal and of the nobles" who were of the company were Daniel and his three companions (Dn 1:3). The manner of J.'s death is obscure. It is merely said (2 K 24:6) that he "slept with his fathers"; but Jer (Ant, X, vi, 3), perhaps assuming that Jeremiah's prediction (Jer 29:19) was fulfilled, states that Nebuchadnezzar slew him and cast his body outside the walls unburied.

JOHN FRANKLIN GENUNG

JEHOARIB, jē-hō'ā-rib (יְהֹאָרִיב), jēhōyaribh, "Jeh pleads" or "contends": A priest in Jerus (1 Ch 9:10); the name occurs again in 1 Ch 24:7 as the name of a family among the 24 courses of priests of the family of Joiarib (יְהוֹאָרְיָב, yēhōyaribh, same meaning as above). Neh 12:6, the head of which is Mattanai in Neh 12:19. In Neh 11:10 we should probably read "Jehadiah and Joiarib" for "Jehadiah the son of Joiarib" (cf 1 Ch 9:10). Jehoarib = Joiarib in 1 Mac 2:1.

JEHONADAB, jē-hōnā-dāb (יְהוֹנָדָב), jēhōnaddāb, either "Jeh is noble" or "liberal," or "Jeh has impelled": = Jonadab (יְהוֹנָדָב), yōnaddāb, same meaning.

Jonadab in Heb of 2 S 13:5; but Jonadab in EV, and in Heb and EV of 13:3.32.35; son of Shimeah, King David's brother. He was friendly with Amnon his cousin, and is said to be a "very shrewd [RV 'subtle'] man." He planned to get Tamar to wait upon Amnon. Two years after, when Absalom had murdered Amnon, and David had heard that all the king's sons were assassinated, J. assured him that only Amnon was killed; and his reassuring tone is justified (ver 35); possibly he knew of Absalom's intentions. LXX, Luc. has "Jonadab in 13:3 ft; and in 2 S 21 21 11 Ch 20 7, there is mentioned a son of Shimei (="Shime- en," 1 Ch 20 7 = "Shimmaḥ," 1 S 16 9), whose name is Jonathan. See Jonathan, (4).

(2) Jehonadab in 2 K 10 15.23; in Heb of Jer 35 8.14.16.18 = Jonadab in Jer 35 6.10.19, and EV of 35 6.10.19. The "Son of Joekiel the Kenite clan (1 Ch 2 55). J. is described in 2 K 10 as an ally of Jehu in the abolition of Baal-worship in Samaria. Jehu met him after slaying the son of Ahab (10 15); the second part of the verse should probably be "told". And he greeted him and said to him, 'Is thy heart upright [with me]? as my heart is with thee? And Jehonadab answered, Yes. Then spake Jehu [so LXX], If so, give me thy hand.' In Jer 35 (where EV has Jonadab throughout), he is called the father of the priests, who, together with him, took from them their ordinances for their nomadic life and abstention from wine. See Rechab, Re- chabites. DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JEHONATHAN, jē-hōnā-thān (יְהוֹנָתָן, yōnāthan), "Jeh has given": The name is the same as Jonathan: the Heb has the two forms for the same person sometimes; sometimes only one is found. See Jonathan. The form "Jehonathan" occurs as follows in EV:

(1) A Levite who took part in teaching the Torah in the cities of Judah under Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 17 8 EV and Heb).

(2) Head of the priestly family of Shemaiah (Neh 13 18 EV and Heb).

(3) AV and Heb in 2 Ch 27 25; see Jonathan, (7).

JEHORAM, jē-hōrām, written also in the abridged form, JORAM (יְהוֹרָם, yōrām), yōāram, "Jeh is high": RV retains "Joram" for Heb yōhōram in 2 K 9 15-24:

(1) Ninth king of Israel (2 K 1 17 9-28), son of Ahab and Jezebel, successor to his brother Ahaziah, who died young (2 K 1 26), and was succeeded by his son Jehoram. He reigned 853 BC, and reigned 5 years (2 K 3 1 8 16).

The statement in 2 K 1 17. "the second year of J. Ahaziah," follows a system of chronology common to the Lucianic group of MSS, in which the 1st year of Jehoshaphat falls in the 11th year of Omri: the 24th year of Jehoshaphat in the 1st year of Ahaziah: and the 1st year of Jehoram in the 3rd year of Jehoram. The double chronology (2 K 1 17 and 2 K 3 1) is due to the intention of the compiler of the EV to refer all the acts of Elisha to the reign of Jehoram, thus dislocating the order of events in that reign. Elisha, however, survived the reign of Jehoram many years, and it is possible some of the events are to be referred to subsequent reigns.

It is difficult to estimate the religious character of J. Apparently the fierce fanaticism of Jezebel and the boldness of Ahab reappear in the son in the form of duplicity and superstition. The attempt of Jezebel to substitute Baal for Jeh had failed. The people were on the side of Jeh. Otherwise Jehu could not have carried out his bloody reform. All the worshippers of Baal in the land could be gathered into one temple of Baal (2 K 10 18 ff). Evidently J. feared the people. Accordingly he posed as a reformer by putting away the pillar of Baal (2 K 3 2), while secretly he worshipped Baal (3 13c). Nevertheless, when he got into straits, he expected to receive the help of J. (3 13b). He had not learned that a dual nature is as impossible as a union of Baal and Jeh.

Immediately upon his accession, J. came into conflict with the Ammonites. Moab (2 K 3 4). The account of the affiict is of special interest because of the supplementary information concerning Moab furnished by the Moabite Stone. There is a reference to Moab (ll 1-8) that Moab became tributary to Israel in the days of Rehoboam, and remained so for forty years, but that it rebelled in the days of Ahab. This probably brings us to the statement in 2 K 3 4 ff that Moab "rendered unto the king of
Israel the wool of a hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred thousand rams; and that "when Ahab was dead, ... the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel, and the Moabites gathered together by the M S, possibly took place before the events of 2 K 3-4 ff. Accordingly, J. resolved to recover the allegiance of the Moabites. He called to his aid the ally of his father, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the latter's vassal, the king of Edom. J. was entertained at Jerus (Jos, Ant, IX, iii, 1). The allies marched against Moab by the longer route, around the southern end of the Dead Sea, indicating that Moab was fortified against attack from the W., and that Israel was weak in the East Jordan country. After the allies had been miraculously delivered from perishing for lack of water, they devastated the land and sacked the cities, and finally they succeeded in shutting up Mesha in Kir-hareseth. Driven to despair, Mesha offered his eldest son upon the wall as a burnt offering to Chemosh. This seems to have caused the tide to turn, for "there was great wrath against Israel," and the allies returned to their own land, apparently having failed to secure a lasting advantage.

Assuming that 2 K 4-8 belong to the reign of J., it appears that the Syrians made frequent incursions into the land of Israel, perhaps more in the nature of plundering robber bands than invasions by a regular army. Finally, however, Ben-hadad, in person invaded the country and besieged Samaria. The inhabitants were reduced to horrible straits by famine, when the oppressors took sudden flight and Israel was saved. In the years 847-845 B.C. Jehoram of Damascus invaded Syria. It is probable that during this period J. recovered Ramoth-gilead, which had fallen to Syria under Ahab. Hazael succeeded Ben-hadad as ruler of Syria, and his first act, after having murdered his predecessor, was to regain Ramoth-gilead. In the defence of the city, J., who was assisted by his nephew, Ahaziah, was wounded, and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds. J. left the army at Ramoth-gilead under the command of Jehoshaphat, J. having returned to the host. While J. was at Jezreel, Elisha sent a prophet to anoint Jeho into Judah. Jehu had been a witness of the dramatic scene when Elijah hurled the curse of God upon Jehoram, son of Ahab. Ahaziah, brother of J., suspected treachery, and, in company with Ahaziah, he rode out to meet Jehu. On his question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" he received a brutal reply that "no longer left him in doubt as to the intention of the conspirator. As J. returned to Bethesda he carried J. with him in the back so that the arrow pierced his heart. His dead body was thrown into the plat of ground that had belonged to Naboth. (2) King of Judah, son of Jehoshaphat (2 K 8 16-24; 2 Ch 21 1-20), he began to rule about 849 and reigned 8 years. With reference to the chronological difficulty introduced by 2 K 17, see (1) above.

In the beginning of the reigns of Ahab and Jehoshaphat, an attempt was made to end the old feud between Israel and Judah. At the suggestion of Ahab, the two kingdoms, for the first time, joined forces against the common foe from the N., the Syrians. To seal the alliance, Athaliah, daughter of Jehoram and Ahab, was married to J., son of Jehoshaphat. Thus Jehoram was brother-in-law to (1) above. No doubt this was considered as a master stroke of conciliatory policy by the parties interested. However, it proved disastrous for Judah. Beyond a doubt, the unknowledge of Jehoshaphat included the Baalizing of Judah as well as of Israel. This marriage was a step in that direction.

A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife. J. did so. "He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab" (2 K 8 18).

2. His Marriage with Syria. According to 2 Ch 21 11.13, J. not only accepted the religion of Athaliah, but he became a persecutor, compelling the inhabitants of Jerus and of the land to become apostates. Because of his gross idolatry and his wickedness, he is said (2 Ch 21 12 ff) to have received a denunciatory letter from the prophet Elijah. This led to a chronicler otherwise never mentions Elijah. Oettli is of the opinion that one should either read "Elisha" for "Elijah," or else consider the letter to have been written as the exception of a later writer, who felt that Elijah must have taken note of the wickedness of J. and his wife, Athaliah, daughter of Ahab. In the latter event, the letter might be called a haggadic Midrash.

4. His Character. A man's character is indicated from his character. Baalism had in it the elements of tyranny and civic unrighteousness. In keeping with his religion, and in true oriental fashion, J. began his reign by murdering all his brothers, and other princes of the land, to whom Jehoshaphat had given valuable gifts and responsible positions. The only event belonging to his reign recorded in K is the revolt of Edom. Edom was subdued by David, and, probably with the exception of a temporary revolt under Solomon (1 K 15 14 ff), it had remained subject to the united kingdom or to Judah until the revolt under J. The text is somewhat obscure, but it altogether that the expedition of J. against Edom ended in failure. In the account we are told that at the same time Libnah revolted.

Perhaps the revolt of Libnah should be taken in connection with the invasion of the Philistia and of the Arabians, mentioned in 2 Ch 21. 6. The Raid of Libnah was located on the south into Judah western border of Judah. Since it was a border city, it is possible that the compiler of K considered it as belonging to Philistia. In the account in Ch. J. is represented as having lost all his possessions and all his family, save Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons, when the town was sacked and the palace plundered by the invading forces of Philistia and Arabians. This account appears to be based upon reliable sources.

In his last days, he was afflicted with a frightful disease in the bowels. His death was unregretted, and his burial without honor. Contr. the revolt, however, 2 K 8 24 with 2 Ch 21 19-20. Ahaziah, also called Jehoahaz, his younger son, then became king in his stead.

S. K. Mosiman

Jehoshabeath, jeh-hosh-abe'ath (יְהוֹשָׁבֶת, y'hoshabh'eth, "Jeh is an oath"): In 2 Ch 22 11. Jehoshera (q.v.) of 2 K 11 2.

Jehoshaphat, jeh-hosh-ah-fat (יְהוֹשָׁפָט, y'hōšaphāt, "Jeh has judged").

(1) King of Judah. See separate article.
(2) Son of Ahilud. He was recorder under David
Jehoshaphat. The INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

Jehovah-Jireh

(2 S 8 16; 20 24; 1 Ch 18 15) and Solomon (1 K 4 24). (3) Son of Paruah, and Solomon's overseer in Issachar to provide victuals for the royal household for one month of the year (1 K 4 17). (4) Son of Nimshi, and father of Jehu, king of Northern Israel (2 K 9 2 14). His name is omitted in 9 20 and 1 K 19 16, where Jehu is called "son of Nimshi." (5) AV (but not Heb) in 1 Ch 15 24; RV correctly JOSIAH (q.v.).

Jehoshaphat, jeh-o-sha'fat (יְהוֹשָׁפָט), yhō-shāphāt, "Jehud judges"): The 4 th king of Judah, son of Asa. His mother was Abigail, the daughter of Shilhi, of whom nothing further is known. He was 35 years of age at his accession, and reigned 25 years, c 873–849 BC. The history of his reign is contained in 1 K 22 41–50 and in 2 Ch 17 1–22. The narrative in 1 K 22 1–35a and in 2 K 3 4 ff belongs to the history of the Northern Kingdom. The absence from K of the details contained in 2 Ch affords no presumption against their truth. Neither do high numbers, embellished statements, and the coloring of the writer's own age destructive of the perspective.

The reign of J. appears to have been one of unusual religious activity. It was, however, characterized not so much by striking religious measures as it was by the religious spirit that pervaded every act of the king, who sought the favor of Jeh in every detail of his life (2 Ch 17 3 4).

1. His Religious Policy

He evidently felt that a nation's character is determined by its religion. Accordingly, he made it his duty to purify the national worship. The "sodomites," i.e. those who practised immorality in the worship of Jeh in the temple precincts, were banished from the land (1 K 22 46). The Asherim were taken out of Judah (2 Ch 17 6; 19 3), and "the people from Beer-sheba to the hill-country of Ephraim were brought back unto Jeh, the God of their fathers" (19 4). Because of his zeal for Jeh, J. is rewarded with power and "riches and honor in abundance" (17 5).

Believing that religion and morals, the foundation and bulwarks of civilization, suffer from ignorance, J. introduced a system of public instruction for the whole land (2 Ch 17 6 ff). He appointed a commission of princes, Levites and priests, to go from city to city to instruct the people. Their instruction was to be based on the one true foundation of sound morals and healthy religious life, "the book of the law of Jeh." (17 7–9).

Next in importance to J.'s system of public instruction, was his provision for the better administration of justice. He appointed judges to preside over courts of common pleas, which he established in all the fortified cities of Judah. In addition to these local courts, two courts of appeal, an ecclesiastical and a civil court, were established at Jerusalem to be presided over by priests, Levites, and leading nobles as judges. At the head of the ecclesiastical court was the high priest, and a layman, "the ruler of the house of Judah," headed the civil court of appeal (2 Ch 19 4–11). The insistence that a judge was to be in character like J., with whom there is "no iniquity among the people of respect of persons, nor taking of bribes" (19 7), is worthy of note.

According to 2 Ch 17 2, J. began his reign with defensive measures against Israel. Furthermore, he built castles and cities of store in the land of Judah, "and he had many works," probably military supplies, "in the cities of Judah" (17 15). He appears to have had a large standing army, including cavalry (1 Military K 22 4; 2 Ch 17 14 ff). However, the numbers in 2 Ch 17 14 ff seem to be impossibly high.

Godliness and security at home were followed by respect among and peace abroad. The fact that the Philis and the Arabians brought tribute (17 11), and that Edom had no king (1 K 22 47), but a deputy instead, who possibly was appointed by J., would indicate that he held the suzerainty over the nations and tribes bordering Judah on the S. and W. Holding the suzerainty over the weaker nations, and being allied with the stronger, J. secured the peace for the greater part of his reign (1 Ch 17 10) that fostered the internal development of the kingdom.

In contrast to the former kings of Judah, J. saw greater benefit in an alliance with Israel than in civil war. Accordingly, the old feud between the two kingdoms (1 K 14 Alliance 30; 15 6) was dropped, and J. made with Ahab peace with Israel (22 44). The political union was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram, son of J., to Jezebel, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. Shortly after the marriage, J. joined Ahab in a campaign against Syria (2 Ch 18 1–3). In view of the subordinate position that J. seems to take in the campaign (1 K 22 43), and in view of the military assistance rendered to Jehoram (2 K 3 4 ff), Jehud seems to have become a dependency of Israel. Nevertheless, the union may have contributed to the welfare and prosperity of Judah, and it may have enabled J. to hold the suzerainty over the neighboring nations. However, the final outcome of the alliance with the house of Omri was disastrous for Judah. The introduction into Judah of Baalism more than counterbalanced any political and material advantage gained, and in the succeeding reigns it indirectly led to the almost total extinction of the royal family of Judah (11 1 ff).

In spite of the denunciation of the prophet Jehu for his expedition with Ahab, thus "helping" the wicked" (2 Ch 19 3), J. maintained a similar alliance with Jehoram of Israel Alliance with (2 K 3 4 ff). On the invitation of Je- Jehoram to join him in an expedition against Moab, J. was ready with the same set speech of acceptance as in the case of Ahab (2 K 3 7; of 1 K 22 4). For the details of the expedition see Jehoram, (1).

The Chronicler has given us a very remarkable account of a victory gained by J. over the Moabites and Ammonites. No doubt he made use of a current historical Midr. Many over the find the historical basis of the Midr in the events recorded in 2 K 3 4 ff. And Am- However, the localities are different, and monites and there a defeat is recorded, while in this case we have a victory. The story in outline bears the stamp of probability. 1 K 22 45 seems to suggest wars of J. that are not mentioned in K. The tribes mentioned in the account are represented as trying to make permanent settlement in Judah (2 Ch 20 11). In their advance through the S. of Judah, they were doubtless harassed by the shepherd population of the country. J., according to his custom, sought the help of Jeh. The invading forces fell to quarreling among themselves (2 Ch 20 23), and destroyed each other. The spoil was great because the invaders had brought all their goods with them, expecting to remain in the land.
The destruction of J.'s fleet is recorded in 1 K 22 48.49 and in 2 Ch 20 35–37. However, the two accounts are quite different.

9. Destruction of J.'s fleet. According to K. J. built ships of Tarshish to sail to Ophir for gold, but the fleet of Jehoshaphat's vessels were wrecked at Ezion-geber.

Fleet Thereupon Ahaziah offered to assist J. with seamen, but J. refused to enter into the alliance. According to Ch the alliance had been formed, and together they built ships at Ezion-geber, which were destroyed because J. had made an alliance with the wicked king of Israel. In view of J.'s other alliances, the Chronicler may be in the right. Ch, however, misunderstood the term "ships of Tarshish."

J. died at the age of 60. Jos says (Ant. IX, iii, 2) that he was buried in a magnificent manner, for he had imitated the actions of David. The kingdom was left to Jehoram, who inaugurated the beginning of his reign by causing the massacre of his brethren.

S. K. MOSIMAN

JEHOASHAPHAT, VALLEY OF (גֵּיהָשׁוֹפָּחָת), 'emek yehoshaphat; the latter word means "Jeh judgeth," and 'emek, "wide," "open valley"; LXX hé kóildás Iosaphat): The name is used in Joel 3 2.12 of the scene of Judgment: "Let the nations bestir themselves, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about" (ver 12). "The valley of decision" (or "sharp judgment") is another name the prophet gives to this spot (ver 14). Some have identified it with the valley ('emek) of Berakah (q.v.) of 2 Ch 20 26, where King Jehoshaphat obtained a great victory, but this is improbable.

Since the 4th cent. AD the Kidron (q.v.) valley has been named the Valley of J. The tradition is now strongest among the Moslems who point out the exact scene of the Judgment; the Bridge As Sard, dividing heaven and hell, is to stretch across this valley from the Haram area to the Mount of Olives. It is, however, the ambition of every pious Jew to be buried on the slopes of this valley, to be at hand at the resurrection. This, too, was an ordinary place for Jewish graves in prehistoric times (2 K 23 6, etc.) The valley today, esp. that part adjacent to the temple, is crowded with Moslem and Jewish graves. A worthless tradition indicates the tomb of Jehoshaphat himself close to the so-called "Pillar of Absalom." See King's Vale. There is not the slightest reason for believing that this is the spot referred to by Joel—indeed he may have spoken of an ideal spot only. The valley of the Kidron is a nábāl ("ravine"), not an 'emek ("broad valley"). It is impossible not to suspect that there is some connection between the name Jehoshaphat and the name of a village near the head of this valley.—Sháphat; perhaps at one time it was Wády Sháphat, which name would readily suggest the traditional one. See Gehenna.

E. W. G. MASTERTON

JEHOSHEBA, jé-hosh'ē-ba, jé-hó-shé-ba (גֵּיהוֹשֶׁבָּה, y'hoshéba', "Jeh is deliverance"); Called "Jehoshabeath" in 2 Ch 22 11; daughter of Jehoram king of Judah, possibly by a wife other than Athaliah (2 K 11 2). According to 2 Ch 22 11, she was the wife of Jehoiada, the priest. She hid Jehoash, the young son of King Ahaziah, and so saved his life from Queen Athaliah.

JEHOASHUA, jé-hosh'ū-a (גֵּיהוֹשֻׁוָה, y'hoshu'a", "Jeh is deliverance," or "is opulence"); The usual Heb form of the name "Joshua"; it occurs in AV of Nu 13 16 (ARV "Hoshea"); and in some editions of AV in 1 Ch 7 27, where others have the form "Jehoshuah" (being wrongly added at the end). See Joshua, son of Nun.

JEHOVAH, jé-hó'va, je-hó'va. See God, Names of, II, 5.

JEHOVAH-JIREH, jé-hó'vah-ji're (גֵּיהוֹוָה יִירֶה, yahweh yir'eh, "Jeh he seeth"); The name given by Abraham to the place where he had sacrificed a ram provided by God, instead of his son Isaac (Gen 22 14). The meaning plainly is that the Lord sees and provides for the necessities of His
servants. There is an allusion to ver 8 where Abraham says, “God will provide himself [RVm "will see for himself"] the lamb for a burnt offering.” The verse (4 AV) goes on to connect the incident with the popular proverb, “In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen” (RV “provided”). RVm suggests “he shall be seen.” “The mount of Jehovah” in other places denotes the temple hill at Jerusalem (Psc 24 8; Isa 2 3, etc). Various changes of the punctuation very different readings have been suggested. According to Swete’s text: “And A. called the name of that place [the ‘Lord saw’ (acfr)] in order that they may say today: ‘In the mountain [the] Lord was seen’” (acfr). LXIX reads, “In the mountain Jehovah seen,” or “will see.” If there is merely a verbal connection between the clauses we should most naturally read, “In the mount of Jehovah one is seen” (appears), i.e. men, people, appear—the reference being to the custom of visiting the temple at pilgrimages (Dive, HDB, s.v.). But if the connection of the proverb with the name “Jehovah-jireh” depends on the double sense of the word ‘see’ then the best explanation may be, Jehovah sees the needs of those who come to worship before Him on Zion, and there is “seen,” i.e. reveals Himself to them by answering their prayers and supplying their wants. His “seeing,” in other words, takes practical effect in a “being seen” (ibid).

JEHOVAH-NISSI, j-nis’i (גְּהֹוָּה נִיְּגִּי, yahweh nigei), “Jeh is my banner”: So Moses named the altar which he reared to signalize the defeat of the Amalekites by Israel under Joshua, at Rephidim (Ex 17 15). LXIX translates it “the Lord my refuge,” deriving nigei from נִיָּגָה, niga, “to flce.” ’The Onkelos reads, Moses built an altar and worshipped on it before Jehovah, who had wrought for him miracles” (יְהוֹה נִיָּגָה). The suggestion is that the people should rally round God as an army gathers round its standard. He is who leads them to victory.

JEHOVAH, SERVANT OF. See SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

JEHOVAH-SHALOM, j-shal’om (גְּהֹוָּה שָלֹם, yahweh shalom), “Jehovah is peace”: This was the name given by Gideon to the altar he built at Ophrah, in allusion to the word spoken to him by the Lord, “Peace be unto thee” (Jgs 6 24). It is equivalent to “Jeh is well disposed.”

JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH, j-sham’ah (גְּהֹוָּה שַמָּמָה, yahweh shammah), “Jehovah is there”: The name to be given to the new Jerusalem, restored and glorified, as seen in the vision of Ezek (48 35 m; cf Rev 21 3). Jehovah returns to the temple of which He had forsaken, and from that time forward the fact of supreme importance is that He is there, dwelling in the midst of His people.

JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU (CIDKENU), j-tsid’ke-’nu (גְּהֹוָּה צִדְקֵנּוּ, yahweh tsidkenu), “Jeh [is] our righteousness”: The symbolic name given (1) to the king who is to reign over the restored Israel (Jer 23 6); (2) to the state or capital (33 16).

JEHOZABAD, j-hoz’a-bad (גְּהֹזָּבָד, yhózâ-báth, “Jeh has bestowed”): (1) A servant of King Jehoash of Judah. According to 2 K 12 21 (22), he was a son of Shomer, but 2 Ch 24 26 makes him “son of Shimrich the Moabiess.” (2) A Korahite doorkeeper, son of Obed-edom (1 Ch 26 4). (3) A Benjamite, one of King Jehoshaphat’s warriors (2 Ch 17 18).

JEHOZADAK, jé-hoz’a-dak (גְּהֹזָּדָּק, yhózâdâdkh, “Jeh is righteous”): Priest at the time of the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar (1 Ch 6 14 15 (Heb 5 40 41)). He was the father of Joshua (Jehushal) the priest (Hag 1 13 14; 2 2 4; Zec 6 11). AV has Josedek in Hag and Zec. Same as “Jozadak” (גְּזֹּדָּק, yózódâkhi, same meaning) in Ex 3 2 8; 5 2; 10 18; Neh 12 26; and = “Josedek” (AV “Josudce”) of 1 Esd 5 48 56; 6 2; 9 19; Sir 49 12.

JEHU, jé’hi (יְהוֹה, yhô), meaning uncertain, perhaps “Jeh is he”; 1 K 19 16 17; 2 K 9 10; Elos, Eloa: Son of Jehoshaphat, and descendant of Nimshi, hence commonly called “the son of Nimshi.” 10th king of Israel, had put to death, and IVth Dynasty, Jehu reigned for 28 years. His accession may be reckoned at c 752 BC (some date a few years later).

Jehu’s Tribute—from Obelisk of Shalmaneser.

A soldier of fortune, J. appears first as an officer in the body-guard of Ahab. To himself we owe the information that he was present 1. Officer at the judicial murder of Naboth, and of Ahab that Naboth’s sons were put to death with his father (2 K 9 26). He was in attendance when Ahab drove from Samaria to inspect his new possession in Jezreel, and was witness of the dramatic encounter at the vineyard between the king and the prophet Elijah (cf 1 K 21 16 ff). Years after, J. reminded Bidkar, his captain (lit. “thirdsman,” in chariot), of the doom they had heard pronounced upon Ahab and his house (2 K 9 25 ff). It was in fulfillment of this doom that J. at that time ordered the body of the slain Jehoram to be thrown into the inclosure which had once been Naboth’s (ver 26). Ahab’s temporary repentance averted the punishment from himself for a few years (1 K 21 27-29), but the blow fell at the battle of Ramoth-gilead, and J. would not be unmindful of the prophet’s words as he beheld the dogs licking Ahab’s blood as they washed his chariot “by the pool of Samaria” (22 38). A different fate awaited Ahab’s two sons. The elder, Ahaziah, died, after a short reign, from the effects of an accident (2 K 1). He 2. Jehoram was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, at Ramoth— who toward the close of his reign of gilead and 12 years (2 K 3 1) determined on an Jezreel attempt to recover Ramoth-gilead, where his father had been fatally stricken, from Hazael, of Syria. Ramoth-gilead was taken (2 K 9 14), but in the attack the Israelish king was severely wounded, and was taken to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds (ver 15). A city meanwhile was left in charge of J. and his fellow-captains. At Jezreel he was visited by Ahaziah, of Judah, who had taken part with him in the war (3 23 29; 9 16). The time was now ripe for the execution of the predicted vengeance on the house of Ahab, and to Elisha the prophet, the successor of Elijah, it fell
to take the decisive step which precipitated the crisis. Hazael and J. had already been named to Elijah as the persons who were to execute the Divine judgment, the one as king of Syria, the other as king of Israel (1 K 19 15-17). Elijah was doubtless aware of this commission, which it was now his part, as respected J., to fulfill. A message was hastily dispatched to Ramoth-gilead, with instructions to seek out J., take him apart, anoint him king of Israel in Jeh's name, and charge him with the task of utterly destroying the house of Ahab in punishment for the righteous blood shed by Ahab and Jezebel. The messenger was then to return, this was done, and J., the sacred oil poured on his head, found himself alone with this appalling trust committed to him (2 K 9 1-10).

Events now moved rapidly. J.'s companions were naturally eager to know what had happened, and on learning that J. had become king, "He had smitten his men with a rod," he" anointed them, and J.'s trumpeters proclaimed, J. is king (1 K 11-12). One was not permitted to leave the city to carry forth tidings, and J. himself, with characteristic impetuosity, set out, with a small body of horsemen, in his chariot to Jezreel. Bidkar was there as charioteer (9 25). As the rearers of the great chariot were with the city, a watchman reported their advance, and messengers were sent to inquire as to their errand. These were ordered to fall into the rear. This conduct awakened suspicion, and Jehoram and Ahaziah— who was still with his invalidated kinsman—ordered their chariots, and proceeded in person to meet J. The companies met at the ill-omened field of Naboth, and there the first stroke of vengeance fell. The anxious query, "Is it peace?" was answered by a storm of denounced wrath from J., and on Jehoram turning to flee, an arrow from J.'s powerful bow shot him through the heart, and he sank dead in his chariot. Ahaziah likewise was pursued, and smitten "at the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam." He died at Megiddo, and was taken to Jezreel for burial in the sanctuary of the kings (9 11-28). A somewhat variant account of Ahaziah's death is given in 2 Ch 22 9. It is possible that J. came to Megiddo or its neighborhood, and had to do with his death.

The slaughter of Jehoram was at once followed by that of the chiefinstigator of all the crimes for which the house of Ahab suffered—the queen mother Jezebel. Hot from the pursuit of Jezreel, Jezebel, now an aged woman, but still defiant, had painted and attired herself, and, looking from her window, met him as he drove into the palace court, with the insulting question, "Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer?" (cf 1 K 18 9-12). J.'s answer was an appeal for aid from those within. Two or three eunuchs of the palace gave signs of their concurrence. These, at J.'s bidding, threw Jezebel down into the courtyard, where, lying in her blood, she was trodden under foot by the chariot horses. When, a little later, her remains were sought for burial, she was found to have been almost wholly devoured by the dogs—a lurid commentary on Elijah's earlier threatening, which was now recalled (2 K 9 30-37). J. was an intrusted minister of judgment, but the pitiless zeal, needless cruelty, and, afterward, deceit, with which he executed his mission, withdrew our sympathy from him, as it did that of a later prophet (Hos 1 4).

The next acts of J. reveal yet more clearly his thoroughness of purpose and promptitude of action, while they afford fresh exhibitions of his ruthless and unscrupulousness of spirit. Samaria was the capital of the kingdom, and headquarters of Ahaziah of J. that he had removed, at least temporarily, an obelisk of Baal, which his father had set up (2 K 3: 2-10 26). The city was still held for the house of Ahab, and 

6. Slaughter of the Baal-worship Adventurers. J. continued, in the large sense of male descendants—resided in it (10 1-6). J. here adopted a bold and astute policy. He sent letters to Samaria challenging those in authority to set up one of their master's sons as king, and fight for the city and the kingdom. The governors knew well that they could make no effective resistance to J., and at once humbly tendered their submission. J., in a second message, bade them prove their sincerity by delivering to him the heads of the 70 princes of Ahab's house in baskets. This they did, by their act irrevocably committing themselves to J.'s cause (ver 9). The ghastly relics were piled up in two heaps at the gate of Jezreel—a horrible object-lesson to any stars lost. The heads of these princes were given over to the hands of J., and he placed them in the court of the temple (all, of course, with great ceremony).

Apart from the faultlessness in the agent's motive, the deeds now recounted fell within the letter of J.'s commission, and were within signs of the great works of blood that follow. J. had killed Ahaziah, king of Judah. Now, on his way of Ahaziah's to Samaria, he met a company of 42 persons, described as "brethren of Ahaziah"—evidently blood-relation degrees, as Ahaziah's own brethren had been earlier slain by the Syrians (2 Ch 21 17; 22 1)—and, on learning who they were, and the respect of their kindred to Jezreel, gave orders that they be slain on the spot, and their bodies ignominiously carried to the pit (or "cistern") of the sheep-house, where he had discovered them. It was a cruel excess for which no sufficient justification can be pleaded (2 K 10 12-14). Still less can the craft and violence be condoned by which, when he reached Samaria, J. evinced his "zeal for Jeh" (ver 16) in the extirpation of the worshippers of Baal. J. had secured on his side the support of a nobleman—Jehoram the son of Jehu of the family of Bani and his entrance into Samaria was signaled by further slaying of all adherents of Ahab. Then, doubtless to the amazement of many, J. proclaimed himself an enthusiastic follower of Baal. A great festival was organized, to which all persons—worshippers, and priests of Baal were invited from every part of Israel. J. himself took the leading part in the sacrifice (ver 25). Vestments were distributed to distinguish the true worshippers of Baal from others. Then when all were safely gathered into "the house of Baal," the gates were closed, and 80 soldiers were sent in to massacre the whole deluded company in cold blood. None escaped. The temple of Baal was broken up. Thus, indeed, "J. destroyed Baal out of Israel" (ver 33) at a frightful cost of falsehood and treacherous dealing!

The history of J. in the Bible is chiefly the history of his revolution as now narrated. His reign itself is summed up in more or less effects, crowded with the attacks made by Hazael, with Hazael of Syria, on the trans-Jordanic territories of Israel (10 32-33). These districts were overrun, and remained lost to Israel in the reign of J.'s great-grandson, Jeroboam II (2 K 14 23).

It is in another direction, viz., to the annals of Assyria, we have to look for further information we possess on the reign of J. In these annals, fortunately, some interesting notices are preserved. In 854 BC was fought
the great battle of Karkar (a place between Aleppo and Hamath), when Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria, defeated a powerful combination formed against him (Damascus, Hamath, Philistia, Ammon, etc.). An arms treaty with the Medes is mentioned (Ashurbanipal's New Year's Cylinder, Sargon's "Constitutions," and the two are said to point to a foreign origin.

Jehudi, jē-hū'di (1 Ch 4 18 AV). See Hā-jeHudiiah.

Jehuel, jē-hū'ēl (K'thīb בָּנַי, yāhādēl; but K'ro בָּנַי, yāhādl, i.e. "Jehiel" AV, in 2 Ch 29 14): A Levite; see Jehiel, (5).

Jehush, jē-hūsh (1 Ch 8 39). See Jēsh, (3).

Jē'el, jē-'ēl (יֵעֵל, yē'ēl, meaning unknown): (1) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5 7).

(2) In 1 Ch 8 29, added in AV from 9 35, where K'thīb is "Jeuel," an ancestor of King Saul; AV "Jehiel." (3) One of David's mighty men (1 Ch 11 44).

AV is "Jehiel"; K'thīb is "Jediel." (4) A Levite, keeper of the ark with Obed-edom (1 Ch 15 18 21; 16 5; 2 Ch 20 14), called "Je-hiah" in 1 Ch 16 24.

(5) A Levite (1 Ch 16 5) = "Jaaziel" of 1 Ch 16 15 (q.v.). (6) A scribe under King Uzziah (2 Ch 26 11).

(7) A chief of the Levites, present at King Josiah's great Passover feast (2 Ch 35 9).

(8) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 43) = "Juel" in 1 Esd 9 35. (9) AV in 2 Ch 29 14; see Jehiel, (5). (10) AV in Ezra 18 13; see Jēhu, (3).

David F. Francis Roberts

Jēka'zeń, jē-kā'-zēn (גֶּקְעֹנ, gēkō'ān, "God gathereth"); Neh 11 25. See Kābzeel.

Jēka'ăm, jē-kā'-əm (גֶּקָעֹמ, gēkō'ām, probably "may kinsman establish"); Head of a Levitical house (1 Ch 23 19; 24 23).

The meaning of the name depends upon that of לְעַמ (lam) in compound names; see HPN, 46, 51 ff.

Jēkāmi'ah, jē-kā'-mə-ā (גֶּקָעָמִי, gēkō'amī, "may Jeh establishe"): (1) A Judahite, son of Shallum (1 Ch 2 41).

(2) A son of King Jehoniah (Jehoiachin); in AV "Jecamiah" (1 Ch 3 18).

Jēkuthiel, jē-kū'-thi-ēl (גֶּקְעֹתי-יל, gēkō'tī'ēl, meaning doubtful): A Judahite (1 Ch 4 18). The meaning may be "preservation of God," or perhaps the same as יָקָע (yēkāthāl, "Joktheel," the name of a place in Josh 16 38; 2 K 14 7.

Jēmi'māh, jē-mī'-mə (גֶּמִימָה, gēmīmāh, perhaps a diminutive meaning "little dove"): The first daughter of Job (42 13), born after his restoration from affliction.

Jēmē'naan, jēmē'-nān (עֵמְנָאָן, Emēnān): A city on the coast of Pal; mentioned among those affected by the expedition of Holofernes ( Judges 2 28; 3 1 ff.). The name is used for Judael, generally called "Jamnia" by the Gr writers.

Jēmuel, jē-ˈmē-əl (גֶּמְיוּל, gēmī'əl, meaning unknown): A son of Simeon (Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15) = "Nemuel" in Nu 26 12; 1 Ch 4 24.

Syr version has "Jemuel" in the 4 passages, but Gray (HPN, 307, n. 6) thinks "Jemuel" is more probably a correction in Geon than "Nemuel" in Nu.

Egypt, jēp'ard, JēPARDy, jēp'ar-di: The Eng. word referred originally to a game where
the chances were even (from OfR. jeu parti); transferred thence to designate any great risk. In the NT, represented by the Gr. kindethel (Lk 8:23; 1 Cor 15:30). In the OT (Jgs 5:18) for a Hittite chief, possibly pronounced by the Israelites as “Jeh.” The chief name thus translated is of small value upon their lives (Vulg. “offered their souls to death”); for elliptical expression, “went with their lives,” in 2 S 23:17 m.

**JEPHTHAH**, jef'tha (תִּפְתַּח, yiphṭah, “opened,” or “opener,” probably signifying “Jeh will open”; †يفתא, Iefthade; used as the name of a place, as in Josh 16:43; 19:14; of a man, Jgs 10:6—12:7): Ninth judge of the Israelites. His antecedents are obscure. In the story of his rise, Gilead was probably intended to be the actual name of his father, his mother was a harlot. He was driven from home on account of his illegitimacy, and went to the land of Tob in Eastern Syria (Jgs 11:23). Here he and his followers lived the life of freebooters. The Israelites beyond the Jordan being in danger of an invasion by the Ammonites, J. was invited by the elders of Gilead to be their leader (11:6). Remembering how they had expelled him from their territory and his heritage, J. demanded of them that in the event of success with the Ammonites, he was to be continued as leader. This condition being accepted he returned to Gilead (11:7—11). The account of the diplomacy used by J. to prevent the Ammonites from invading Gilead is a interpolation, and is thought by many interpreters to be a compilation from Nu 20—21. It is of great interest, however, not only because of the fairness of the argument used (11:12-28), but also by virtue of the fact that it contains a history of the journey of the Israelites from Lower Egypt to the banks of the Jordan. This history is distinguished from that of the Pentiphery chiefly by the things omitted. If diplomacy was tried, it failed to dissuade the Ammonites from seeking to invade Israel. J. prepared for battle, but before taking the field paused at Mizpeh of Gilead, and registered a vow that if he were successful in battle, he would offer as a burnt offering to Jeh whatsoever should first come from his doors to greet him (11:29—31). The battle is fought. J. is the victor, and now his vow returns to him with anguish and sorrow. Returning to his home, the first to greet him is his daughter and only child. The father’s sorrow and the courage of the daughter are the bright lights on this sombre crucifixion of God and the nature of sacrifice. That the sacrifice was made seems certain from the narrative, although some critics choose to substitute for the actual death of the maiden the setting the girl apart for a life of perpetual virginity. The Israelitish laws concerning sacrifices and the language used in 11:39 are the chief arguments for the latter interpretation. The entire narrative, however, will hardly bear this construction (11:34—40). J. was judge in Israel for 6 years, but appears only once more in the Scripture narrative. The men of Ephraim, offended because they had had no share in the victory over the Ammonites, made war upon Gilead, but were put to rout by the forces under J. (12:1—6).

**JEPHUNNEH**, jef'oon'e (יַפְחֻנֶה, yiph'ahuneh, meaning uncertain):

1. A son of Caleb (Nu 13:6; 14:6,90, etc.). According to Nu 13:6, he was of the tribe of Judah; according to Josh 14:16, a Kenizzite; the Kenizzites were incorporated in Judah (cf. 1 Ch 4:13—15).
2. A son of Jether, an Asherite (1 Ch 7:38).

**JERAH**, je'ra (יִרְעָה, yerah): A son of Joktan (Gen 10:26; 1 Ch 1:20). No district Jerah has been discovered. However, Yurâhk in Yemen and Yara'h in Hijaz are places named by the Arab. geographers. The fact that the word in Heb means “moon” has led to the following suggestions: the Banâ' Hîdal (“sun placed over the little moon”); the small value upon their lives (Vulg. “offered their souls to death”); for elliptical expression, “went with their lives,” in 2 S 23:17 m.

**JERAHMEEL**, jera-mel' (יַרְחַמֶל, yera'mel’; “may God have compassion!”):

1. In 1 Ch 2 9.25.26.27.33.42, he is described as the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law (Gen 38). In 1 S 27:10 is mentioned the negheb of the Jerahmeelites, jera-mel'el-t's (יוּרְחַמֶלְלֵת, a collective noun), RV “the South of the Jerahmeelites.” The latter is a tribal name in use probably before the proper name, above; their cities are mentioned in 1 S 30:20. Cheyne has radical views on J. See BB, s.v.; also T. Witton Davies in Review of Theology and Philosophy, III, 689—708 (May, 1908); and Cheyne's replies in Hibbert Journal, VII, 132—51 (October, 1908), and Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah.
2. A Merarite Levite, son of Kish (1 Ch 24:29).
3. “The king’s son,” RV and AVm (Jer 36:26). RVm, AV “have of son of Hammelech,” taking the word יארְחָמֶל as a proper name. He was “probably a royal prince, one who had a king among his ancestors but not necessarily son of the ruling king; so 36:6; 1 K 22:50; esp. Zeph 1:8 written at a time when the reigning king, Josiah, could not have had a grown-up son” (Driver, Jer, 224, n.e.). J. was with two others commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch.

**JERECHU**, je-re'ku, AV Jerechus, je-re'kus (1 E d 5 22). See JERICHO.

**JERED**, je'red (יִרְעֶד, yeredh, “descent”): A Judahite, father of Gedor (1 Ch 4:18). See also JARED.

**JEREMAI**, je-re'mi, je-rem'ai (יִרְמַי, yirmay), meaning unknown): One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:33). See JEREMIAS (1 E d 9 34).

**JEREMIAH**, je-rem'ia (יוֹרְמִיהָ, yirm'yah, or [b] shorter form, יִרְמִיָה, yirm'yah), both differently explained as “Jeh establishes [so Gesenius suggests, “appoints”]” (A. B. Davidson in HDB, II, 5906), and “Jeh loosenth [the womb];” see BDB): The form (b) is used of Jeremiah the prophet only in Jer 27:1; 28:5—6.10.11.12.16.19; 39:1; 1 Esr 1:1; Dn 9:2, while the other is found 116:1 in Jer 25. In 1 E d 1 28:32.47.57; 2 Esd 2:18, EV has “Jeremia,” so AV in 2 Mac 2.1.57; Mt 2:17; 27:9; in Mt 16:14, AV has “Jeremias,” but RV in 2 Mac and Mt has “Jeremiah.”

1. The prophet. See special article. Of the following, (2), (3), and (4) have form (a) above; the others the form (b).
2. Father of Hanumal (Hamital), the mother of King Jehoahaz and King Jehoakim (2 K 23:31; 24:18; Jer 62:1).
3. A Rechabite (Jer 36:3).
4. In 1 Ch 12:13 (Heb 14), a Gadite.
5. In 1 Ch 12:10 (Heb 11), a Gadite.
6. In 1 Ch 12:4 (Heb 6), a Benjaminite (?) or Judaeans. (4), (5), and (6) all joined David at Ziklag.
JEREMIAH, jer-ea-mi'a:
1. Name and Person
2. Life of Jeremiah
3. The Personal Character of Jeremiah
4. The Prophecies of Jeremiah
5. The Book of Jeremiah
6. Authenticity and Integrity of the Book
7. Relation to the LXX

The name of one of the greatest prophets of Israel. The Heb יְרֵמֱיָהוּ, yirmēyahu, abbreviated to יְרָמָי, yiramai, signifies either “Jeh hurle” or “Jeh finds,” LXX and person reads Ἰερομαίος, Ieromaios, and the Vulg Jeremia. As this name also occurs not infrequently, the prophet is called “the son of Hilkiah” (I 1), who is, however, not the high priest mentioned in 2 K 22 and 23, as it is merely stated that he was “of the priests who were in Anathoth” (A and B). In Anathoth, now Andata, a small village 1½ hours N.E. of Jerusalem, lived a class of priests who belonged to a side line, not to the line of Zadok (cf 1 K 2 26).

J. was called by the Lord to the office of a prophet while still a youth (I 2) about 20 years of age, in the 13th year of King Josiah (1 2; 25 3), in the year 627 BC, and was active in the life of Jeremiah in this capacity from this time on to the destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC, under kings Josiah, Jehoash, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah. Even after the fall of the capital city he prophesied in Egypt at least for several years, so that his work extended over a period of about 50 years in all. At first he probably lived in Anathoth, and put in his appearance publicly in Jerusalem only on the occasion of the great festivals; later he lived in Jerusalem, and was there during the terrible times of the siege and the destruction of the city.

Although King Josiah was God-fearing and willing to serve Jehovah, and soon inaugurated his reformation according to the law of Jehovah (in the 18th year of his reign), yet J., at the time when he was called to the prophetic office, was not left in doubt about the fact that the catastrophe of the judgment of God over the city would soon come (1 11 ff); and when, after a few years, the Book of the Law was found in the temple (2 K 22 and 23), J. preached “the words of this covenant” to the people in the town and throughout the land (11 1-8; 17 19-27), and exhorted to obedience to the Divine command; but in doing this then and afterward he became the object of much hostility, esp. in his native city, Anathoth. Even his own brethren or near relatives entered into a conspiracy against him by declaring that he was a dangerous fanatic (12 6). However, the condition of J. under this pious king was the most happy in his career, and he lamented the latter’s untimely death in sad lyrics, which the author of Chb was able to use (2 Ch 36 25), but which have not come down to our times.

Much more unfavorable was the prophet’s condition after the death of Josiah. Jehoash-Shallum, who ruled only 3 months, received the announcement from J. (22 10 ff), Jehoashiah (609-598 BC) in turn favored the heathen worship, and oppressed the people through his love of luxury and by the erection of grand structures (Jer 22 13 ff). In addition, his policies were treacherous. He conspired with Egypt against his superior, Nebuchadnezzar. Epoch-making was his most notable exploit. It was he who murdered Gedaliah, the Chaldean governor whom Jehovah had sent to substitute for the former. Of all the Chaldeans, the Chaldeans gained the upper hand in Hither Asia, as J. had predicted (46 1-12). Under Jehoiakim J. delivered his great temple discourse (7-9; 10 17-25). The priests for this reason determined to have the prophet put to death (ch 26). However, influential elders interceded for him, and the princes yet showed some justice. He was, however, abused by the authorities at the appeal of the priests (ch 20). According to 36 1 ff, he was no longer permitted to enter the place of the temple. For this reason the Lord commanded him to collect his prophecies in a book-roll, and to have them read to the people by his faithful pupil Baruch (ch 36; of ch 45). The book fell into the hands of the king, who burned it. However, J. dictated the book a second time to Baruch, together with new additions.

Jehoiachin or Coniah (22 4 ff), the son of Jehoiakim, after a reign of 3 months, was taken into captivity to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, together with a large number of his nobles and the best part of the people (Jer 24 1; 29 2), as the prophet had predicted (22 20-30). But conditions did not improve under Zedekiah (597-586 BC). This king was overthrown, and the city was destroyed; the temple had been; but all the more hostile were the princes and the leaders, who were now in command after the better class of these had been deported to Babylon. They continually planned rebellion against Babylon, while J. was compelled to oppose this and to arouse the patriotism of his country.

Finally, the Bab army came in order to punish the faithless vassal who had again entered into an alliance with Egypt. J. earnestly advised submission, but the king was too firmly resolved to follow this, not only as against his nobles. A long siege resulted, which caused the direst sufferings in the life of J. The commander threw him into a vile prison, charging him with being a traitor (37 11 ff). The king, who consulted him secretly, released him from prison, and put him into the “court of the guard” (37 17 ff), where he could move around freely, and could again prophesy. Now that the judgment had come, he could again speak to the people (chs 32, 33). Also chs 30 and 31, probably, were spoken about this time. But as he continued to preach submission to the people, those in authority cast him into a slimy cistern, from which the pity of a co-worker, Johanan, delivered him (39 15-18). He again returned to the court of the guard, where he remained until Jerus was taken.

After the capture of the city, J. was treated with great consideration by the Babylonians, who knew that he had spoken in favor of their government (39 11 ff; 40 1 ff). They gave him the choice of going to Babylon or of remaining in his native land. He decided for the latter, and went to the governor Gedaliah, at Mizpah, a man worthy of all confidence. But when this man, after a short time, was murdered by conspirators, the Jews who had been left in Pal, becoming alarmed and fearing the vengeance of the Chaldeans, determined to emigrate to Egypt. J. advised against this most earnestly, and threatened the vengeance of Jehovah, if the people should insist upon their undertaking (42 1 ff). But they insisted and even compelled the aged prophet to go with them (43 1 ff). Their first goal was Tahpanhes (Daphne), a town in Lower Egypt. At this place they still continued to preach the word of God, and to announce the latest of his preserved discourses in 43 8-13, as also the sermon in ch 44, delivered at a somewhat later time but yet before 570 BC. At that time J. must have been from 70 to 80 years old. He

(7) Head of a Manassite family (1 Ch 5 24).

(8) A priest who sealed the covenant with Nebuchadnezzar in the 13th year of his reign (22 10), probably the same as he of 12 24, who took part in the procession at the dedication of the walls of Jerus.

(9) A priest who went to Jerus with Zerubbabel from exile and became head of a priestly family of that name (Neh 12 1).
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probably died soon after this in Egypt. The church Fathers report that he was stoned to death at Daphne by the Jews (Jerome, *Ado. Jovin., ii, 37; Tertullian, *Contra Gnost.*, viii: Psuedepigraph., De P. Rabbae 26).

The Book of Jer gives us not only a fuller account of the life and career of its author than do the books of the other prophets, but we also find Personal learn more about his own inner and Character personal life and feelings than we do of Jeremiah of Isaiah or any other prophet. From this source we learn that he was, by nature, gentle and tender in his feelings, and sympathetic. A decided contrast to this is found in the hard and unmerciful judgment which it was his mission to announce. God made him strong and firm and immovable like iron for his mission (1 18; 15 20). This contrast between his naturally warm personal feelings and his strict Divine mission not rarely appears in the history of utterances and actions. However, when he rejoiced over God spoke to him (15 16); but soon these words of God were to his heart a source of pain and of suffering (15 17 ff). He would have preferred not to utter them; and then they burned in his breast as a fire (20 7 ff; 22 9). He personally stood in need of love, and yet was not permitted to marry (16 1 f). He was compelled to forego the pleasures of youth (15 17). He loved his people as nobody else, and yet was always compelled to prophesy evil for it, and be the servant of his nation. This often caused him to despair. The enmity to which he fell a victim, on account of his declaration of nothing but the truth, he deeply felt; see his complaints (9 1 ff; 12 5 ff; 15 10; 17 14–15; 18 23, and often). In this sad antagonism between his heart and the commands of the Lord, he would perhaps wish that God had not spoken to him; he even cursed the day of his birth (15 10; 20 14–18; cf Job 3 1 ff). Such complaints distinguish him from that which the Lord through His Spirit communicated to the prophet. God rebukes him for these complaints, and demands of him to repent and to trust and obey Him (15 19). This discipline makes him the all the more uncontrollable. Even his enemies began to denounce the message of his exhortations (11 20 ff; 15 15; 17 18; 18 21–23) originated in part in his passionate and deep nature, and show how great is the difference between him and that perfect Sufferer, who prayed even for his deadly enemies. But J. was nevertheless a type of that Suffering Saviour, more than any of the OT saints. He, as a priest, prayed for his people, until God forbade him to do so (7 16; 11 14; 14 11; 18 20). He was compelled more than all others to suffer the reproaches as belonging to God, which fell on his people. The people themselves also felt that he meant well to them. A proof of this is seen in the fact that the rebellious people, who always did the contrary of what he had commanded them, forced him, the unwelcome prophet of God, to go along with them because they felt that he was their good genius.

What J. was to preach was the judgment upon Judah. As the reason for this judgment J. everywhere mentioned the apostasy from Deh Pehem, to Babylon, which was practised on bemoth, or the “high places” by of Jeremiah Judah, as this had been done by Israel. Many heathenish abuses had found their way into the life of the people. Outespoken heathenism had been introduced by such men as King Manasseh, even the sacrifice of children to the honor of Baal-Molech in the valley of Hinnom (7 31; 19 5; 32 35), and the worship of “the queen of heaven” (7 18; 44 10). It is true that the reformation of Josiah swept away the worst of these abominations. But an inner return to Jehovah did not result from this reformation. For the reason that the improvement had been made on the surface and outward, and was done to please the king, J. charges up to his people all their previous sins, and the guilt of the present generation was yet added to this (16 11 f). Together with religious insincerity went the moral corruption of the people, such as dishonesty, injustice, oppression of the helpless, slander, and the like. Compare the accusations found in 5 1 ff. 7 26 ff; 6 7 13; 7 5 1 9; 9 2 5 8; 17 9 ff; 21 12; 22 13 ff; 25 10; 29 23, etc. Esp. to the spiritual leaders, the priests and prophets, are these things charged up.

The judgment which is to come in the near future, as a punishment for the sins of the people, is from the outset declared to be the conquest of the country through an enemy from abroad. In this way the heated caldron with the face from the N., in the vision containing the full tale of the Calamity of the N. (1 10), was to be understood. This power in the N. is not named until the 4th year of Jehoiakim (ch 25), where Nebuchadnezzar is definitely designated as the conqueror. It is often thought, that, in the earlier years, J. was merely speaking of the Scythians when he spoke of the enemies from the N., esp. in chs 4–6. The Scythians (according to Herodotus 1 103 ff) had, probably a few years before J.'s call to the prophetical office, taken possession of Media, then marched through Asia Minor, and even forced their way as far as Egypt. They crossed through Canna, passing by on their march from E. to W., near Beth-shean (Scythopolis). The ravages of this fierce people probably influenced the language used by J. in his prophecies (cf 11 11 ff; 15 15 ff; 6 3 ff 22 ff). But it is unthinkable that J. expected nothing more than a plundering and a booty-seeking expedition of the Scythian nomad hordes. Chariots, such as are described in 3 13, the Scythians did not possess. Moreover, it cannot be forgotten that J. from the outset speaks of a deportation of his people to this foreign land (3 18; 5 19), while an exile of Israel in the country of the Scythians was out of the question. At all events from the 4th year of J.'s mission, he foresees the Chaldaeans as the enemy who, according to his former announcement, would come from the N. It is possible that it was only in the course of time that he reached a clear conviction as to what nation was meant by the revelation from God. But, upon further reflection, he must have felt almost certain on this subject, esp. as Isaiah (59 6), Micah (4 10), and, soon after these, Habakkuk had named Babylon as the power that was to carry out the judgment upon Israel. Other prophets, too, regard the Babylonians as belonging to the foreign nations (cf Zec 6 8), because they always came from the N., and because they were the legal successors of the Assyrians.

In contrast to optimistic prophets, who had hoped to remedy matters in Israel (6 14), J. from the beginning predicted the destruction of the city and of the sanctuary, as also the end of the Jewish nation and the exile of the people through these enemies from abroad. According to 25 11; 29 10, the Bab supremacy (not exactly the empire) was to last for 70 years; and after this, deliverance should come. Promises to this effect are found only now and then in the earlier years of the prophet (3 14 ff; 12 14 ff; 16 14 f). However, during the time of the siege and afterward, such predictions are
more frequent (cf 23 1 ff; 24 6 f; 47 2-7; and in the "Book of Comfort," chs 30-33).

What characterizes this prophet is the spiritual import given to his religious character; the external theocracy he delivers up to destruction, because its forms were not animated by God-fearing sentiments. External circumcision is of no value without inner purity of heart. The external temple will be destroyed, because it has become the hiding-place of sinners. External sacrifices have no value, because those who offer them are lacking in spirituality, and this is displeasing to God. The law is abused and misinterpreted (8 8); the words of the prophets as a rule do not apply to other forms of worship than the forms of the Council is eventually to make way for a glorious presence of the Lord. The law is to be written in the hearts of men (31 31 ff). The glories of the Messianic times the prophet does not describe in detail, but their spiritual character he repeatedly describes in the words "Jehu our righteousness," (23 6; 33 16). However, we must not overestimate the idealism of J. He believed in a realistic restoration of the theocracy to a form, just as the other prophets (of chs 31, 32, 38-40).

As far as the form of his prophetic utterances is concerned, J. is of a poetical nature; but he was not only a poet. He often speaks in the meter of an elegy; but he is not bound by this, and readily passes over to other forms at times into prose speech, when the contents of his discourses require it. The somewhat monotonous and elegiac tone, which is in harmony with his sad message to the people, gives way to more lively and varied forms of expression, when the prophet speaks of other and foreign nations. In doing this he often makes use of the utterances of earlier prophets.

The first composition of the book is reported in 36 1 ff. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim, at the command of Jeh, he dictated all of the prophecies he had spoken down to this time to his pupil Baruch, who wrote them on a roll. After the destruction of this book-rol by the king, he would not be stopped from reproducing the contents again and making additions to it (36 32). In this we have the origin of the present book of Jer. This book, however, not only received further additions, but had been modified. The contents of the book had originally been arranged chronologically, and these reached only down to the 4th year of King Jehoiakim, we find in the book, as it is now, as early as 21 1 ff; 23 1 ff; 25 1 ff, discourses from the times of Jeremiah. However, the 2d edition (36 28) contained, no doubt, ch 25, with these discourses directed against the heathen nations extant at that time. The lack of order, from a chronological point of view, in the present book, is attributable also to the fact that historical accounts appendices concerning the career of J. were added to the book in later times, e.g. chs 26, 35, 36 and others; and in these additions are also found older discourses of the prophet. Beginning with ch 37, the story of the prophet during the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the city is reported, and in connection with this are his words and discourses belonging to this period.

It is a question whether these pieces, which are more narrative in character and of a contemporary, probably Baruch, who was the prophet when the first part of the book, at one time constituted a book by themselves, out of which they were later taken and incorporated in the book of the prophet, or whether they were inserted by Baruch, or by the editor of the first part of the book, it may be urged that they are not always found at their proper places chronologically; e.g. ch 26 is a part of the temple discourse in chs 7-9. This book of Baruch," which is claimed by some critics to have existed as a separate book beside that of Jer, would not furnish a connected biography, and does not seem to have a religious purpose. It contains introductions to certain words and speeches of the prophet and statements of what the consequences of these had been. Thus it is more probable that Baruch, at a later time, made supplementary additions to the original book, which the prophet had dictated without any personal data. But in this work the prophet himself may have cooperated. At places, perhaps, the dictation of the prophet ends in a narrative of Baruch (19 14-20 6), or vice versa, when the Ark of the Covenant is eventually to make way for a gloriously presence of the Lord. The law is to be written in the hearts of men (31 31 ff). The glories of the Messianic times the prophet does not describe in detail, but their spiritual character he repeatedly describes in the words "Jehu our righteousness," (23 6; 33 16). However, we must not overestimate the idealism of J. He believed in a realistic restoration of the theocracy to a form, just as the other prophets (of chs 31, 32, 38-40).

As far as the form of his prophetic utterances is concerned, J. is of a poetical nature; but he was not only a poet. He often speaks in the meter of an elegy; but he is not bound by this, and readily passes over to other forms at times into prose speech, when the contents of his discourses require it. The somewhat monotonous and elegiac tone, which is in harmony with his sad message to the people, gives way to more lively and varied forms of expression, when the prophet speaks of other and foreign nations. In doing this he often makes use of the utterances of earlier prophets.

The first composition of the book is reported in 36 1 ff. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim, at the command of Jeh, he dictated all of the prophecies he had spoken down to this time to his pupil Baruch, who wrote them on a roll. After the destruction of this book-roll by the king, he would not be stopped from reproducing the contents again and making additions to it (36 32). In this we have the origin of the present book of Jer. This book, however, not only received further additions, but had been modified. The contents of the book had originally been arranged chronologically, and these reached only down to the 4th year of King Jehoiakim, we find in the book, as it is now, as early as 21 1 ff; 23 1 ff; 25 1 ff, discourses from the times of Jeremiah. However, the 2d edition (36 28) contained, no doubt, ch 25, with these discourses directed against the heathen nations extant at that time. The lack of order, from a chronological point of view, in the present book, is attributable also to the fact that historical accounts appendices concerning the career of J. were added to the book in later times, e.g. chs 26, 35, 36 and others; and in these additions are also found older discourses of the prophet. Beginning with ch 37, the story of the prophet during the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the city is reported, and in connection with this are his words and discourses belonging to this period.

It is a question whether these pieces, which are more narrative in character and of a contemporary, probably Baruch, who was the prophet when the first part of the book, at one time constituted a book by themselves, out of which they were later taken and incorporated in the book of the prophet, or whether they were inserted by Baruch, or by the editor of the first part of the book, it may be urged that they are not always found at their proper places chronologically; e.g. ch 26 is a part of the temple discourse in chs 7-9. However, this "Book...
A special problem is furnished by the relation of the text of Jer to the Alexandrian version of the Seventy (LXX). Not only does the Heb form of the text differ from the Gr materially, much more than this is the case in other books of the OT, but the arrangement, too, is quite different. The overruling consideration here is the formula of the heathen nations (chs 46-51) is in the LXX found in the middle of ch 48, at least, in an altogether different order (vss. 49 35-54; 50; 51; 47 1-7; 49 7-22; 49 1-5, 28-33: 52-3; 48). In addition, the readings throughout the book in many cases are divergent, the text in the LXX being in general shorter and more compact. The Heb text has about 2,700 Heb words less than the authentic Heb text, and is thus about one-eighth shorter. As far as the insertion of the addresses against the heathen nations in ch 29 is concerned, the Gr order is certainly not more original than the Heb. It rather casts a shadow on the whole. But the final chapter of the Heb text is in general shorter and more compact. The Heb text has about 2,700 Heb words less than the authentic Heb text, and is thus about one-eighth shorter.

As far as the insertion of the addresses against the heathen nations in ch 29 is concerned, the Gr order is certainly not more original than the Heb. It rather casts a shadow on the whole. But the final chapter of the Heb text is in general shorter and more compact. The Heb text has about 2,700 Heb words less than the authentic Heb text, and is thus about one-eighth shorter.


C. von Orelli.

JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF. See Jeremy, The Epistle of.

JEREMIAH, THE LAMENTATIONS OF. See LAMENTATIONS.

JEREMIAH, jer-e-mi'-ahs (Iērēmias, Jeremias). (1) Named among the sons of Bani as one of those who had married foreign wives (1 Esdr 9 34). In Ezr 10 33 we find, “Jeremiah” among the sons of Hashum. In 1 Esdr it should come in 9 33 after Manasses.

(2) See Jeremiah (general art.).

JEREMIEL, jer-e-miel'-iel (Lat Hieremiel, al. Jeremiel, “El hurlis” or “El appoints”). AV and RV in 2 Esdr 4 36 for AV “Uriel.” He is here called the “archangel” who answers the question raised by the souls of the righteous dead. He is perhaps identical with Remiel of Apoc Bar or Remiel of Eti Enoch.

JEREMOH, jer-e-moth (עדרים, Jeremoth), and [בּדרים, Yeredim, ירמדוד], תּרמָדָה, yermadoth, meaning unknown). Of the following (1) has form (b), (5) form (c), the rest (a).

(1) In 1 Ch 7 8 (AV “Jeremoth”), and
(2) In 1 Ch 8 14, Benjamite. Cf Jeremia (2).
(3) In 1 Ch 13 23, and (4) in 1 Ch 25 22—“Jeremoth,” 24 30; heads of Levitical houses.

(5) A Naphtalite, one of David’s tribal princes (1 Ch 27 19); AV “Jerimoth.”

(6) (7) 8 Men who had married foreign wives. In Ezr 10 28 (=“Hieremoth,” 1 Esdr 9 27); ver 27 (av “Hieremoth,” 1 Esdr 9 29); and ver 29 (=“Hieremoth,” 1 Esdr 9 30); the Kt of the last is וָרְמָדָה, vuradoth, “and Ramoth”; so RVm, AV.
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JEREMY, jer-e-mi'-i. See Jeremiah (general art.).


4. Original Language
5. Authorship, Date and Aim
6. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

In MSS BA the title is simply “An Epistle of Jeremy.” But in B, etc., there is a superscription introducing the letter: “Cord of a letter

1. Name Which Jeremiah sent to the captives about to be led to Babylon by [Pesh adds Nebuchadnezzar] the king of the Babylonians, to make known to them what had been commanded him by God.” What follows is a statistical exposition of the folly of idolatry, and not a letter. The idea of introducing this as a letter from Jeremiah was probably suggested by Jer 29 1 ff.

The early Gr Fathers regarded the whole favorably disposed toward this tract, reckoning it to be a part of the Canon. It is therefore included in the list of canonical books of Origen, Ephraem, Cyril of Alexandria, Athanasius, and was so authoritatively recognized by the Council of Laodicea (360 AD).

In most Gr MSS of the LXX (BA Codex, March, Chalc, in the Syr Hex.), it follows Lam as an independent piece, closing the supposed writings of Jeremiah. In the best-known of the known printed edd of the LXX (Tischendorf, Swete, etc.), the order is Jer, Bar, Lam, Ep. Jer. In Fritzsche, L. 6, and the AV and RV text, Ep. Jer stands before Bar. But in Lat MSS, including those of the Vulg. It is appended to Bar. of which it forms ch 30, though it really has nothing to do with it. In the more ancient rec., it is appended to Bar, with Protestant edd (BY, etc.) of the Apoc, a more intelligible arrangement, as Jer and Lam do not occur in the Apoc, and the Bib. Baruch was Jeremiah’s amanuensis.

In the so-called letter (see 1, above) the author shows the absurdity and wickedness of heathen worship. The Jews, for their sins, will be removed to Babylon, where they will remain 7 generations. In that land they will be tempted to worship the gods of the people. The writer’s aim is ostensibly to warn them beforehand by showing how helpless and useless the idols worshipped are, and how immoral as well as silly the rites of the Bab religion are. For similar polemics against idolatry, see Isa 44 9-19 (which in its earnestness resembles the Ep. Jer closely); Jer 10 3-9; Ps 115 4-8; 135 15-18; Wis 13 10-19; 15 13-17.

That the Ep. Jer was composed in Gr is the opinion of practically all scholars. There are no marks of translation; the Gr is on the whole good, and abounds in such rhetorical terms as characterized the Gr of Northern Egypt about the beginning of our era. There is no trace of a Heb original, though Origen has been mistakenly understood to say there was one in his day (see Schürer, GJV, III, 467 f.). Romanist writers defend a Heb original, and point to some Hebraisms (ver 44 and the use of the fut. for the past), but these can be matched in admittedly Hellenistic Gr writings.

The writer was almost certainly a resident in Alexandria toward the close of the last cent. BC. The title of the book, the references to Egypt religion (ver 19, where the Feast of Lights at Sais—Herod. ii.62— is Aim referred to), and the allusion to the Ep. Jer in 2 Mace 2 2, denied by Schürer, etc., make the above conclusion very probable. The author had in mind the dangers to the religion of his fellow-countrymen presented by the fascinating forms of idolatry existing at Alexandria. Certainly Jeremiah is not the author, for the book was written in Gr and never formed part of the Gr Canon. Besides, the treatment is far below the level of the genuine writings of that prophet.
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Jerah
Jeroboam

(1) The Greek.—This ep. occurs in the principal MSS of the LXX uncials (BA Q I contain 74a-24a, etc) and cursive (except 70, 96, 230).

6. Text and Versions.

(2) The Syriac.—1 follows the Gr., but the

and

very freely. The Syr II follows the text

of B closely, often at the expense of Syr

idios.

(3) The Latin.—The Vulg is made direct

from the Gr. There is a different Lat VS published by Sabatier in his Bib. Sacr. Latae Versionum Antiquae, II, 734 ff. It is far from being

accurate.

(4) There are also Arabic (following A). Coptic (ed Quatremere, 1859), and Ethiopic (ed Dillmann, 1894) versions.


T. Witton Davies

JERIHON, je-rî-hô-nô (יִרְיחֹּם, yîrîḥ×ôm, "founded of Jeh"),: In 1 Ch 12 v; 24 v 23—"Jerijah" (יִרְיָ֫ה, yîrîyâh), 26 31, head of a Levitical house: called chief of the Hebronites in 24 23 (cf ver 30).

JERIBAI, je-rî-hâ (יִרְיָ֫י, yîrîyâ, mean uncertain): One of David's mighty men of the armies (1 Ch 11 46): one of the names not found in the list in 2 S 23 24-29a.

JERICHO, je-rî-kô (the word occurs in two forms).

In the Peut, in 2 K 5 5 and in Ezr, Neh, Ch it is written יֵרֵיחוֹ, yereẖô; יריחו, yereẖô, elsewhere: In 1 K 16 31 the final letter is h, instead of t, וּוּ. The termination וּוּ is thought to preserve the peculiarities of the old Can. dialect. In the LXX we have the indeclinable form, Ἰεριχώ, Iereẖô (Swete has the form Iereẖô as well), both with and without the fem. art.; in the NT Ἰεριχώ, Iereẖô, once with the fem. art. The Arabic is Ḥerâkh. According to Josh 3 12 20, the spot was opposite Neb, while in 34 3 it is called a city of palm trees. It was surrounded with a wall (Josh 2 15), and provided with a gate which was closed at night (2 5), and was ruled over by a king. When captured, vessels of brass and iron, large quantities of silver and gold, and "a goodly Babylonish garment" were found in it (7 21). It was on the western side of the Jordan, not far from the camp of Israel at Shittim, before crossing the river (2 1). The city was on the "plain" (4 13), but so close to "the mountain" on the W. (probably the cliffs of Quarantia, the traditional scene of Christ's temptation) that it was within easy reach of the spies, protected by Rahab. It was in the lot of Benjamin (18 21), the border of which ascended to the "slope [side] of J. on the N." (18 12). Authorities are generally agreed in locating the ancient city at Tel es-Sultân, a mile and a half N.W. of modern J. Here there is a mound 1,200 ft. long and 50 ft. in height supporting 4 smaller mounds, the highest of which is 90 ft. above the base of the main mound.

The geological situation (see Jordan valley) sheds great light upon the capture of the city by Joshua (Josh 6). If the city was built as we suppose it to have been, upon the unconsolidated sedimentary deposits which accumulated to a great depth in the Jordan valley during the enlargement of the Dead Sea, which took place in

Pleistocene (or glacial) times, the sudden falling of the walls becomes easily credible to anyone who believes in the personality of God and in His ability to know the future or to direct at His will the secondary causes with which man has to deal in Nature. The narrative does not state that the blowing of the trumpets by the Israelites themselves effected the falling of the walls. It was simply said that at a specified juncture on the 7th day the city would fall, and that they actually fell at that juncture. The miracle may, therefore, be regarded as either that of prophecy, in which the Creator foretold to a people the course of things to Joshua, secured the function of Divine and human activities which constitutes a true miracle, or we may regard the event as a result of the strategic position which brought down the walls to be the result of direct Divine action, such as is asserted by man who believes in the unique interposition of God at a particular time and place. The phenomena are just such as occurred in the earthquake of San Francisco in 1906, where, according to the report of the scientific commission appointed by the state, "the most violent destruction of buildings was on the made ground. This ground seems to have behaved during the earthquake very much in the same way as jelly in a bowl, or as semi-liquid sand. The walls would fall, and the houses would tumble down, while at a considerable depth, the destruction was slight. The floor, "underwent a considerable depth by loose or slightly coherent geological formations."

20 miles from the rift, was the most severely shaken town in the state and suffered the greatest disaster relatively to its population and extent (Report, 13 and 16). Thus an earthquake, such as is easily provided for along the margin of this great Jordan dead sea plain, would produce exactly the phenomena here described, and its occurrence at the time and place foretold to Joshua constitutes it a miracle of the first magnitude.

Notwithstanding the curse pronounced in Josh 6 26 AV, prophesying that whosoever should rebuild the city "he shall lay the foundations thereof in his firstborn," it was rebuilt (1 K 16 34) by Hiel the Bethelite in the days of Ahab. The curse was literally fulfilled. Still David's successors are said to have "tarryed at Jericho" in his day (2 S 10 5; 1 Ch 19 5). In Elisha's time (2 K 2 5) there was a school of prophets there, while several other references to the city occur in the 6 books of the Apoc (2 Ch 23 t 15, where it is called "the city of the pines trees"; 2 K 25 5; Jer 35 5; Ezr 2 34; Neh 3 2; 7 36; 1 Macc 9 50). Jos describes it and the fertile plain surrounding it, in glowing terms. In the time of Christ, it was an important place yielding a large revenue to the royal family. But the city which Herod rebuilt was on a higher elevation, at the base of the western mountain, probably at Beth Jurb, where there are the ruins of a small fort. Jericho was the place of rendezvous for Galilean pilgrims desiring to avoid Samaria, both in coming and in departing from Jerus, and it has been visited at all times by thousands of pilgrims, who go down from Jerus to bathe in the Jordan. The road leading from Jerus to Jericho is still infested by robbers who hide in the rocky caverns adjoining it, and appear without warning from the tributary gorges of the wadies which dissect the mountain wall. At the present time Jericho and the region about is occupied only by a few hundred miserable inhabitants, deteriorated by the torrid climate which prevails at the low level about the head of the Dead Sea. But the present barrenness of the region is largely due to the destruction of the aqueducts which formerly distributed over the plain the waters brought down through the wadies which descend from the mountains of Judaea. The ruins of many of these are silent witnesses of the cause of its decay. Twelve aqueducts at various levels formerly branched from the Wady Kelt, irrigating the plain both N. and S. The remains of Roman mosaics are found in these. In the Middle Ages they were so repaired that an abundance and variety of crops were raised, including wheat, barley, millet, figs, grapes and sugar cane. See further Palestine (Recent Exploration). George Frederick Wright

JERIEL, je-ri-él, je-rî-él (יִרְיֶלְ, yîrîyél), "founded of God"; of Jeriah: A chief of Issachar (1 Ch 7 2).

JERIJAH, je-ri-ja (1 Ch 26 31). See Jeriah.
JERIMOTH, jer-imoth (see Jereimoth, [c]):
(1) A Benjaminite (1 Ch 7 7).
(2) A Benjaminite who joined David at Ziklag, or perhaps a Judasian (1 Ch 12 5 [Heb 6]).
(3) A Levite, Jereimoth (q.v.).
(4) A Levite musician in David’s time (1 Ch 25 4).

(5) Son of David and father of Mahalah, Reho- boam’s wife (2 Ch 11 18). He is not mentioned (2 S 3 2-5; 1 Ch 3 1-3; 14 7) among the sons of David’s wives, so Curtis (Ch, 360) think of that he was either the son of a concubine, or possibly the name is a corruption of “Ithishem” (יִהַשְּרֶה), yithrah’am, 1 Ch 3 3).

(6) A Levite overseer in Hezekiah’s time (2 Ch 31 13).

DAVID FRANCES ROBERTS

JERIOH, jer-i-oth, jer-i-oth (יְרִיאֹת), [tent-]curtains: In 1 Ch 2 18, where MT is corrupt, Kittel in his comm. and in Bib. Heb reads “Caleb begat [children] of Azubah his wife, Jerioth.” Wellhausen (De Gent, et Fam. Jud., 33) reads, “Caleb begat [children] of Azubah his wife, the daughter of Jerioth.” According to EV, Caleb had two wives, but the context does not bear this out. J. Michaelis regarded J. as another name for Azubah. See Curtis, Comm. on Ch, 92.

JEROBOAM, jer-o-bo’âm (יְרֵיהוֹבָאָם), yithrah’äm: LXX Ἰηρόβαος, Hierobamos, usually assumed to have been derived from ירֹה and בָּא, and signifying “the people contend,” or “he pleads the people’s cause”. The name was borne by two kings of Israel.

(1) Jeroboam I, son of Nebat, an Ephraimite, and of Sheerah, a widow (1 K 11 26-40; 12 1-20). He was the first king of Israel after the disruption of the kingdom, and he reigned 22 years (937-915 BC). The history of J. is contained in 1 K 11 26-40; 12 1-40; 2 Ch 1 10 1-11 4; 11 14-16; 12 15; 13 3-20, and in an insertion in the LXX after 1 K 12 24 (o-r). This insertion covers about the same ground as the MT, and the LXX elsewhere, with some additions and variations. The fact that it calls J.’s mother a porath (harlot), and his wife the Egyptian princess Aserah (1 K 11 33), that J. was unfaithful by the death of his son before he has done any wrong; that the episode with the prophet’s mantle does not occur until the meeting at Shechem; that J. is not proclaimed king at all—all this proves the passage is misplaced. No doubt it is a fragment of some historical work, which, after the manner of the later Midr, has combined history and tradition, making rather free use of the historical kernel.

J., as a highly gifted and valorous young Ephraimite, comes to the notice of Solomon early in his reign (1 K 11 29; cf 15 24-25).

2. His Rise Having noticed his ability, the king and Revolt made him overseer of the fortifications and public work at Jerus, and placed him over the levies from the house of Joseph. The fact that the latter term for the whole of the ten tribes (cf Am 5 6; 6 6; Ob ver 18) indicates the importance of the position, which, however, he used to plot against the king. No doubt he had the support of the people in his designs. Prejudices of long standing (2 S 19 40 f; 20 f) were augmented when Israelish interests were made subservient to Judah and to the king, while enforced labor and burdensome taxation filled the people’s hearts with bitterness and jealousy. J. the son of a widow (16) did the first to feel the galling oppression and to give voice to the suffering of the people. In addition, he had the approval of the prophet Ahijah of the old sanctuary of Shiloh, who, by tearing his new mantle into twelve pieces and giving ten of them to J., informed him that he was to become king of the ten tribes. J. says (1 K 12 21-22) that J. was elevated by the words of the prophet, “and being a young man of warm temper, and ambitious of greatness, he could not be quiet,” but tried to get the government into his hands at once. For the time being, however, J. fled to Egypt where he was received and kindly treated by Shishak, the successor to the father-in-law of Solomon.

The genial and imposing personality of Solomon had been able to stem the tide of discontent excited by his oppressive regime, which at his death burst all restraints. Nevertheless, the northern tribes, at a popular assembly held at Shechem, solemnly promised to serve Rehoobam, the son of Solomon, who had already been proclaimed king at Jerus, on condition that he would lighten the burdens that so unjustly rested upon them. Instead of receiving the magna charta which they expected, the king, in a spirit of despotism, gave them a rough answer, and J. says “the people were struck by his words, as it were, by an iron hammer” (1 K 12 9). But despotism lost the day. The rough answer of the king was met by the Marseillaise of the people:...

...What portion have we in David? Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: To your tents, O Israel: Now see to thine own house, David!” (1 K 12 16).

Seeing the turn affairs had taken, but still unwilling to make any concessions, Rehoobam sent Adoram, who had been over the levy for many years (1 K 4 5; 12 18), and who no doubt had quelled dissatisfaction before, to force the people to submission, possibly by the violent methods he had threatened to employ (1 K 12 14). But the attempt failed. The aged Adoram was stoned to death, while Rehoobam was obliged to flee ignominiously back to Jerus, king only of Judah (1 K 12 20). Thus the great work of David for a united kingdom was shattered by inferior, who put personal ambitions above great ideals.

As soon as J. heard that Solomon was dead, he returned from his forced exile in Egypt and took (of his residence in his native town, Zeredah, in the hill country of Ephrhem) the northern tribes, having rejected the house of David, now turned to the leader, and perhaps instigator of the revolution. Jeroboam was sent for and raised to the throne by the choice of the popular assembly. Divinely set apart for his task, and having the approval of the people, J. nevertheless failed to rise to the greatness of his opportunities, and his kingdom degenerated into a mere military monarchy, never stronger than the ruler who chanced to occupy the throne. In trying to avoid the Scylla that threatened its freedom and faith (1 K 11 33), the nation steered into the Charybdis of revolution and anarchy in which it finally perished.

Immediately upon his accession, J. fortified Shechem, the largest city in Central Israel, and made it his capital. Later he fortified

5. Political Events

(1) 1 K 14 17, Tirzah was the capital during the latter part of his reign. About J.’s external relations very little is known beyond the fact that there was war between him and Rehoobam constantly (1 K 14 30). In 2 Ch 12 2-20 we read of an ignominious alliance with Abijah of Judah. When Shishak invaded Judah (1 K 14 25 f), he did not spare Israel, as appears from his inscription on the temple at Karnak, where a list of the towns captured by him is given. These belong to Northern Israel as well as to Judah,
showing that Shishak exacted tribute there, even if he used violence only in Judah. The fact that J. successfully managed a revolution but failed to establish a dynasty shows that his strength lay in the power of his personality more than in the soundness of his policy.

Despite the success of the revolution politically, J. dwelt in the卤o surrounding the temple and its ritual a danger which threatened the permanency of his kingdom. He justifiedly drew a warning in favor of the house of David, should the people make repeated religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem after the first passion of the rebellion had spent itself. He therefore resolved to establish national sanctuaries in Israel. Accordingly, he fixed on Bethel, which from time immemorial was one of the chief sanctuaries of the land (Gen 28:19; 35:1; Hos 12:4), and Dan, also a holy place since the conquest, as the chief centers of worship for Israel. J. now made "two calves of gold" as symbols of the strength and creative power of Jehu, and set them up in the sanctuaries at Bethel and Dan, where altars and other sacred objects already existed. It appears that many of the Hebrews went in the later period to Bethel to its image-worship (2 Ch 11:13 f). Accordingly, it found its necessity to institute a new, non-Levitical priesthood (1 K 13:33). A new and popular festival on the model of the feasts at Jerusalem was also established. J.'s policy might have been considered as a clever political move, had it not contained the dangerous appeal to the lower instincts of the masses, that led them into the immoralities of heathenism and hastened the destruction of the nation. J. sacrificed the higher interests of religion to politics. This was the "sin of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, wherewith he made Israel to sin" (1 K 12:30; 16:26).

It may be that many of the prophets sanctified J.'s religious policy. Whatever the attitude of the majority may have been, there was opposition to the image-worship. The prophetic movement in Jeroboam's day was by pure chance inaugurated at Bethel."A man of God out of Judah" appeared at Bethel and publicly denounced the import of his message was that the altar should be destroyed and the temple burned. The prophet warned the people to bring down the altar and the temple of David. The altar was saved from the wrath of the king only by a miracle. "The altar also was rent, and the ashes poured out from the altar." This narrative of 1 K 13 is usually considered to belong to a later time, but whatever the date of compilation, the general historicity of the account is little affected by it.

(2) The prophet Ahijah.—At a later date, when J. had realized his ambition, but not the ideal which the prophet had set before him, Ahijah predicted the consequences of his evil policy. J.'s eldest son had fallen sick. He thought of Ahijah, now old and blind, and sent the queen in disguise to learn the issue of the sickness. The prophet bade her to announce to J. that the house of J. should be extirpated root and branch; that the people whom he had seduced to idolatry should be uprooted from the land and transported beyond the river; and, severest of all, that her son should die. J. died in the 22d year of his reign, having "bequeathed to posterity the reputation of an apostate and a succession of endless revolutions."  

S. K. MOSTMAN

(2) Jeroboam II (2 K 14:25-29), son of Joash and 13th king of Israel; 4th sovereign of the dynasty of Jehu. He reigned 41 years. His accession may be placed c 798 BC (some date lower).

J. came into power on the crest of the wave of prosperity that followed the crushing of the supremacy of Damascus by his great victory at Aphek, followed by others, Joash had regained the territory lost to Israel in the reigns of Jehu and Jehoaz (2 K 13:25). This satisfied Joash, or his death prevented further hostilities. J., however, then a young man, resolved on a war of retaliation against Damascus, and on further conquests. The condition of the eastern world favored his projects, for Assyria was at the time engaged, under Shalmaneser III and Assurban, in a life-and-death struggle with Armenia. Syria being weakened, J. determined on a bold attempt to conquer and annex the whole kingdom of which Damascus was the capital. The steps of the campaign by which this was accomplished are unknown to us. The result only is recorded, that not only the intermediate territory fell into J.'s hands, but that Damascus itself was captured (2 K 14:28). Hamath was taken, and thus were restored the eastern boundaries of the kingdom, as they were in the days of Solomon (1 K 10:28). The time of J. is marked by the prophecy of the prophet of the time of "the entrance of Hamath" (Josh 13:5), a narrow pass leading into the valley of the Lebanon's, had been the accepted northern boundary of the promised land. This involved the subjection of Moab and Ammon, probably already tributaries of Damascus.

J.'s long reign of over 40 years gave time for the collected tribute of this greatly increased territory to flow into the coffers of Samaria, and J. could have the exactions ruthlessly enforced. The prophet Amos, a contemporary of J., in his later years, dwells on the cruelties inflicted on the trans-Jordanic tribes by Hazael, who "threw the Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" (Am 1:3). All this would be remembered now, and wealth to which the Northern Kingdom had been accustomed flowed into its treasuries. The bowls of unburned brick in which the citizens had lived were replaced by "houses of ivory" (Am 5:11). The ivory house which Ahab built in Samaria (1 K 22:39; decorations only are meant) was imitated, and there were many "great houses" (Am 3:15). The sovereign had both a political and a religious policy, which with the growth of the palace a banquet scene within one of these palatial abodes is likeable in its portraiture. The guests stretched themselves upon the silken cushions of the couches, eating the flesh of lambs and stall-fed calves, drinking wine from huge bowls, singing idle songs to the sound of viols, themselves perfumed and anointed with oil (Am 6:4-6). Meanwhile, they were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph, and cared nothing for the wrong-doing of which the country was full. Side by side with this luxury, the poor of the land were in the utmost distress. A case in which a man was sold into slavery for the price of a pair of shoes seems to have come to the prophet's knowledge, and is twice referred to by him (Am 2:6; 8:6). With all this, and as part of the social organization, religion of a kind flourished. Ritual took the place of righteousness; and in a memorable passage, Amos denounces the substitution of the one for the other (Am 3:13). From the banqueting hall worship took place in the sanctuaries of the golden calves, where the votaries prostrated themselves before the altar clothed in garments taken in cruel pledge, and drank sacrificial wine bought with the money of those who were
JERUZELM, je-roō'el, je-ro'ool (יהי), "founded by El"); Jahaziel prophesied that King Jehoshaphat should meet the hordes of Moabites and Ammonites, after they had come up by the "ascent of Ziz," "at the end of the valley [i.e. wady]", before the wilderness of Jeruel" (2 Ch 20:16). The particular part of the wilderness intended, is unknown. Cheyne (EB) thinks this may be an error for the Jezreel of Judah, mentioned in Josh 18:56, etc. See JEZEREEL.
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JERUZEALEM, je-roō'el, je-ro'ool (יהי), "founded by El"); Jahaziel prophesied that King Jehoshaphat should meet the hordes of Moabites and Ammonites, after they had come up by the "ascent of Ziz," "at the end of the valley [i.e. wady]", before the wilderness of Jeruel" (2 Ch 20:16). The particular part of the wilderness intended, is unknown. Cheyne (EB) thinks this may be an error for the Jezreel of Judah, mentioned in Josh 18:56, etc. See JEZEREEL.
have יִרְשָׁדּוּלִים, yərəshaləyim, a form which occurs on the Jewish coins of the Revolt and also in Jewish literature; it is commonly used by modern Talmudic Jews. The form was treated in the ending -əlim or -ayim is interpreted as some facing a dual, the one having the upper and lower Jerus, but such forms occur in other names as indicating special solemnity; such a pronunciation is both local and late.

In the LXX we have Ἱεροσολύμα (Ἱεροσολύμα), constantly used in the earliest and the common Hebrew pronunciation, the initial letter being probably unaspirated; soon, however, we meet with Ἱεροσολύμα (Ἱεροσολύμα)—with the aspirate—the common form in Jos. and Ἱεροσολύμα (Ἱεροσολύμα) elsewhere in Mac. (Books II-IV), and in Strabo. This last form has been carried over into the Lat writers, Cicer, Flinty, Tacitus and Suetonius. It was replaced in official use for some centuries by Hadrian’s Ἀκλία Κατολίνα, which occurs as late as Jerome, but it again comes into common use in the documents of the Crusades, while Solyma occurs at various periods as a poetic abbreviation.

In the NT we have Ἱεροσολύμα (Ἱεροσολύμα), particularly in the writings of St. Luke and St. Paul, Justin and Ῥά (Ἱεροσολύμα, Ῥά Χερουσαλήμ) elsewhere. The AV of 1611 has Jerusalem in the OT and Hierusalem in the NT. The form Jerusalem first occurs in Greek writings of the 12th cent.

With regard to the meaning of the original name there is no concurrence of opinion. The oldest known form, Uru-sa-li-mu, has been considered by many to mean either the “City of Peace” or the “City of [the] goblet” Salém, but other interpreters, considering the name as of Heb origin, interpret it as the “possess of peace” or “foundation of peace.” It is one of the ironies of history that a city which in all its long history has seen so little peace and for whose possession much of blood has been shed should have such a possible meaning for its name.

Other names for the city occur. For the name Jebus see Jere. In Is. 29 1, occurs the name בֵּית מֵלֶךְ, betel, probably “the hearth of God.” and in 1 26 the “city of righteousness.” In Ps. 72 16; Jer. 32 24 f; Ezek 7 23, we have the term הָרָה, hārā, “the city” in contrast to “the land.” A whole group of names is connected with the idea of the sanctity of the site: ἱρά καὶ ἱδανής, the “holy city” occurs in Isa. 48 2; 52 1; Neh 11 1, and yərəshaləyim ha-ḥādōšah, “Jerusalem the holy” is inscribed on Simon’s coins. In Mt. 4 5; 27 53 we have הֵרְאָה פֶּלֶת, hisaḥa pēlē, the “holy city,” and in Phil. Ἰεροσολύμα, Hieropolis, with the same meaning.

In Arab, the common name is بِئْطِلِمَة, bībatilma, “the holy house,” or el Maqādha, “the holy,” or the common name, used by the Moslems everywhere today, el Kuds, a shortened form of el Kūdāsh Shérif, “the holy sanctuary.”

Non-Moslems usually use the Arab form Yerusalem.

II. Geology, Climate and Springs.—The geology of the site and environs of Jerusalem is comparatively simple, when studied in connection with that of the land as a whole (see Geology of Palestine). The outstanding feature is that the rocks consist entirely of various forms of limestone, with strata containing flints; there are no primary rocks, no sandstone (such as comes to the surface on the E. of the Jordan) and no volcanic rocks. The lime-
stone formations are in regular strata dipping toward the S.E., with an angle of about 10°.

On the high hills overlooking Jerus on the E., S.E., and S.W. there still remain strata of considerable thickness of those chalky limestones of the post-Tertiary period which crown so many hilltops of Pal, and once covered the whole land. On the "Mount of Olives," for example, occurs a layer of conglomerate limestone known as Nabi 'Omar "firestone," and another thicker deposit, known as Ka'alkul, of which two distinct strata can be distinguished. In these layers, esp. the latter, occur pockets containing marl or haur, and in both there are beds of flint.

Over the central city's site all this has been denuded long ages ago. Here we have three layers of limestone of varying density very distinctly distinguished by all the native builders and masons:

1. Mizzeh helu, lit. "sweet mizzeh," a hard, reddish-grey layer capable of polish, and reaching in places to a depth of 70 ft. or more. The "holy rock" in the temple-area belongs to this layer, and much of the ancient building stone was of this nature.

2. Below this is the Melekh or "royal" layer, which, though not very thick—35 ft. or so—has been of great importance in the history of the city. This rock is peculiar in that when first exposed to the air it is often so soft that it can be cut with a knife, but under the influence of the atmosphere it hardens to make a stone of considerable durability, useful for ordinary buildings. The great importance of this layer, however, lies in the fact that in it have been excavated the hundreds of caverns, cisterns, Oases and aqueducts which honeycomb the city's site.

3. Under the Melekh is a Cenomanian limestone of great durability, known as Mizzeh Yehudeh, or "Jewish mizzeh." It is a highly valued building stone, though hard to work. Geologically it is distinguished from Mizzeh helu by its containing ammonites. Characteristically it is a yellowish-grey stone, sometimes slightly reddish. A variety of a distinctly reddish appearance, known as Mizzeh ahmar, or "red mizzeh," is used as ornamental stone for columns, tombstones, etc; it takes a high polish and is sometimes locally known as "marble."

This deep layer, which underlies the whole city, comes to the surface in the Kidron valley; all the monumental sites of Jerus underlies it. It contains the Virgin's Fount. The water over the site and environs of Jerus percolates with ease the upper layer, but is conducted to the surface by this hard layer; the comparatively superficial source of the water of this spring accounts for the poorness of its quality.

The broad features of the climate of Jerus have probably remained the same throughout history, although there is plenty of evidence that there have been cycles of greater and lesser abundance of rain. The almost countless cisterns belonging to all ages upon the site and the long and complicated conduits for bringing water from a distance, testify that over the greater part of history the rainfall must have been, as at present, only seasonal.

As a whole, the climate of Jerus may be considered healthy. The common diseases should be largely preventable—under all civilized conditions. The great menace, even in the malaria which so prevalent is to a large extent an importation from the low-lying country, and could be stopped at once, were sufficient means taken for destroying the carriers of infection, the abundant Anopheles mosquitoes. On account of its altitude and its exposed position, almost upon the watershed, wind, rain and cold are all more excessive than in the maritime plains or the Jordan valley. Although the winter's cold is severely felt, on account of its coldness with the days of heaviest rainfall (of Ez 10 9), and also because of the dwellings and clothes of the inhabitants being suited for enduring heat more than cold, the actual lowest cold recorded is only 25°, and frost occurs only on perhaps a dozen nights in an average year.

During the rainless summer months the mean temperature rises steadily until August, when it reaches 73.6°, but the days of greatest heat, with temperature over 100°, in the shade at times, occur commonly in September. In midsummer the cool northwest breezes, which generally blow during the afternoons and early night, do much to make life healthy. The most unpleasant days occur in May and from the middle of September until the end of October, when the dry southeast winds—the sirocco—blow hot and stifling from over the deserts, carrying with them at times fine dust sufficient in quantity to produce a marked haze in the atmosphere. At such times all vegetation droops, and most human beings, esp. residents not brought up under such conditions, suffer less from depression and physical discomfort; malarial, "sandfly," and other fevers are apt to be peculiarly prevalent. "At that time shall it be said . . . to Jerus, A hot wind from the bare heights in the wilderness toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow, nor to cleanse" (Jer 4 11).

During the late summer—except at spells of sirocco—heavy "dews" occur at night, and at the end of September or beginning of October "former" rains fall—not uncommonly in tropical downpours accompanied by thunder. After this there is frequently a dry spell of several weeks, and then the winter's rain falls in December, January and February. In some seasons an abundant rainfall in March gives peculiar satisfaction to the inhabitants by filling up the cisterns late in the season and by producing an abundant harvest. The average rainfall is about 20 in., the maximum recorded in the city being 42.56 in. in the position of the site, and the minimum being 12.5 in. in 1896–97. An abundant rainfall is not only important for storage, for replenishment of the springs and for the crops, but as the city's sewage largely accumulates in the very primitive drains, it requires a considerable force of water to remove it. Snow falls heavily in some seasons, causing considerable destruction to the badly built roofs and to the trees; in the winter of 1910–11 a fall of 9 in. occurred.

There is only one actual spring in the Jerus area, and even to this some authorities would deny the name of true spring on account of the comparatively shallow source of its origin; this is the inner spring, called by the Europeans Christian 'Ain Satti Miriam (the "spring of the Lady Mary"), and by the Muslims generally called "The Virgin's Fount." All the archaeological evidence points to this as the original source of attraction of earliest occupants of the site; in the OT this spring is known as Girih (q.v.). The water rises in the actual bottom, though apparently west side, of the Kidron valley some 300 yds. due S.W. from the city. The approach to the spring is down two flights of steps, an upper of 16 leading to a small-level platform, covered by a modern arch, and a lower, narrower flight of 14 steps, which ends at the mouth of a small cave. The water has its source in long a cleft (perhaps 16 ft. long) running E. and
W. in the rocky bed of the Kidron valley, now many feet below the present surface. The western or higher end of the channel at the entry entrance of the cave, but most of the water rushes forth from the lower and wider part which lies underneath the steps. When the water is scanty, the women of Siloam creep down into the cavity under the steps and fill their water-skins there; at such times no water at all finds its way into the cave. At the far end of the cave is the opening of that system of ancient tunnel-aqueducts which is described in VI, below. This spring is "intermittent," the water rising rapidly and gushing forth with considerable force several times in the rainy season, and only once or twice in the dry. This "intermittent" condition of springs is not uncommon in Pal, and is explained by the accumulation of the underground water in certain cavities or cracks in the rock, which together make up a reservoir which empties itself by syphon action. Where the accumulated water reaches the bend of the syphon, the overflow commences and continues to run until the reservoir is emptied. Such a phenomenon is naturally attributed to an underground agency by the ignorant—in this case, among the modern fellahin, to a dragon—and natives, specially Jews, visit the source, even today, at times of its overflow, for healing. Whether this intermittent condition of the fountain is, in ancient times, it is not possible to say, but, as Jerome (Comm. in Esa. 86) speaks of it, it was probably present in NT times, and if so we have a strong argument for finding here the "Pool of Bethesda." See BERSEBAY.

In ancient times all the water flowed down the open, rocky valley, but at an early period a wall was constructed to bank up the water and convert the source into a pool. Without such an arrangement no one could find its way into the cave and the tunnels. The tunnels, described below (VI), were constructed for the purpose (1) of reaching the water source from within the city walls, and (2) of preventing the enemies of the Jews from getting at the water through the spring (2 Chron. 24). The water of this source, though used for all purposes by the people of Siloam, is brackish to the taste, and contains a considerable percentage of sewage; it is quite unfit for drinking. This condition is doubtless due to the waste distribution of sewage, both intentionally (for irrigation of the gardens, for example) and unintentionally (through seepage, etc.), over the soil. The water then flows into the rocks from which the water flows. In earlier times the water was certainly purer, and it is probable, too, that the fountain was more copious, as new hundreds of cisterns imprison the waters which once found their way through the soil to the deep sources of the spring.

The waters of the Virgin’s Fount find their way through the Siloam tunnel and out at Ain Silaôn (the "spring" of Siloam), into the Pool of Siloam, and from this source descend into the Kidron valley to water the numerous vegetable gardens belonging to the village of Siloam (see SILOAM).

The second source of water in Jerusalem is the deep well known as Btr Egêb, "Job’s well," which is situated a little below the point where the Kidron valley and Hinnom meet. In all probability it derives its modern name from a legend in the Korân (Sura 36.60–41) which narrates that God commanded Abraham to erect a wall around the spring miraculously burst up. The well, which had been quite lost sight of, was rediscovered by the Crusaders in 1184 A.D., and was then cleaned out. It is 125 ft. deep. The supply of water in this well is quite measurable, although there is no better of that of the "Virgin’s Fount"; after several days of heavy rain the water overflows underground and bursts out a few yards lower down the valley as a little stream. It continues to run for a few days after a heavy fall of rain is over, and, in those latter days, is a district of attraction to the native residents of Jerusalem, who pour forth from the city to enjoy the rare sight of running water. Somewhere in the neighborhood of Btr Egêb must have lain 'En-Rogel, but if that were once an actual spring, its source is now buried under the great mound of rubbish accumulated here (see EN-ROGEL).

Nearly 600 yds. S. of Btr Egêb lies a small gravelly basin where, when the Btr Egêb overflows, a small spring called An el Lezath (the "spring of the almond") bursts forth. It is not a true spring, but is due to some of the water of Job’s well which finds its way along an ancient rock-cut aqueduct on the west side of the Wady en Når, bursting up here.

The only other possible site of a spring in the Jerusalem area is the Hamman esh Shefed, "the bath of healing." This is an underground rock-basin in the Tyropeon valley, within the city walls, in which water collects by percolation through the debris of the city. Though once a reservoir with probably rock-cut channels conducting water to it, it is now a deep well with arches erected over it at various periods, as the rubbish of the city gradually accumulated through the centuries. There is no evidence whatever of there being any natural fountain, and the water is used only as sewage, though used in a neighboring Turkish bath.

G. A. Smith thinks that the Jackal’s Well (q.v.) mentioned by Nehemiah (3, 13), which must have been situated in the Wady of Arnon, may possibly have had a temporary spring arising there for a few years in consequence of an earthquake, but it is extremely likely that any well sunk then would tap water flowing along the bed of the valley. There is no "spring," "pool," or "well" there today.

III. The Natural Site.—Modern Jerusalem occupies a situation defined geographically as 31°46’45’’ N. lat., by 35°13’25’’ E. long. It lies in the midst of a bare and rocky plateau, the environs being one of the most stony districts in the shipping parts of Pal, with shallow, grey or reddish soil and many outcrops of bare limestone. Like all the hills slopes with a southeasterly aspect, it is so thoroughly exposed to the full blaze of the summer sun that in its natural condition the site would have to be considerably watered, a result of diligent cultivation and frequent watering, a considerable growth of trees and shrubs has been produced in the rapidly extending suburbs. The only fruit tree which reaches perfection around Jerusalem is the olive.

The site of Jerusalem is shut in by a rough triangle of higher mountain ridges: to the W. runs the main ridge, or water parting, of Judaea, which here makes a sweep to the westward, from this ridge a spur runs S.E. and E., culminating due E. of the city in the Mount of Olives (q.v.), nearly 2,700 ft. above sea-level and about 300 ft. above the mean level of the ancient city. Another spur, known as Jebel Dib al Tur, 2,560 ft. high, runs E. from the plateau of el Buke’a and lies S.W. of the city; it is the traditional "Hill of Evil Counsel." The city site is thus dominated on all sides by these higher ranges: the mountains [that are round about] are: (1) Ps. 128.5, where Ps. 128.5, where on the one hand the ancient city was hidden, at any considerable distance, from any direction except the S.E., it is only through this open gap toward the desert and the mountains of Moab that any wide sweep of horizon is possible; (2) the wide nearness and distant mountain wall—often of exquisite loveliness in the light of the setting sun—must all through the ages have been the most familiar and the
The most potent of scenic influences to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Within the enfolding hills the city’s proper site is demarcated by two main valleys. That on the W. and S.W. commences in a hollow occupied by the Moslem cemetery around the pool Birket Mamilla. The valley runs due E. toward the modern Jaffa Gate, and there bends S., being known in this upper part of its course as the Wady el-Mab. In this southern course it is traversed by a great dam, along which the modern Bethlehem road runs, which converts a large area of the valley bed into a great pool, the Birket es-Sulûm. Below this the valley—under the name of Wady er-Râbûbi—bends E.S.E., then E., and finally S.E. again, until near Bîr Egyûth it joins the western valley to form the Wady en-Nâr, 670 ft. below its origin. This valley has been very generally identified as the Valley of Hinnom (see HINNOM).

2. The Valleys

The eastern valley takes a wider sweep. Commencing high up in the plateau to the N. of the city, near the great water-parting, it descends as a wide and open valley in a southerly direction until, where it is crossed by the Great North Road, being here known as Wady el-Jâs (the “Valley of the Walnuts”), it turns more directly E. It gradually curves to the S., and as it runs E. of the city walls, it receives the name of Wady Sûtî Miriam (the “Valley of the Lady Mary”). Below the S.E. corner of the temple-area, near the traditional “Tomb of Absalom,” the valley rapidly deepens and takes a direction slightly to the W. of S. It passes the “Virgin’s Point,” and a quarter of a mile lower it is joined by el Wâd from the N., and a little farther on by the Wady er Râbûbî from the W. South of Bîr Egyûth, the valley formed by their union is continued under the name of Wady en Nâr to the Dead Sea. This western valley is that commonly known as the Brook Kidron, or, more shortly, the “Brook” (wâlûb), as it is run by Moslems, but named from the 5th cent. onward by Christians the Valley of Jehoshaphat (q.v.). The rocky tongue of land inclosed between these deep ravines, an area, roughly speaking, a little over one mile long by half a mile wide, is further subdivided into a number of distinct hills by some shallower valleys. The most prominent of these—indeed the only one noticeable to the superficial observer today—is the great central valley known to modern times by the single name el Wâd, “the valley.” Upon this slight depression of the ground a little N. of the modern “Damascus Gate,” and after entering the city at this gate it rapidly deepens—a fact largely disguised today by the great accumulation of rubbish in its course. It traverses the city with the Haram to its east, and the Christian and Moslem quarters on rapidly rising ground to its west. Its course is observed near the Bâb es-Sûlûm, where it is crossed by an ancient causeway, but farther W. in the valley Eyyûb, narrowing the valley of S. Haram (near the “wailing place” and “Robinson’s arch”) on the E., and steep cliffs crossed by houses of the Jewish quarter on the W. It leaves the city at the “Dung Gate,” and passes with an open curve to the E., until it reaches the Pool of Siloam, below which it merges in the Wady Sûtî Miriam. This is the course of the main valley, but a branch of great importance in the ancient topography of the city starts some 50 yds. to the W. of the modern Jaffa Gate and runs down the eastern part generally known to travelers as “David’s Street,” and thus easterly, along the Tartâ bâb es-Sûlûm, until it merges in the main valley. The main valley is usually considered to be the Tyropocon, or “Cheesemongers’ Valley” of Jos., but modern writers have attempted to confine the name esp. to this western arm of it.

Another interior valley, which is known rather by the rock contours, than by surface observations, being largely filled up today, cuts diagonally across the N.E. corner of the modern city. It has no modern name, though it is sometimes called “St. Anne’s Valley.” It rises in the plateau near “Herod’s Gate,” known as es Sahra, and entering the city about 100 yds. to the E. of that gate, runs S.S.E., and leaves the city between the N.E. angle of the Haram and the Golden Gate, joining the Kidron valley farther S.E. The Birket Israeli runs across the width of this valley, which had far more influence in determining the ancient topography of the city than has been popularly recognized. There is an artificially made valley between the Haram and the buildings to its north, and there is thought by many to be a valley between the S.E. hill, commonly called “Ophéa” and the temple. Such, then, are the valleys, great and small, by which the historic hills on which the city stood are defined. All of them, particularly in their southern parts, were considerably deeper in ancient times, and in places the accumulated debris is 80 ft. or more. All of them were originally torrent beds, dry except immediately after heavy rain. The only perennial outflow of water is the scanty and intermittent stream which overflows from the Pool of Siloam, and is used to irrigate the gardens in the Wady Sûtî Miriam.

The E. and W. valleys isolate a roughly quadrilateral tongue of land running from N.W.W. to S.S.E., and tilted so as to face S.E. Here Jerusalem, S.S.W., and S.W., and E. of them, ran, with the Haram, and the commencement of the Kidron valley to the E. Within the city walls it rises as high as 2,561 ft. near the northwestern corner. It is divided by the west branch of the Tyropocon valley into two parts: a northern part—the western hill—on which is situated today the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the greater part of the “Christian quarter” of the city, and a southern hill—
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the southwestern—which is connected with the northwestern hill by but a narrow saddle—50 yds. wide—calls the Jaffa Gate. This hill sustains the so-called "Tower of David," the baracks and the Armenian quarter within the walls, and the Conoculum and adjacent buildings outside the walls. This hill is from 2,500 to 2,350 ft. high along its summit, but drops rapidly on its southwestern, southern and southeastern sides. In its central part it falls much more gently toward the eastern hill across the now largely filled valley el Wadi.

The eastern ridge may be reckoned as beginning at the rocky hill el Edhemiyeh—popularly known as Gordon's Calvary—but the wide trench made here by quarrying somewhat obscures this fact. The ridge may for convenience be regarded as presenting the same trends as the central or central-eastern, and southeastern summits. The northeastern hill within the modern wall supports the Moslem quarter, and rises in places to a height of over 2,500 ft.; it narrows to a mere neck near the "Tecer Homo" arch, where it is joined to the baracks, on the site of the ancient Antonia. Under the present surface it is here separated from the temple summit by a deep rocky trench.

The central, or central-eastern, summit is that of Sakhra, the sacred temple rock, which is 2,404 ft. high. This is the highest point from which the ground rapidly falls E., W., and S., but the natural contours of the adjacent ground are much obscured by the great substructures which have been made to sustain the temple platform.

The sloping, southeastern, hill, S. of the templearea appears today, at any rate, to have a steady fall of from 2,350 ft. just S. of the Haram southern wall to a little over 2,100 ft. near the Pool of Siloam. It is a narrow neck of 150 yds., but its chief feature, its natural strength, is today greatly obscured on account of the rubbish which slopes down its sides and largely fills up its surrounding valleys. In earlier times, at least three of its sides were protected by deep valleys, and probably on quite two-thirds of its entire surface by natural rocky scars. According to Professor Guthe, this hill is divided from the higher ground to the N. by a depression 12 ft. deep and 50–50 yds. wide, but this has not been confirmed by other observers. The city covering so hilly a site as this must ever have consisted, as it does today, of houses terraced on steep slopes with stairways for streets.

IV. General Topography of Jerusalem.—From the foregoing descript. of the "natural site," it will be seen that we have to deal with 5 natural subdivisions or hills, two on the western and three on the eastern ridges.

In discussing the topography it is useful to commence with the description of the summit, where we give to these 6 areas the same common in his day (BJ, V, iv, 1, 2). He says: "The city was built upon two hills Josephus which are opposite to one another and have a valley to divide them asunder. . . . Now the Valley of the Cheesemongers, as it was called, and was that which distinguished the hill of the upper city from that of the lower, extended as far as Siloam" (ib, V, iv, 1). Here we get the first prominent physical feature, the bissection of the city into two main hills. Further on, however, in the same passage—one, it must be admitted, of some obscurity—Jos distinguishes 5 distinct regions:

1. The Upper City or Upper Market Place: (The hill) which sustains the upper city is much higher and in length more direct. Accordingly, it was called the citadel (σπαρών, phoritron) of King David. . . . but it is us called the Upper Market Place." This is without dispute the southwestern hill.

2. Akra and Lower City: "The other hill, which was called Akra, and sustains the lower city, is double-curved" (αψιδαι, amphi kurtos). The description can apply only to the semicircular shape of the southeastern hill, as viewed from the "upper city." These names, "Akra" and "Lower City," are, with reservations, therefore, to be applied to the southeastern hill.

3. The Temple Hill: Josephus' description here is curious, on account of its indefiniteness, but there can be no question as to which hill he intends. He writes: "Over against this is a third hill, but naturally lower than the Akra and parted formerly from the other by a flat valley. However, in those times when the Hasmonaean reigned, they did away with this valley, wishing to connect the city with the temple: and cutting down the summit of the Akra, they made it lower, so that the temple might be visible over it." Comparison with other passages shows that this "third hill" is the central-eastern— the Temple Hill.

4. Betzhetha: "It was Agrippa who encompassed the parts added to the old city with this wall (i.e. the third wall) which had been all naked before; for as the city grew more populous, it gradually crept beyond its old limits, and those parts of it that stood northward of the Temple, and seemed a hill to the city, made it considerably larger, and occasioned that hill which is in number the fourth, and is called 'Bezetha,' to be inhabited also. It lies over against the tower Antonia, but is divided from it by a deep valley, which was dug on purpose. This new-built part of the city was called 'Bezetha' in our language, which, if interpreted in the Gr. language, may be called the 'New City.'"

5. The Northern Quarter of the City: From the account of the walls given by Jos, it is evident that the northern part of his "first wall" ran along the northern edge of the southwestern hill; the second wall inclosed the inhabited part of the northwestern hill. This wall or rampart took its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath in the first wall, and inclosing the northern quarter only reached to the Antonia. This area is not described as a separate hill, as the inhabited area, except on the S., was defined by natural valleys, and besides covering the northwestern hill, must have extended into the Tyropeon valley. Here then we have Josephus' names for these five districts: (1) "the two mountains Hill, or "Upper City" and "Upper Market Place"; also the 2. Summary Phoritron, or "fortress of David." Of Names From the 4th cent. AD, this hill has. Of the Five also been known as "Zion," and on it Hills Jos, the so-called "Tower of David," built on the foundations of two of Herod's great towers.

2. Summary Phoritron, or "fortress of David." Of Names From the 4th cent. AD, this hill has. Of the Five also been known as "Zion," and on it Hills Jos, the so-called "Tower of David," built on the foundations of two of Herod's great towers.

6. The Northern Hill: "Bezetha" or "New City," even now somewhat sparsely inhabited area, has no name in Bib. literature.

3. The Northern Quarter of the City: From the account of the walls given by Jos, it is evident that the northern part of his "first wall" ran along the northern edge of the southwestern hill; the second wall inclosed the inhabited part of the northwestern hill. This wall or rampart took its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath in the first wall, and inclosing the northern quarter only reached to the Antonia. This area is not described as a separate hill, as the inhabited area, except on the S., was defined by natural valleys, and besides covering the northwestern hill, must have extended into the Tyropeon valley. Here then we have Josephus' names for these five districts: (1) "the two mountains Hill, or "Upper City" and "Upper Market Place"; also the 2. Summary Phoritron, or "fortress of David." Of Names From the 4th cent. AD, this hill has. Of the Five also been known as "Zion," and on it Hills Jos, the so-called "Tower of David," built on the foundations of two of Herod's great towers.

5. Northeastern Hill: "Bezetha" or "New City," even now somewhat sparsely inhabited area, has no name in Bib. literature.

4. Central-eastern Hill: The "third hill" of Jos, clearly the site of the Temple which, as Jos says (BJ, V, v), "was built upon a strong hill." In
earlier times it was the “threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite.” On the question whether it has any claims to be the Moriah of Gen 22:2, as it is called in 1 Ch. 16:39, see MORIATH. The temple hill is also in many of the Heb writings called ZION, on which point see ZION.

(5) Southeastern Hill: This Jos calls “Akra” and “Lower City,” but while on the one hand these names require some elucidation, there are other names which have at one period or another come to be applied to this hill, viz. “City of David,” “ZION” and “Ophel.” These names for this hill we shall now deal with in order.

In spite of the very definite description of Jos, there has been considerable difference of opinion regarding the situation of the “Akra.”

3. The Akra

Various parts of the northwestern, the northeastern, the southeastern hills, and even the central-eastern itself, have been suggested by earlier authorities, but instead of considering the various arguments, now largely out of date, for other proposed sites, it will be better to deal with the positive arguments for the southeastern hill. Jos states that in his day the term “Akra” was applied to the southeastern hill, but in references to the earlier history it is clear that the Akra was not a whole hill, but a definite fortress (ἀκρα, ἀκρων = “fortress”).

(1) It was situated on the site, or on part of the site, which was considered in the days of the Maccabees to have been the “City of David.” Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BC), after destroying Jerus., fortified the city of David with a great and strong wall, with strong towers and it became unto them an Akra (1 Mac 3:33-36). The formidable fortress—known henceforth as the “Akra”—became a constant menace to the Jews, until at length, in 142 BC, it was captured by Simon, who not only razed the whole fortress, but, according to Jos (Ant, XIII, vi, 7; BJ, V, iv, 1), actually cut down the hill on which it stood. He says that “they all, labouring zealously, demolished the hill, and ceasing not from the work night and day for three whole years, brought it to a level and even slope, so that the Temple became the highest of all after the Akra and the hill upon which it was built had been removed” (Ant, XIII, vi, 7). The fact that at the time of Jos this hill was evidently lower than the temple hill is in itself sufficient argument against an Akra which would place the Temple on the northwestern or southeastern hills. (2) The Akra was close to the temple (1 Mac 13:52), and from its walls the garrison could actually overlook it (1 Mac 14:36). Before the hill was cut down it obscured the temple site (6b). (3) It is identified by Jos as forming part, at least, of the lower city, which (see below) bordered upon the temple (cf BJ, I, i, 4; V, iv, 1; vi, 1). (4) The LXX identifies the Akra with Millo (2 S 5:9; 1 K 9 13-24; 2 Ch 32:5).

Allowing that the original Akra of the Syrians was on the southeastern hill, it is still a matter of some difficulty to determine whereabouts it stood, e.g., as if the statements of Jos are correct, the natural configuration of the ground has been greatly altered. The most prominent point upon the southeastern hill, in the neighborhood of Gihon, appears to have been occupied by the Jebusite fortress of Zion (q.v.), but the site of the Akra can hardly be identical with this, for this became the “City of David” and here were the venerated tombs of David and the Judean kings, which must have been destroyed if this hill was, as Jos states, cut down. On this and other grounds we must look for a site farther north. Sir Charles Watson (PEPS, 1906, 1907) has produced strong topographical and literary arguments for placing it where the al Aksa mosque is today; other writers are more inclined to put it farther south, somewhere in the neighborhood of the massive tower discovered by Warde on the “threshing-floor.” If the account of Jos, written two centuries after the events, is to be taken as literal, then Watson’s view is the more probable. Jos, as we have seen, identified the Akra of his day with the Lower City. This latter is not a name occurring in the Bible, as will be shown, the OT name for Lower City this part was “City of David.” That by Lower City Jos means the southeastern hill is shown by many facts. It is actually the lowest part of the city, as compared with the “Upper City,” Temple Hill and the Bezetha; it is, as Jos describes, separated from the Upper City by a deep valley—the Tyropoön; this southeastern hill is “double-curved,” as Jos describes, and lastly several passages in his writings show that the Lower City was associated with the Temple on the one end and the Pool of Siloam at the other (cf Ant, XIV, xvi, 2; BJ, II, xvii, 5; IV, ix, 12; VI, vi, 3; vii, 2).

In the wider sense the “Lower City” must have included, not only the section of the city covering the southeastern hill up to the ridge, but parts of other hills, where were the palaces (BJ, V, vi, 1; VI, vi, 3), and the homes of the well-to-do, but also that in the valley of the Tyropoön from Siloam up to the Council House, which was near the northern “first wall” (cf BJ, V, iv, 2), a part doubtless inhabited by the poorest.

It is clear (2 S 5:7; 1 Ch 11:5) that the citadel “Zion” of the Jebusites became the “City of David,” or as G. A. Smith calls it, “David’s hill,” after it was reoccupied by David and his people. The arguments for placing Zion “ZION” on the southeastern hill are given elsewhere (see ZION), but a few acts relevant esp. to the “City of David” may be mentioned here: the capture of the Jebusite city by means of the gutter (2 S 5:8), which is most reasonably explained as “Warren’s Shaft!” (VII); the references to David’s halt on his flight (2 S 15:23), and his sending Solomon to Gihon to be crowned (1 K 1:33), and the common expression “up,” used in describing the transference of the Ark from the City of David to the Temple Hill (1 K 8:1; 2 Ch 5:2; cf 1 K 9:24), are all consistent with this view. More convincing are the references to Hezekiah’s aqueduct which brought the water “on the west side of the city of David” (2 Ch 32:30); the mention of the City of David as adjacent to the Pool of Shelah (or Siloam; cf Is 8:6), and the “king’s garden” in Neh 3:15, and the position of the Fountain Gate in this passage and Neh 12:37; and the statement that Manasseb built “an outer wall to the City of David, on the west side of Gihon” in the nahal, i.e. the Kidron valley (2 Ch 33:14).

The name appears to have had a wider significance as the city grew. Originally “City of David” was only the name of the Jebusite fort, but later it became equivalent to the whole southeastern hill. In the same way, Akra was originally the name of the Syrian fort, but the name became extended to the whole southeastern hill. Jos speaks of the “City of David” and “Akra” as synonymous, and applies to both the name “Lower City.” For the names Ophel and Opheles see OPHEL.

V. Excavations and Antiquities.—During the last hundred years excursions to Jerusalem have been made by a large number of engineers and archaeologists and have furnished an enormous mass of observations for the understanding of the condition of ancient Jerusalem. Some of the most important are as follows:

In 1883 Meiser, Bonomi, Catherwood and Arundale made a first thorough survey of the Haram (temple-area),
a work which was the foundation of all subsequent maps for over a hundred years.

In 1838, and again in 1839, the famous American traveler and writer Dr. E. L. Wilson, published an account of his explorations in southern Palestine. In 1846-48 he was employed by Lieutenant-Colonel A. W. B. Durand, of the Ordnance Survey Department of Great Britain, to superintend the survey of Jerusalem, with a view to furnishing the city with a satisfactory water-supply, and to provide for the safety of the sanctuary.

In 1877-78 Captain (later Lieutenant-General Sir) Charles Warren, R.E., carried out a series of most exciting and original excavations all over the south of the Holy Land, and of Tentative excavations and observations in the same area. In 1876 he was employed by the British Ordnance Survey of Great Britain, and of the Holy Land.

In 1882 the Palestine Exploration Fund was constituted, for the purpose of investigating the topography of the land, and natural history of the Holy Land.

In 1885 Mr. Harry Maudslay, taking advantage of the occasion of the rebuilding of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, made a careful examination of the remarkable rock cuttings which are now incorporated in the buildings, and made considerable excavations, the results being described in the April (1886) number of ZDPV. In 1881 Professor Guthe made a series of important observations on the topography of Jerusalem, and his results are published in ZDPV, 1883.

M. Clermont-Ganneau, who was resident in Jerusalem in the French consular service, made many, from 1886 onward, a large number of excavations and observations on the archaeology of Jerusalem, and of the surrounding countryside, the results of which were published by the PEF. Another name honored in connection with the careful study of the topography of Jerusalem is that of Rev. S. J. Morse, the late American consul at Jerusalem.

In 1897-98 the Palestine Exploration Fund conducted an elaborate series of excavations with a view to determining the position of the ancient southern walls under the direction of Mr. Budge. The records of the work of these excavations are published in ZDPV, and the results of the work are now embodied in a topographical map of the city.

Bliss and Dickie, the authors of the Archæology of Jerusalem, have published a number of other works on the subject, including a monograph on the ancient walls of the city, and a number of smaller works on various aspects of the archaeology of Jerusalem.

Following upon these excavations a number of private investigations have been made by the Augustinians in Jerusalem, and a number of excavations in the neighborhood of the city have been carried on by the PEF, and the results of these investigations have been published in ZDPV.

In 1899-1901 a party of Englishmen, under Captain the Hon. Maj. R. M. Bowley, made a number of explorations with very elaborate tunnels upon the hill of Ophel, immediately above the Virgin's Tomb. In the course of their work, they cleared out the whole of Siloam; they opened up some new passages, they reconstructed the Siloam Pool, and discovered a number of ancient tombs, one of which was the tomb of the Virgin Mary, and another of which was the tomb of the Virgin's Brother, St. James the Less, which was discovered in 1899.

In 1901-02 a party of Englishmen, under Captain the Hon. Maj. R. M. Bowley, made a number of explorations with very elaborate tunnels upon the hill of Ophel, immediately above the Virgin's Tomb. In the course of their work, they cleared out the whole of Siloam; they opened up some new passages, they reconstructed the Siloam Pool, and discovered a number of ancient tombs, one of which was the tomb of the Virgin Mary, and another of which was the tomb of the Virgin's Brother, St. James the Less, which was discovered in 1899.

In 1901-02 a party of Englishmen, under Captain the Hon. Maj. R. M. Bowley, made a number of explorations with very elaborate tunnels upon the hill of Ophel, immediately above the Virgin's Tomb. In the course of their work, they cleared out the whole of Siloam; they opened up some new passages, they reconstructed the Siloam Pool, and discovered a number of ancient tombs, one of which was the tomb of the Virgin Mary, and another of which was the tomb of the Virgin's Brother, St. James the Less, which was discovered in 1899.
tremites of the southern wall, thus determined by the temple-platform and legionary camp, respectively, was probably that area followed by the southern wall of Herod's city Aelia.

Of the 8 existing city gates, on the west side there is but one, Bāb el Khadd (the "Gate of Hebron"), commonly known to travelers as the Jaffa Gate. It is probably the site of several earlier gates. On the N. there are 3 gates, Bāb Abūl Ḥamīd (named after the sultan who made it) or the "New Gate"; Bāb el ʿAmād ("Gate of the Columns"), now commonly called the "Damascus Gate"; but more ancienly known as "St. Stephen's Gate," and clearly, from the existing remains, the site of an earlier gateway; and, still farther east, the Bāb es Sābīrah ("Gate of the Plain"), or "Herod's Gate.

3. The Existing Gates are 3 gates, Bāb Abūl Ḥamīd (named after the sultan who made it) or the "New Gate"; Bāb el ʿAmād ("Gate of the Columns"), now commonly called the "Damascus Gate"; but more ancienly known as "St. Stephen's Gate," and clearly, from the existing remains, the site of an earlier gateway; and, still farther east, the Bāb es Sābīrah ("Gate of the Plain"), or "Herod's Gate.

On the east side the only open gate is the Bāb el ʿAtib ("Gate of the Tribes"), commonly called by native Christians, Bāb Sītū Mirīm ("Gate of the Lady Mary"), but in European guide-books called "St. Stephen's Gate." A little farther S., near the northeastern corner of the Haram is the great walled-up Byzantine Gate, known as Bāb ed ʿDahīrīyeh ("Gate of the Conqueror"), but to Europeans as the "Golden Gate." This structure has been variously ascribed to Justinian and Herachus, but there are massive blocks which belong to a much earlier structure, and early Christian tradition places the "Beautiful Gate" of the Temple here. In the southern wall are two city gates; one, insignificant and mean, occupies the center of el Wād and is known as Bāb el Mughāribeh ("Gate of the Moor"), and to Europeans as the "Dung Gate"; the other, which is on the crown of the western hill, traditional Zion, is the important Bāb Nebī Daouud ("Gate of the Prophet David"), or the "Zion Gate."

All three gates assumed their present form at the time of the reconstruction of the walls by Suleiman the Magnificent, but the more important ones occupy the sites of earlier gates. Their names have varied very much even since the times of the Crusaders. The multiplicity of names for these various gates—they all have two or three today—and their frequent changes are worth noticing in connection with the fact that in the OT history some of the gates appear to have had two or more names.

the Heb history of the city. The sanctity of the Holy Sepulchre has caused the city life to center itself more and more around that sanctuary, thereby greatly confusing the ancient topography for many centuries.

(1) Warren's excavations revealed: (a) a massive masonry wall 46 ft. E. of the Golden Gate, which closed curved toward the W. at its northern end, following the ancient wall of the city in pre-Herodian times.

4. Buried in the southeastern hill is a rock-cut burial vault, the exact nature of which cannot be determined, but which is said to be the sepulcher of the Queen of Sheba.

Moeran cemetery outside the eastern wall of the Haram precludes the possibility of any more excavations in this neighborhood. (b) More important remains in the southeastern hill, commonly known as "Ophel." Here commencing at the southeastern angle of the Haram, Warren uncovered a wall 14½ ft. thick running S. for 90 ft. and then S.W. along the edge of the hill for 700 ft. This wall, which shows at least two periods of construction, abuts on the sanctuary wall with a straight point. Along its course were found 4 small towers with a projection of 6 ft. and a face from 22 to 28 ft. broad, and a great corner tower projecting 41½ ft. from the wall and with a face 50 ft. broad. The face of this great tower consists of stones one to two ft. high and 2 to 3 ft. long, it is crowned by a rock-cut stairway; upon this massive foundation must have stood a great tower at what was in ancient times the southeastern corner of the city. From this point a scarp facing westward was traced for 100 ft. northward toward the modern southwestern angle of the walls, while a rock scarp, in places 40 ft. high on the outer or southern side and at least 14 ft. on the inner face, was followed for 250 ft. eastward until it reached another great rock projection with a face of 43 ft. Although no stones were found in situ, it is evident that such great rock cuttings must have supported a wall and tower of extraordinary strength, and hundreds of massive squared stones belonging to this wall are now incorporated in neighboring buildings.

(4) Bliss and Dickie's work commenced at the southeastern extremity of Maudslay's scarp, where was the above-mentioned massive projection for a tower, and here were found several courses of masonry still in situ. This tower appears to have been at the point of divergence of two distinct lines of wall, one of which ran in a direction N.E., skirting the edge of the southeastern hill, and probably joined the line of the modern walls at the ruined masonry tower known as Būy el Khebbī, and swung S.E. down toward the Pool of Siloam, along the edge of the Wādī er Rabbābī (Hinnom). The former of these walls cannot be very ancient, because of the occurrence of late Byzantine moldings in its foundations.

The excaovations revealed in the city area about 435-450 AD (see IX, 55), and also in the 14th century. Bliss considers it probable that this is the wall built in 1239
by Frederick II, and it is certainly that depicted in the map of Marino Sanuto (1521 AD). Although the masonry remains comparatively fine, there were some reasons for thinking that at a much earlier date a wall took a similar direction along the edge of the southwestern hill; and it is an attractive theory, though unsupported by any very definite archaeological evidence, that the wall of Solomon took also this general line. The wall running S.E. from the tower, along the edge of the gorge of Hinnom, is historically of much greater importance. Bliss's investigations showed that here were remains belonging to several periods, covering altogether considerably over a millennium. The upper line of wall was of fine masonry, with stones 1 ft. by 3 ft. in size, beautifully jointed and finely dressed; in some places this wall was founded upon the remains of the lower wall, in others a layer of debris intervened. It is impossible that this upper wall can be pre-Rom, and Bliss ascribes it to the Empress Eudoxia (see IX, 55). The lower wall rested upon the rock and showed at least 3 periods of construction. In the earliest the stones had broad margins and were carefully jointed, without mortar. This may have been the work of Solomon or one of the early kings of Judah. The later remains are evidently of the nature of repairs, and include the work of the Judaeans, kings of Nehemiah, and of all the wall-repairers, down to the destruction in 70 AD. At somewhat irregular intervals along the wall were towers of very similar projection and breadth to those found on Warren's wall on the southern hill. These wall foundations were traced—except for an interval where they passed under a Jewish cemetery—all the way to the mouth of the Tyropoeon valley. The upper wall disappeared (the stones having been all removed for later buildings) before the Jewish cemetery was reached. During most periods, if not indeed in all, the wall was carried across the mouth of the Tyropoeon valley upon a great dam of which the massive foundations still exist under the southern hill. The wall foundations were traced—except for an interval where they passed under a Jewish cemetery—all the way to the mouth of the Tyropoeon valley. The upper wall disappeared (the stones having been all removed for later buildings) before the Jewish cemetery was reached.

5. The Great Dam of the Tyropoeon the Birket el Hamra (see SILOAM). This ancient dam evidently once supported a pool in the mouth of the Tyropoeon, and it showed evident signs of both battering and of repairs. Although it is clear that during the greater part of Jewish history, before and after the captivity, the southern wall of Jerusalem crossed upon this dam, there were remains of walls found which tended to show that at one period, at any rate, the wall circled round the two Siloam pools, leaving them outside the fortifications.

In the stretch of wall from "Maudslay's Scarp" to the Tyropoeon valley remains of 2 city gates were found, and doubtful indications of another. The character of the masonry tended to show that the gate belonged to the upper wall, which is apparently entirely of the Christian era. If this is so, this cannot be the "Gate of the Gaii" of Neh 3:12, although the earlier gate may have occupied this site. Bliss suggests as a probable position for this gate an interval between the two contiguous towers IV and V, a little farther to the W. of the gate was a small pool 10 ft. 10 in. wide, marked only by the cuttings in the rock for the door sockets. It lay a little to the W. of the city gate next to be described, and both from its position and its insignificance, it does not appear to have been an entrance to the city; it may, as Bliss suggests, have had some comparatively later use.

The second great city gateway was found some 200 ft. S. of the Birket el Hamra, close to the southeastern angle of the ancient wall. The existing remains are bonded into walls of the earlier period, but the three superimposed door sills, with their sockets—to be seen uncovered today in situ—mark three distinct periods of long duration. The gate gave access to the great main street running down the Tyropoeon, underneath which ran a great rock-cut drain, which probably traveled to the middle valley of the city. During the last two periods of the gate's use, a tower was erected—at the exact southeastern angle—to protect the entrance. The earliest remains here probably belong to the Jewish kings, and it is very probable that we have here the "Gate calleth by Neh 3:12 the "Dung Gate." Bliss considered that it might be the "Fountain Gate" (Neh 3:15), which, however, was probably more to the E., although Bliss could find no remains of it surviving. The repairs and alterations here have been extensive, so that its disappearance is in no way surprising. The Fountain Gate is almost certainly identical with the "Gate between the Two Walls," through which Zebedee and his men of war fled (2 K 5:5; Jer. 39:4; 52:7).

The most definite account of the old walls is that of Jos (BJ, V, iv, 1, 2), and though it referred primarily to the existing walls of his day, is a convenient point for commencing the historical survey. He describes the walls three walls. The first wall "began on the N., at the tower called Hippicus, and extended as far as the Xistus, and then running across the street at the Cyrenian gate, to the eastern cloister of the temple." On the course of this section of the wall there is no dispute. The tower Hippicus was close to the present Jaffa Gate, and the wall ran from here almost due W. to the temple-area along the southern edge of the western arm of the Tyropoeon (see III, 2, above). It is probable that the Haret ed Dawâyeh, a street running nearly parallel with the neighboring "David Street," but high up above the Siloam and the lower parts of this wall. It must have crossed the main Tyropoeon near the Tarīk bāb es Sila‘il, and joined the western cloisters close to where the Mekhenneth, the present "Council House," is situated.

Jos traces the southern course of the first wall thus: "It began at the same place [i.e. Hippicus], and extended through a place called Bethaso to the gate of the Essenes; and after that it went southward, having its bending above the fountain Siloam, when it also bends again toward the E. at Solomon's Pool, and reaches as far as a certain place which they called 'Ophlas,' where it was joined to the eastern cloister of the temple." Although the main course of this wall was followed with pick and shovel, several points are still uncertain. Bethaso is not known, but must have been close to the southwestern angle, which, as we have seen, was situated where "Bishop Gobat's School" is today. It is very probably identical with the "Tower of the Furnaces" of Neh 3:11, while the "Gate of the Essenes" must have been near, if not identical with, the "Gate of the Gaii" of ver 13. The description of Jos certainly seems to imply that the mouth of the Siloam aqueduct ("fountain of Siloam") and the pools were both outside the wall, as can be seen from these indications in the underground remains that this was the case at one period. Solomon's Pool is very probably represented by the
modern Birket el Hamra. It is clear that the wall from here to the southeastern angle of the templeplate followed the edge of the southeastern hill, and coincided farther north with the old wall excavated by Warren. As will be shown below, this first wall was the main fortification of the city from the time of the kings of Judah onward. In the time of Jos, this first wall had 60 towers.

From it the probable Second view in and the wall with cavated and unknown Tower no wall. with no wall below), described by Josephus. The "Second Wall" was probably added in the days of the Hasmonean rulers; the "Third Wall" was commenced by Herod Agrippa I and hurriedly finished shortly before the siege by Titus.

The Second Wall of Jos "took its beginning from that gate which they called 'Gennath,' which belonged to the first wall: it only encompassed the northern quarter of the city and reached as far as the tower Antonia" (ib). In no part of Jerusalem topography has there been more disagreement than upon this wall, both as regards its curve and as regards its date of origin. Unfortunately, we have no idea at all where the "Gate Gennath" was. The Tower Antonia we know. The line must have passed in a curved or zigzag direction from some unknown point on the first wall, i.e. between the Jaffa Gate and the Haram to the Antonia. A considerable number of authorities in the past and a few careful students today would identify the general course of this wall with that of the modern northern wall. The greatest objections to this view are that no really satisfactory alternative course has been laid down for the third wall (see below), and that it must have run far N. of the Antonia, a course which does not seem to agree with the description of Jos, which states that the wall "went up" to the Antonia. On the other hand, no certain remains of any city wall within the present north wall have ever been found; fragments have been reported by various observers (e.g. the piece referred to as forming the eastern wall of the so-called "Pool of Hezekiah"; see VII, ii, below), but in an area so frequently desolated and rebuilt upon—where the demand for squared stones must always have been great—it is probable that the traces, if surviving at all, are very scanty. This is the case with the south wall excavated by Bliss (see VI), and that neighborhood has for many centuries been unbuilt upon. It is quite probable that the area included within the second wall may have been quite small, merely the buildings which clustered along the sides of the Tyropoeon. The 40 towers may have been small and built close together, because the position was, from the military aspect, weak. It must be remembered that it was the unsatisfactory state of the second wall which necessitated a third wall. There is no absolute reason why it may not have excluded the greater part of the northwestern hill—and with it the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—but there is no proof that it did. The date of the second wall is unknown (see below).

This third wall, which was commenced after the time of Christ by Herod Agrippa I, is described in more detail by Jos. It was begun 10. Third upon an elaborate plan, but was not Wall finished in its original design because Agrippa feared Claudius Caesar, lest he should suspect that so strong a wall was built in order to make some innovation in public affairs" (BJ, V, iv, 2). It, however, at the time of the siege, was of a breadth of over 18 ft., and a height of 40 ft., and had 90 massive towers. Jos describes it as beginning at the tower Hippicus (near the Jaffa Gate), "where it reached as far as the north quarter of the city, and the tower Psephinus. This mighty tower, 155 ft. high, was at the northwestern corner and overlooked the whole city. From it, according to Jos (BJ, V, vi, 3), there was a view of Arabia (Mosh) at sunrise, and also of "the utmost limits of the Heb possessions at the Sea westward." From this corner the wall turned eastward until it came over against the monument of Helene of Adiabene, a statement, however, which must be read in connection with another passage (Ant, XX, iv, 3), where it says that this tomb "was distant no more than 3 furlongs from the city of Jerus." The wall then "extended to a very great length" and passed by the sepulchral caverns of the kings—which may well be the so-called "Solomon's Quarries," and it then bent at the "Tower of the Corner," at a monument which is called the Monument of the Fuller (not identified), and joined to the old wall at the Kidron valley.

The commonly accepted theory is that a great part of this line of wall is that pursued by the modern north wall, and that the site of the Tyropoeon is the foundation of it, that marks the site of Psephinus. The Damascus Gate is certainly on the line of some earlier gate. The "Tower of the Corner" was probably about where the modern Herod's Gate is, or a little more to the E., and the course of the wall was from here very probably along the southern edge of the "St. Anne's Valley," joining on to the N.E. corner of the Haram a little S. of the present St. Stephen's Gate. This course of the wall fits in well with the description of Jos. If the so-called "Tombe of the Kings" are really those of Queen Helena of Adiabene and her family, then the distance given as 3 furlongs is not as far out as the distance to the modern wall; the distance is actually 3½ furlongs.

Others, following the learned Dr. Robinson, find it impossible to believe that the total circuit of the walls was so small, and would carry the third wall considerably farther north, making the general line of the modern north wall coincide with the second wall of Jos. The supporters of this view point to the description of the extensive view from Psephinus and contend that this presupposed a site on still higher ground, e.g. where the present Russian buildings now are. They also claim that the statement that the wall came "over against" the monument of Queen Helena certainly should not be considered much nearer that monument than the present walls. Dr. Robinson and others who have followed him...
have pointed to various fragments which they claim to have been pieces of the missing wall. The present writer, after very many years' residence in Jerusalem, watching the buildings which in the last 25 years have sprung up over the area across which this line of wall is claimed to have run, has never seen a trace of wall foundations or of bases which was in the very least convincing; while on the other hand this area now being rapidly covered by the modern suburb of Jerusalem presents almost everywhere below the surface virgin rock. There is no evidence of any more buildings than occasional scattered Rom villas, with mosaic floors. The present writer has rather unwillingly come to the opinion that the city walls were never farther north than the line they follow today. With respect to the objection raised that there could not have been room enough between the two walls for the "Camp of the Assyrians," where Titus pitched his camp (BJ, V, vii, 3), any probable line for the second wall would leave a mean of 1,000 ft. between the two walls, and in several directions considerably more. The probable position of the "Camp of the Assyrians" would, according to this view, be in the high ground (the northwestern hill) now occupied by the Christian quarter of the modern city. The question of what the population of Jerusalem was at this period is discussed in IX, 49, below. For the other great buildings of the city at this period, see also IX, 43-44, below.

Taking then the walls of Jerusalem as described by Jos, we may work backward and see how the walls ran in earlier periods. The third wall

11. Date of does not concern us any more, as it Second Wall was built after the Crucifixion. With respect to the second wall, there is a great deal of difference of opinion, regarding its origin. Some consider, like Sir Charles Watson, that it does not go back earlier than the monarch. The evidence is inconclusive, but the most probable view seems to be that the "first wall," as described by Jos, was the only circuit of wall from the kings of Judah down to the 2d cent. BC, and perhaps later.

The most complete Scriptural description we have of the walls and gates of Jerusalem is that given by Nehemiah. His account is valuable, not only as a record of what he did, but of what had been the state of the walls before the exile. It is perfectly clear that considerable traces of the old walls and gates remained, and that his one endeavor was to restore what had been before—even though it produced a city enclosure much larger than necessary at his time. The relevant passages are Neh 2:13-19, the account of his night ride; 3:1-32, the description of the rebuilding; and 12:31-39, the routes of the two processes at the dedication.

In the first account we learn that Nehemiah went out by night to the Valley Gate (q.v.), or Gate of the Gai, a gate (that is, opening)

13. Valley Gate into the Gai Hinnom, and probably at or near the gate discovered by Bliss in what is now part of the Anglo-German cemetery he passed to the Dung Gate, and from here viewed the walls of the city. This, with considerable assurance, may be located at the ruined foundations of a gate discovered by Bliss in the southeastern corner of the city. The line of wall clearly followed the south edge of the southwestern hill from the Anglo-German cemetery to this point. He then proceeded to the Fountain Gate, the site of which has not been recovered, but, as there must have been water running out here (as today) from the mouth of the Siloam tunnel, is very appropriately named here. Near by was the King's Pool (q.v.), probably the pool of Siloam—buried—which is today represented by the Birket el Hamra. Here Nehemiah apparently thought of turning into the city, "but there was no place for the beast that was under me to pass" (2:14), so he went up by the Nahal Kidron to the hills from there, and then retraced his steps to the Valley Gate. There is another possibility, and that is that the King's Pool was the pool (which certainly existed) at Gihon, in which case the Fountain Gate may also have been in that neighborhood.

All the archaeological evidence is in favor of the wall having crossed the mouth of the Tyropoeon by the great dam at this time, and the propinquity of this structure to the Fountain Gate is seen in Neh 3:15, where we read that Shallum built the Fountain Gate "and covered it, and set up the doors thereof . . . and the bars thereof, and the wall of the pool of Shalah [see Siloam] by the King's Garden [q.v.], even unto the stairs that go down from the city of David." All these localities were close together at the mouth of el Wad.

Passing from here we can follow the circuit of the city from the accounts of the rebuilding of the walls in Neh 3:15f. The wall from here was carried "over against the ascent of David," which we know to have stood in the original "City of David" above Gihon, past "the pool that was made," and "the house of the Gibbôrim" (mighty men)—both unknown sites. It is clear that the wall is being carried along the edge of the southeastern hill toward the temple. We read of two angles in the wall—both needed by the geographical conditions—the high priest's house, of "the tower that standeth out" (supposed to have been unearthed by Warren), and the wall of the Orphel (q.v.).
There is also mention of a Water Gate in this position, which, just where one would expect a road to lead from the temple-area down.

16. Water to Gihon. From the great number of companies engaged in building, it may be inferred that all along this stretch of wall from the Tyropoeon to the temple, the destruction of the walls had been specially great.

Proceeding N., we come to the Horse Gate. This was close to the entry to the king's house (2 K 11 16; 2 Ch 23 15; Jer 31 17).

17. Horse Gate 40. The expression, "above" Gate, or Horse Gate, may imply that the gate itself may have been uninjured; it may have been kind of rock-cut passage or tunnel. It cannot have been far from the present southeastern angle of the city. Thence "repaired, the priests, every one over against his own house"—the houses of these people being to the E. of the temple. Then comes the Gate of HAMMIPHAK (q.v.), the ascent (or "upper chamber," m) of the corner, and finally the Sheep Gate (q.v.) which was repaired by the goldsmiths and merchants. This last gate was the point from which the circuit of the repairs was traced. The references, Neh 3 1 31; 12 39, clearly show that it was at the eastern extremity of the north wall.

The details of the gates and buildings in the north wall as described by Nehemiah, are difficult, and certainty is impossible; this side must always necessarily have been the weak side for defence because it was protected by no, or only by a very little, natural valley. As has been said, we cannot be certain whether Nehemiah is describing a wall which on its western two-thirds corresponded with the first or the second wall of Jos. Taking the first theory as probable, we may plan it as follows: W. of the Sheep Gate two towers are mentioned (Neh 3 1; 12 39). Of these Hananel (q.v.) was more easterly than Hammear (q.v.), and, too, it would appear from Zec 14 10 to have been the most northerly point of the city. Probably then two towers occupied the important hill where afterward stood the fortress Baris and, later, the Antonia. At the Hammersha tower the wall would descend into the Tyropoeon to join the eastern extremity of the first wall where in the time of Jos stood the Council House (BJ, V, iv, 2).

It is generally considered that the Fish Gate (q.v.) (Neh 3 3; 12 39; Zeph 1 10; 2 Ch 33 14) stood across the Tyropoeon in much the same way as the modern Gate Damascus Gate does now, only considerably farther S. It was probably so called because here the men of Tyre sold their fish (Neh 13 16). It is very probably identical with the "Middle Gate" of Jer 39 3. With this region are associated the Mishneh (q.v.) or "second quarter" (Zeph 1 10 m) and the Makkesh (q.v.) or "mortar" (Zeph 1 11).

The next gate westward, after apparently a considerable interval, is the EV "Old Gate" (q.v.), but is more correctly the "Gate of the old . . .": what the word thus qualified is, is doubtful. Neh 3 6 m suggests "old city" or "old wall," whereas Mitchell (Wall of Jerusalem according to the Book of Neh) proposes "old pool," taking the word in question to be the so-called "Pool of Hezekiah." According to the view here accepted, that the account of Neh refers only to the first wall, the expression "old wall" would be peculiarly suitable, and must have been some part of that first wall which went back probably to the time of Solomon. The western wall to the extent of 400 cubits had been rebuilt after its destruction by Jehoash, king of Israel (see IX, 12, below), and Manasseh had repaired all the wall from Gihon round N. and then W. to the Fish Gate. This gate has also been identified with the Sha'ar ha-Pinnah, or "Corner Gate," of 2 K 14 13; 2 Ch 26 23; Jer 31 38; Zec 14 10, and with the Sha'ar ha-Rishon, or "First Gate," of Zec 14 10, which is identified as the same as the Corner Gate; indeed m'shān ("first") is probably a textual error for yashōn ("old"). If this is so, this "Gate of the Old" or "Corner Gate" must have stood near the northwestern corner of the city, somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate.

The next gate mentioned is the Gate of Ephraim (Neh 12 39), which, according to 2 K 14 13; 2 Ch 25 23, was 400 cubits or 600 ft.

21. Gate of from the Corner Gate. This must Ephraim have been somewhere on the western wall; it is scarcely possible to believe, as some writers would suggest, that there could have been no single gate between the Corner Gate near the northwestern corner and the Valley Gate on the southern wall.

The "Broad Wall" appears to correspond to the southern stretch of the western wall.

22. Tower as far as the "Tower of the Furnaces" of the or ovens, which was probably the Furnaces extremely important corner tower now incorporated in "Bishop Gobat's School." This circuit of the walls satisfies fairly well all the conditions; the difficulties are chiefly on the N. and W. It is a problem how the Gate of Ephraim comes to be omitted in the account of the repairs, but G. A. Smith suggests that it may be indicated by the expression, "thrones of the governor beyond the river" (Neh 3 7). See, however, Mitchell (loc. cit.). If the theory be accepted that the second wall already existed, the Corner Gate and the Fish Gate will have to be placed farther north.

![Probable Course of Solomon's Wall.](image-url)
In Zec 14 10 the breadth of the city is indicated, where the prophet writes, "She shall be lifted up, and shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate."

The Upper Gate of the Temple (2 K 15 35; 2 Ch 27 3; cf 2 Ch 23 20; Ezk 9 2) is probably another name for the same gate. It must be remembered the gates were, as excavations have shown us, reduced to a minimum in fortified sites: they were sources of weakness.

The general outline of the walls and gates thus followed is in the main that existing from Nehemiah back until the early Judaean monarchy, and possibly to Solomon.

Of the various destructions and repairs which occurred during the time of the monarchy, a sufficient account is given in IX below, on the history. Solomon was probably the first to inclose the northwestern Walls hill within the walls, and to him usually is ascribed all the northern and western stretch of the "First Wall"; whether his wall ran down to the mouth of the Tyropoan, or only skirted the summit of the northwestern hill is uncertain, but the latter view is probable. David was protected by the powerful fortifications of the Jebusites, which probably inclosed only the southeastern hill; he added to the defences the fortress Millo (q.v.). It is quite possible that the original Jebusite city had but one gate, on the N. (2 S 15 2), but the city must have overflowed its narrow limits during David's reign and have needed an extended and powerful defence, such as Solomon made, to secure the capital. For the varied history and situation of the walls in the post-Bib. period, see IX ("History"), below.

VII. Antiquarian Remains Connected with the Water-Supply.—In a city like Jerusalem, where the problem of a water-supply must always have been one of the greatest, it is only natural that some of the most ancient and important works should have centered round it. The three sources of supply have been (1) springs, (2) cisterns, (3) aqueducts.

(1) The natural springs have been described in II, 3; but connected with them, and esp. with the city's greatest and most venerated source, the Gihon, there are certain antiquarian remains of great interest.

(a) The "Virgin's Fount," ancient Gihon, arises, as has been described (II, 3), in a rocky cleft in the Kidron valley bottom; under natural conditions the water would run along the valley bed, now deeply buried under debris of the ancient city, and doubtless when the earliest settlers made their dwellings in the caves (which have been excavated) on the sides of the valley near the spring, they and their flocks lived on the banks of a stream of running water in a sequestered valley among waterless hills. From, however, a comparatively early period—at the least 2000 BC—efforts were made to retain some of the water, and a solid stone dam was built which converted the sources into a pool of considerable depth. Either then, or somewhat later, excavations were made in the cliffs overhanging the pool, whereby some at least of these waters were conducted, by means of a tunnel, into the heart of the southeastern hill "Ophel," so that the source could be reached from within the city walls. There are today two systems of tunnels which are usually classed as one under the name of the "Siloam aqueduct," but the two systems are probably many centuries apart in age. The older tunnel begins in a cave near the source and then runs westward for a distance of 67 ft.; at the inner end of the tunnel there is a perpendicular shaft which ascends for over 40 ft. and opens into a lofty rock-cut passage which runs, with a slight lateral curve, toward the N., in the direction of the surface. The upper end has been partially destroyed, and the roof, which had fallen in, was long ago partially restored by a masonry arch. At this part of the passage the floor is...
abruptly interrupted across its whole width by a deep chasm which Warren partially excavated, but which Parker has since conclusively shown to end blindly. It is clear that this great gallery, which is 8 to 9 ft. wide, and in places as high or higher, was constructed (as he believed) to facilitate the passage of water from the reservoir (by means of a tunnel) which was to be built above the city (see GAZA). The only conjecture of this is now afforded by the passage of the modern aqueduct (1500 BC) at Gezer (q.v.), which commenced in a rock-cut pit 26 ft. deep and descended with steps to a depth of 94 ft. 6 in. below the level of the rock surface; the sloping passage was 23 ft. high and 13 ft. broad. This passage, which could be dated with certainty as before 1500 BC, and almost certainly as early as 2000 BC, was cut out with flint knives and apparently was made entirely to reach a great underground source of water. The discovery of this Gezer well-passage has thrown a flood of light upon the "Warren's Shaft" in Jerusalem, which would appear to have been made for an exactly similar purpose. The chasm mentioned before may have been an effort to reach the source from a higher point, or it may have been made, or later adapted, to prevent ingress by means of the system of tunnels into the city. This passage is in all probability the "watercourse" (Ch 2 Sam 15: 2) of 2 S 5 8 up which, apparently, Joab and his men (1 Ch 11: 6) secretly made their way; they must have waded through the water at the source, ascended the perpendicular shaft (a feat performed in 1910 by some British officers without any assistance from ladders), and then made their way into the heart of the city along the great tunnel. Judging by the similar Gezer water tunnel, this great work may not only have existed in David's time, but may have been constructed as much as 1,000 years before.

3. Warren's Shaft, or Siloam tunnel

The true Siloam tunnel is a considerably later work. It branches off from the older aqueduct at a point 67 ft. from the entrance, and after running an exceedingly winding course of 1,882 ft. it empties itself into the Pool of Siloam (total length 1,749 ft.). The whole canal is rock cut; it is 2 to 3 ft. wide, and varies in height from 16 ft. at the south end to 4 ft. 6 in. at the lowest point, near the middle. The extent of this tunnel has recently been greatly changed through Captain Parker's party having cleared out the accumulated silt of centuries; before this, parts of the channel could be traversed only with the greatest difficulty and discomfort. The primitive nature of this construction is shown by the many false passages made, and also by the extensive cuttings which greatly add to its length. This latter may also be partly due to the workmen following lines of soft strata. M. Clermont-Ganneau and others have thought that one or more of the great cuttings may have been made deliberately to avoid the tombs of the kings of Judah. The method of construction of the tunnel is narrated in the Siloam Inscription (see SITOAM). It was begun simultaneously from each end, and the two parties met in the middle. It is a remarkable thing that there is a difference of level of only one foot at each end; but the lofty height of the southern end is probably due to a lowering of the floor here after the junction was effected. It is practically certain that this great work is that referred to in 2 K 20: 20: "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made the pool, and the conduit, and brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah? And in 2 Ch 32: 30: "This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them straight down on the west side of the city of David." In addition to these two conduits, which have a direct Scriptural interest, there are remains of at least two other aqueducts which take their origin at the Virgin's Fountain—one a channel deeply cut in rock along one of the sides of the Kidron valley, found by Captain Parker, and the other a built channel, lined with very good cement, which takes its rise at a lower level than any of the other conduits close to the before-mentioned rocky gulf, from which the water rises, and runs in a very winding direction along the western side of the Kidron. This the present writer has described in PEFS, 1902. One of these, perhaps more probably the former, may be the conduit which is referred to as Shiloah (shiloh), or "conducted" (Isa 8: 6), before the construction of Hezekiah's work (see shiloah).

4. Hezekiah's "Siloam" Aqueduct

This the present writer has described in PEFS, 1902. One of these, perhaps more probably the former, may be the conduit which is referred to as Shiloah (shiloh), or "conducted" (Isa 8: 6), before the construction of Hezekiah's work (see shiloah).

6. Br Eyyubh

Eyyubh has a depth of 125 ft.; the water collects at the bottom in a large rock-hewn chamber, and it is clear that it has been deepened at some period, because at the depth of 113 ft. there is a collecting chamber which is now replaced by the deeper one. Various rock-cut passages or staircases were found by Warren in the neighborhood of this well.

2. The cisterns and tanks.—Every ancient site in the hill country of Pal is riddled with cisterns for the storage of rain water. In Jerusalem there are many hundred of these, the cisterns of the Kings of Judah, the wall of ice in the Palace of Herod, the "bottles" of the Virgin's Fountain, and the "Astral" reservoir. Some of these cisterns are large enough to hold a considerable amount of water. They are generally cut into the rock or built of stone, and are often supported by arches or columns. The water is obtained by means of a siphon or pipe, and is generally stored in a cistern or tank, which is usually located near the entrance to the cistern. The water is then distributed by means of a network of pipes and channels, and is used for domestic purposes. Some of these cisterns are quite large, and are capable of holding a considerable amount of water. They are generally cut into the rock or built of stone, and are often supported by arches or columns. The water is obtained by means of a siphon or pipe, and is generally stored in a cistern or tank, which is usually located near the entrance to the cistern. The water is then distributed by means of a network of pipes and channels, and is used for domestic purposes. Some of these cisterns are quite large, and are capable of holding a considerable amount of water. They are generally cut into the rock or built of stone, and are often supported by arches or columns. The water is obtained by means of a siphon or pipe, and is generally stored in a cistern or tank, which is usually located near the entrance to the cistern. The water is then distributed by means of a network of pipes and channels, and is used for domestic purposes.
For more public purposes large cisterns were made in the Haram, or temple-area. Some 3 dozen are known and planned; the largest is calculated to contain 3,000,000 gallons. Such structures were made large for the religious ritual, but, as we shall see, they have been supplied by other sources than the rainfall. In many parts of the city open tanks have been constructed, such a tank being known in Arab. as a birket, or, followed by a vowel, birket. With most of these there is considerable doubt as to their date of construction, but probably none of them, in their present form at any rate, antedates the Rom period.

Within the city walls the largest reservoir is the Birket Isrâ'âl which extends from the northeastern angle of the Haram westward for 360 ft. It is 125 ft. wide and was originally 80 ft. deep, but has in recent years been largely filled up by the city’s refuse. The eastern and western ends of this pool are partially rock-cut and partly masonry, the masonry of the former being a great dam 45 ft. thick, the lower part of which is continuous with the ancient eastern wall of the temple-area. The sides of the pool are entirely masonry because the reservoir is built across the width of the valley referred to before (III, 2) as “St. Anne’s Valley.” Other parts of this valley are filled with débris to the depth of 100 ft. The original bottom of the reservoir is covered with a layer of about 19 in, of very hard concrete and cement. There was a great conduit at the eastern end of the pool built of massive stones, and connected with the pool by a perforated stone with three round holes 6 in. in diameter. The position of this outlet shows that all water over a depth of 22 ft. must have flowed away. Some authorities consider this pool to have been preëxile. By early Christian pilgrims it was identified as the “Sheep Pool” of Jn 5: 2, and at a later period, until quite recent times, it was supposed to have been the Pool of Bethesda.

9. Pool of Bethesda
The discovery, a few years ago, of the long-lost Piscina in the neighborhood of the ‘Church of St. Anne,’ which was without doubt the Pool of Bethesda of the 5th cent., AD, has caused this identification to be abandoned. See Bethesda.

To the W. of the Birket Isrâ'âl are the “twin pools” which extend under the roadway in the neighborhood of the “Ecces Homo” arch. The western one is 165 ft. by 20 ft. and the eastern 127 ft. by 20 ft. M. Clermont-Ganneau considers them to be identical with the Pool Struthius of Jos (BJ, V, xi, 4), but others, considering that they are actually made in the fosse of the Antonia, gives them a later date of origin. In connection with these pools a great aqueduct was discovered in 1871, 2-3 ft. wide and in places 12 ft. high, running from the neighborhood of the Damascene Gate and destroyed farther north —and from the pools another aqueduct runs in the direction of the Haram.

On the northwestern hill, between the Jaffa Gate and the Church of the Sepulchre there is a large open reservoir, known to the modern inhabitants of the city as Birket Hamâmân el Bâtrak, “the Pool of the Patriarch’s Bath.” It is 240 ft. long (N. to S.), 144 ft. broad and 19-24 ft. deep. If the present lining of the bottom is cracked and practically useless. The eastern wall of this pool is particularly massive, and forms the base of the remarkably level street Haret en Nasara, or “Christian Street”; it is a not improbable theory that this is actually a fragment of the long-sought “seventh” wall of Jerusalem. The wall, it is said, to have once extended 60 ft. farther north, may have been constructed originally as part of the fosse. On the other hand, this pool appears to be the Amygdalon Pool, or “Pool of the Tower” (יהודיה הרובע, birket ha-migdâl), mentioned by Jos (BJ, V, xi, 4), which was one of the activities of the 10th. cent. B.C. and this seems inconsistent with the previous theory, as the events described seem to imply that the second wall ran outside the pool. The popular traveler’s name, “Pool of Hezekiah,” given to this reservoir is due to the theory, now quite discarded, that there is the pool referred to in 2 K 20: 20. “Hezekiah the king, and the conduit, and brought water into the city.” Other earlier topographers have identified it as the “upper pool” of Isa. 7 3; 36 2. The Birket Hamâmân el Bâtrak is supplied with water from the Birket Mimâl, about 3/4 mile to the W. This large pool, 293 ft. long by 12. Birket 193 ft. broad and 19½ ft. deep, lies in the midst of a large Moslem cemetery at the head of the Wady Mâs, the first beginning of the Wady er Rabûbi (Himmon). The aqueduct which connects the two pools springs from the eastern end of the Birket Mimâl, runs a somewhat winding course and enters the city near the Jaffa Gate. The aqueduct is in bad repair, and the water it carries, chiefly from the rain, is filthy. In the Middle Ages it was supposed that this was the “Upper Pool of Gihon” (see Gihon), but this and likewise the “highway of the Fuller’s Field” (q.v.) are now located elsewhere. Wilson and others have suggested that it is the “Serpent’s Pool” of Jos (BJ, V, iii, 2). Titus levelled “all the places from Scoopus to Herod’s monument which adjoin the pool called that of the Serpent.” Like many such identifications, there is not very much to be said for or against it; it is likely that the pool existed at the time of the siege. It is likely that this is the Beth Menem of the Talb Bab, *Erubähn* 51 b; *Sanhedrin* 24 a; *Brê'shith Rabbe 51*. The Birket es Suzuki is a large pool—or, more strictly speaking, inclosure—555 ft. N. and S. by 220 ft. E. and W. It is bounded on the W. and N. by a great curve of the Birket es Suzuki low-level aqueduct as it passes along and then across the Wady er Rabûbi. The southern side consists of a massive dam across the valley over which the Bethesda runs. The name may signify either the “great” pool or be connected with the fact that it was re-constructed in the 16th cent. by the sultan Suliman ibn Selim, as is recorded on an inscription upon a wayside fountain upon the southern wall of the pool, which is registered in the cartulary of the Holy Sepulchre as the Lacus Germani, after the name of a knight of Germanus, who built or renovated the pool in 1176 AD. Probably a great part of the pool is a catchment area, and the true reservoir is the rock-cut birkeh at the southern end, which has recently been cleaned out. It is extremely difficult to believe that under any conditions any large proportion of the whole area could ever have been filled. Today the reservoir at the lower end holds, after the rainy season, some 10 or 12 ft. of very dirty water, chiefly the street drainage of the Jaffa road, while the upper two-thirds of the inclosure is used as a cattle market on Fridays. The water is now used for sprinkling the dusty roads in dry seasons.

The Pool of Siloam, hand to hand, is the Birket el Hamra are described under Siloam (q.v.).

There are other tanks of considerable size in and around the city, e.g. the Birket Sittî Miriam, near “St. Stephen’s Gate,” an uncedented pool in the Wady Jôs, connected with which there is a rock-cleft aqueduct which is there stated, but it has not of sufficient historical importance to merit description here.
(3) The conduits bringing water to the city from a distance are called the "high-level" and "low-level" aqueducts respectively, because they reached the city at different levels, conveyed water from three great pools in the Wady 'Arràb, 7 miles S. of Jerusalem. They are usually called "Solomon's pools," in reference perhaps partly to Eccl 4:6: "I made me pools of water, to water therefrom the forest where trees were reared," but as any mighty work in Pal is apt to be referred to the wise king of Israel, much stress cannot be laid on the name. These three storage reservoirs are constructed across the breadth of the valley, the lowest and largest being 582 ft. long by 177 ft. broad and, at the lowest end, 50 ft. deep. Although the overflow waters of 'Ain es Salih, commonly known as the "sealed fountain" (of Cant. 4:12), reach the pools, the chief function was probably to collect the flood waters from the winter rains, and the water was passed from tank to tank after purification. There are in all four springs above the southern slopes of the site of Jerusalem to the Haram. The total length of this aqueduct is nearly 12 miles, but at a later date the supply was increased by the construction of a long extension of the conduit for a further 28 miles to Wady 'Arràb on the road to Hebron, another 5 miles directly S. of the pools. Here, too, there is a reservoir, the Birket el 'Arràb, for the collection of the flood-water, and also several small springs, which are conducted in a number of underground rock-cut channels to the aqueduct. The total length of the low-level aqueduct is about 10 miles, and it falls in level from Birket el 'Arràb (2,645 ft. above sea-level) at its far end to Kds., the termination in the Haram (2,410 ft. above sea-level), is 235 ft.

The high-level aqueduct commences in a remarkable chain of wells connected with a tunnel, about 4 furlongs long, in the Wady Bihr, "the Valley of Wells." Upward of 50 Level wells along the valley bottom supply Aqueduct each its quotient; the water therefrom, passed through a pool where the solid matter settled, and traversed a tunnel 700 ft. long into the 'Arràb valley. Here, where its level was 150 ft. above that of the low-level aqueduct, the conduit received the waters of the "sealed fountain," and finally "delivered" them at a level of about 20 ft. above that of the Jaffa Gate (Wilson). The most remarkable feature of this conduit is the inverted syphon of perforated limestone blocks, forming a stone tube 15 in. in diameter, which carried the water across the valley near Rachel's Tomb. On a number of these blocks, Lat inscriptions with the names of centurions of the time of Severus (195 AD) have been found, and this has led many to fix a date to this great work. So good construction of an authority as Wilson, however, considers that these inscriptions may refer to repairs, and that the work is more probably Herodian. Unless the accounts of Jos (BJ, V, iv, 4; II, xvii, 8) are exaggerated, Herod must have had some means of bringing abundant running water into the city at the level obtained by this conduit. The late Dr. Schick even suggested a date as early as Hyrcanus (135-125 BC). With regard to the low-level Aqueduct, we have two definite data. First Jos (Ant., XVIII, iii, 2) states that Pontius Pilate "undertook to bring a current of water to Jerusalem, and did it with the sacred money, and derived the origin of the stream from the distance of 200 furlongs" (over 22 miles; in BJ, II, ix, 4 he is said to have brought the water "from 400 furlongs")—probably a copyist's error. But these references must either be to restorations or to the extension from Wady 'Arràb to Wady 'Arràb (28 miles), for the low-level aqueduct from the pools to Jerusalem is certainly the same construction as the aqueduct from these pools to the "Frank Mountain," the Herodium, and that, according to the definite statements of Jos (Ant., XV, ix, 4; BJ, I, xxi, 10), was made by Herod the Great. On the whole the usual view is that the high-level aqueduct was the work of Severus, the low-level that of Herod, with an extension southward by Pontius Pilate.

Jerusalem still benefits somewhat from the low-level aqueduct which is in repair as far as Bethlehem, though all that reaches the city comes only through a solitary 4-in. pipe. The high-level aqueduct is hopelessly destroyed and can be traced only in places; the wells of Wady Bihr are choked and useless, and the long winding aqueduct to Wady 'Arràb is quite broken.

VIII. Tombs, Antiquarian Remains, and Ecclesiastical Sites.—Needless to say all the known ancient tombs in the Jerusalem area have been riddled of
their contents long ago. The so-called Tombs of the Kings in the Wady el Joz are actually the monument of Queen Helena of Adiabene, a convert to Judaism (c. 48 AD). Jos (Ant., XX, iv, 3) states that her bones, along with those of members of her family, were buried "at the pyramids," which were 3 in number and distant from Jerusalem 3 furlongs. A Heb inscription upon a sarcophagus found here by De Saulcy ran: "Queen Sarah," possibly the Jewish name of Queen Helena. On the western side of the Wady el Mts (the higher part of Hinnom), is a very interesting Gr Tomb. These are commonly known as "Herod's Tombs" (although Herod the Great was buried on the Herodium), and, according to Schick, one of the sarcophagi may have belonged to Mariamne, Herod's wife. A more probable theory is that this is the tomb of the high priest Ananias (BD, V, xii, 2).

On the eastern side of the Kidron, near the southeastern angle of the Haram, are 3 conspicuous tombs. The most northerly, Tantur Far'on, generally called "Absalom's Tomb," is a Gr-Jewish tomb of the Hasmonian period, and, according to Conder, possibly the tomb of Alexander Janneaus (HDB, art. "Jerusalem"). S. of this is the traditional "Grotto of St. James," which we know by a square Heb inscription over the pillars to be the family tomb of certain members of the priestly family (1 Ch 24 15), of the Beni Hariz. It may belong to the century before Christ.

The adjoining traditional tomb of Zachariah is a monolithic monument cut out of the living rock, 16 ft. sq. and 30 ft. high. It has square pilasters at the corners, Ionic pillars between, and a pyramidal top. Its origin is unknown; its traditional name is due to Our Lord's word in Mt 25 35; Lk 11 51 (see ZACHARIAS).

A little farther down the valley of the Kidron, at the commencement of the village of Siloam, is another rock-cut tomb, the so-called "Egyptian Egypt Tomb, or according to some, "the tomb of Solomon's Egypt wife." It is a monolith 18 ft. sq. and 11 ft. high, and the interior has at one time been used as a chapel. It is now Russian property. It probably belongs to much the same period as the three before-mentioned tombs, and, like them, shows strong Egyptian influence.

The so-called "Tombs of the Judges" belong to the Roman period, as do the scores of similar excavations in the same valley. The "Tombs of the Prophets" on the western slopes of the Mount of Olives are now considered to belong to the 4th or 5th Christian century.

Near the spot where Jeremiah's Grotto, to the W. and N.W., is a great number of tombs, mostly Christian. The more northerly members of the group are now included in the property of the Dominicans attached to the Church of St. Stephen, but one, the southernmost, has attracted a great deal of attention because it was supposed by the late General Gordon to be the tomb of Christ. In its condition when found it was without doubt, like its Garden Tomb neighbors, a Christian tomb of about the 5th cent., and it was full of skeletons. Whether it may originally have been a Jewish tomb is unproved; it certainly could not have been recognized as a site of any sanctity until General Gordon promulgated his theory (see PEF, 1892, 120-24; see also Golgotha).

The Jews greatly venerate a tomb on the eastern side of the Wady el Joz, not far S. of the great North Road; they consider it to be the tomb of Simon the Just, but it is "Simon the Just" in all probability not a Jewish tomb.

Only passing mention can here be made of certain remains of interest connected with the exterior walls of the Haram. The foundation walls of the temple-platform are built of magnificent blocks of smooth, drafted masonry with an average height of 33 ft. One line, known as the "master course," runs for 600 ft. westward from the southeastern angle, with blocks 7 ft. high. Near the southeastern angle at the foundation itself, certain of the blocks were found by the Palestine Exploration Fund engineers to be marked with Phoen character, which it was supposed by many at the time of their discovery indicated their Solomon origin. It is now gen-
eraly held that these “masons’ marks” may just as well have been used in the time of Herod the Great, and on other grounds it is held that all this magnificent masonry is due to the vast reconstruc-
tion of the Temple which this great monarch initiated (see Temple). In the western wall of the Haram, between the southwestern corner and the “Jewish wailing place,” lies “Robinson’s Arch.” It is the spring of an arch 50 ft. wide, projecting from the temple-wall; the bridge arising from it had a span of 50 ft., and the pier on the farther side was discovered by Warren. Under the bridge ran a contemporary paved Rom street, and beneath the unbroken pavement was found, lying inside a rock aqueduct, a voussoir of an older bridge. This bridge connected the temple-inclosure with the upper city in the days of the Hasmonae kings. It was broken down in 63 BC by the Jews in anticipation of the attack of Pompey (1st, XIV, iv, 2; BJ, I, vii, 2), but was rebuilt by Herod in 19 BC (BJ, VI, viii, 1; vi, 2), and finally destroyed in 70 AD.

Nearly 600 ft. farther N., along this western temple-wall is Wilson’s Arch, which lies under the surface within the causeway which crosses the Tyraspon to the Bab es Sidshek of the Haram; although not itself very ancient there are here, deeper down, arches belonging to the Herodian causeway which here approached the temple-platform.

With regard to the common ecclesiastical sites visited by pious pilgrims little need be said here.

8. Ecclesiastical Sites

The congeries of churches that is included under that name of Church of the Holy Sepulchre includes a great many minor sites of the服务体系 of the Passion which have no serious claims.

Besides the Holy Sepulchre itself—which, apart from its situation, cannot be proved or disproved, as it has actually been destroyed—the only important site is that of Mount Calvary. All that can be said is that if the Sepulchre is genuine, then the site may be also; it is today the hollowed-out shell of a rocky knoll incised in marble and other stones and riddled with chapels. See Golgotha.

The cenacleum, close to the Moslem “Tomb of David” (a site which has no serious claims), has been upheld by Professor S holday (Sacred Sites of the Gospels) as one which has a very strong tradition in its favor.

The most important evidence is that of Epiphanios, who states that when Hadrian visited Jerusalem in 130, one of the few buildings left standing was “the little Church of Calvary, on which the disciples, returning after the Ascension of the Saviour from Olivet, had gone up to the Upper room, for there it had been built, that is to say in the quarter of Zion.” In connection with this spot there has been pointed out from early Christian times the site of the House of Caiaphas and the site of the death of the Virgin Mary—the Dormitio Sanctae Virginis. It is in consequence of this latter tradition that the German Roman Catholics have now erected here their magnificent new church of the Dormition. A rival line of traditions locates the tomb of the Virgin in the Kidron valley near Gethsemane, where there is a remarkable underground chapel belonging to the Greeks.

IX. History.—Pre-Israelitic period.—The beginnings of Jerusalem are long before recorded history: at various points in the neighborhood, e.g. at el Bukeia to the S.W., and at the northern extremity of the Mount of Olives to the N.E., were very large settlements of Paleolithic man, long before the days of the dawn of history, as is proved by the quantities of celts scattered over the surface. It is certain that the city’s site itself was occupied many centuries before David, and it is a traditional view that the city called Salem (q.v.) (Gen 14 18), over which Melchizedek was king, was identical with Jerusalem.

The first certain reference to this city is about 1450 BC, when the name Ur-ur-salem occurs in several letters belonging to the Amarna correspondence. The place here referred to is Amarna, and it is clear that this man was “king,” or governor of the city, as the representative of Pharaoh of Egypt. In this correspondence Abu Khiba represents himself as hard pressed to uphold the rights of his suzerain against the hostile forces which threaten to overwhelm him. Incidentally we may gather that the place was then a fortified city, guarded partly by mercenary Egypt troops, and there are reasons for thinking that the then ruler of Egypt, Amenhotep IV, had made it a sanctuary of his god Aten—the sun-disc. Some territory, possibly extending as far west as Ajalon, seems to have been under the jurisdiction of the governor. Professor Sayce has stated that Abu Khiba was probably a Hittite chief, but this is doubtful. The correspondence closes abruptly, leaving us in uncertainty with regard to the fate of the writer, but we know that the domination of Egypt over Pal.

At the time of Joshua’s invasion of Canaan, Adoni-zedek (q.v.) is mentioned (Josh 10 1–27) as king of Jerusalem, he united with the kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Gibeon to fight against the Gibeonites who had made peace with Joshua; the 5 kings were defeated and, being captured in hiding at the cave Makkedah, were all slain. Another king, Adoni-Bezek (q.v.) (whom some identify with Adoni-zedek), was defeated by Judah after the death of Joshua, and after being mutilated was brought to Jerusalem and died there (Jgs 1 1–7), after which it is recorded (ver 8) that Judah “fought against Jerusalem, and took it, and set the city on fire.” But it is clear that the city remained in the hands of the “Jebusites” for some years more (Jgs 1 21; 19 11), although it was theoretically reckoned on the southern border of Benjamin (Josh 15 8; 18 16, 28). David, after he had reigned 7 years at Hebron, determined to make Jerusalem his capital and, about 1000 BC, captured the city.
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Up to this event it is probable that Jerus was like other contemporary fortified cities, a comparatively small place encircled with powerful walls, with but one or perhaps two gates; it is very generally admitted that this city occupied the ridge to the S. of the temple long incorrectly called "Ophel," and that its walls stood upon steep rocky scars above the Kidron valley on the one side, and the Tyropoeon on the other. We have every reason to believe that the great system of tunnels, known as "Warren's Shaft" (see VII, 3, above) existed all through this period.

The account of the capture of Jerus by David is obscure, but it seems a probable explanation of a difficult passage (2 S 5 6-9) if we conclude that the Jebusites, relying upon the extraordinary strength of their position, challenged David: "Thou shalt not come in hither, but the blind and the lame shall turn thee away" (ver 6 m), and that David directed his followers to go up the "watercourse" and smite the "lame and the blind"—a term he in his turn applies mockingly to the Jebusites. "And Joab the son of Zeruiah went up first, and was made chief" (1 Ch 11 6). It seems at least probable that David's men captured the city through a surprise attack up the great tunnels (see VII, 3, above). David having captured the stronghold "Zion," renamed it the "City of David" and took up his residence there; he added to the strength of the fortifications "round about from the Millo [q.v.] and onward", with the assistance of Phoen workmen supplied by Hiram, king of Tyre, he built himself a "house of cedar" (2 S 5 11; cf 7 2). The ark of Jeh was brought from the house of Obed-edom and lodged in a tent (2 S 6 17) in the "city of David" (of 1 K 8 1). The threshing-floor of Araunah (2 S 24 18), or Orn an (1 Ch 21 15), the Jebusite, was later purchased as the future site of the temple.

The Jerus which David captured was small and compact, but there are indications that during his reign it must have increased considerably by the growth of suburbs outside the Jebusite walls. The population must have increased from several sources. The influx of David's followers doubtless caused many of the older inhabitants to be crowded out of the walled area. There appear to have been a large garrison of (2 S 15 18; 20 7), many officials and priests and their families (2 S 9 16- 18; 20 5-6; 23 26; 20 5-6; and the wives of David's own family and their relatives (2 S 5 13-16; 14 24-28; 1 K 1 52, etc.). It is impossible to suppose that all these were crowded into so narrow an area, while the incidental mention that Absalom lived two whole years in Jerus without seeing the king's face implies burial (2 S 14 24. 28). The new dwellings could probably extend northward toward the site of the future temple and northwestward into and up the Tyropoeon valley along the great north road. It is improbable that they could have occupied much of the western hill. With the accession of Solomon, the increased magnificence of the court, the foreign wives and their establishments, the new officials and the great number of work people brought to the city for Solomon's great buildings must necessarily have enormously swelled the resident population, while the recorded buildings of the city, the temple, the king's house, the House of the Daughter of Pharaoh, the House of the Forest of Lebanon, the Throne Hall and the Pillared Hall (1 K 7 1-8) must have altered the whole aspect of the site. In consequence of these new buildings, the sanctuary together with the houses of the common folk, a new wall for the city was necessary, and we have a statement twice made that Solomon built "the wall of Jerus round about" (1 K 3 1; 9 15); it is also recorded that he built Millo (9 15-24; 11 27), and that "he repaired the breach of the city of David his father" (11 27). The question of the Millo is discussed elsewhere (see Millo); the "breach" referred to may have been the connecting wall needed to include the Millo within the complete circle of fortifications, or else some part of Solomon's fortification which his death had left incomplete.

As regards the "Wall of Jerus" which Solomon built, it is practically certain that it was, on the N. and W., that described by Jos as the First Wall (see VI, 7 above). The mon's City Wall vast rock-cut scars at the southwestern corner testify to the strength of the building. Whether the whole of the southwestern hill was included is a matter of doubt. Inasmuch as there are indications at Bliss's tower (see VI, 4 4) of an ancient wall running north-easterly, and in the southern part of the southwestern hill, it would appear highly probable that Solomon's wall followed that line; in this case this wall must have crossed the Tyropoeon at somewhat the line of the existing southern wall, and then have run southeasterly to join the western wall of the old city of the Jebusites. The temple and palace buildings were all inclosed in a wall of finished masonry which made it a fortified place by itself—as it appears to have been through Heb history—and these walls, where external to the rest of the city, formed part of the whole circle of fortification.

Although Solomon built so magnificent a house for Jeh, he erected in the neighborhood shrines to other local gods (1 K 11 7-8), a lapse ascribed largely to the influence of his foreign wives and consequent foreign alliances.

The disruption of the kingdom must have been a severe blow to Jerus, which was left the capital, no longer of a united state, but of a petty tribe. The resources which were at the command of the new king were insufficient to complete the building up of the city; as soon as Jeroboam's avowed policy, while the long state of war which existed between

Jerusalem of the Jebusites, as Captured by David.
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the two peoples—a state lasting 60 years (1 K 14: 20; 16: 6-16; 22: 44)—must have been very injurious to the growth of commerce and the arts of peace.

In the 5th year of Rehoboam (928), Shishak (Sheshonk) king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem (1 K 14: 25 ff) and took the fenced cities of Judah (2 Ch 12: 4 AV). It has been commonly supposed that he besieged and captured Jerusalem itself, but there is no account of the destruction of fortifications and as the name of this city has not been deciphered upon the Egyptian records of this campaign, it is as consistent as is consistent with the Scriptural references, that Shishak was bought off with “the treasures of the house of Jehush and the treasures of the king’s house” and “all the shields of gold which Solomon had made” (1 K 14: 28).

It is clear that by the reign of Jehoshaphat the city had again largely recovered its importance (cf 1 K 22), but in his son Jehoram’s reign (849-842 BC) Judah was invaded and the royal house was pillaged by Aram of Damascus and was wounded in his chariot near Beth-horon and expiring at Bethel he was carried to Jerusalem and there buried (2 K 9: 27-28). Jerus was now the scene of the dramatic events which center round the usurpation and death of Queen Athaliah (2 K 11: 16; 2 Ch 23: 15) and the coronation and reforms of her grandson Joash (2 K 12: 1-16; 2 Ch 24: 1-14). After the death of the good priest Jehoiada, it is recorded (2 Ch 24: 15 ff) that the king was led astray by the princes of Judah and forsook the house of Jeh, as a consequence of which the Syrians under Hazael came against Judah and slew the princes and spoiled the land, Joash giving him much treachery from both palace and temple (2 K 12: 17-18; 2 Ch 24: 23). Finally Joash was assassinated (2 K 12: 20-31; 2 Ch 24: 25) “at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla.”

During the reign of Amaziah (787-770 BC), the murdered king’s son, a victory over Edom appears to have so alarmed the king that he
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wantonly challenged Jehoash of Israel to battle (2 K 14: 8). The two armies met at Beth-shemesh, and Jehu was defeated and “fled every man to his tent.” Jerus was unable to offer any resistance to the victors, and Jehoash “brake down the wall of Jerus from the gate of Ephaum unto the corner gate, 400 cubits” and then returned to Samaria, loaded with plunder and hostages (ver 14).

Fifteen years later, Amaziah was assassinated at Lachish whither he had fled from a conspiracy; nevertheless they brought his body upon horses, and he was buried in Jerus.

Doubltless it was a reminiscence of the humiliation which his father had undergone which made Uzziah (Azariah) strengthen his position.

13. Uzziah’s iron. He subdued the Philis and the Refortification of Arabs in Gér, and put the Ammonites to tribute (2 Ch 26: 7-8). He built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turnings (LXX) of the walls, and fortified them” (ver 9).

14. Hazael’s alliance with kings of Syria and Israel (2 K 16 Assyria 5:6); but Hazael, feeling the weakness of his little kingdom, bought with silver and gold from the house of Jeh the alliance of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria. He met the king at Damascus and paid him a compliment by having an altar similar to his made for his own ritual in the temple (vs 10-12). His reign is darkened by a record of heathen practices, and specially by his making “his sons pass through the fire” as a human sacrifice in, apparently, the Valley of Hinom (1 K 16: 3-4; cf 2 Ch 28: 3).

15. Hezekiah (737-699 BC), his son, succeeded to the kingdom at a time of surpassing danger. Samaria, and with it the last of Israel’s kingdoms, had fallen. Assyria had with diiih’s great cullt been bought off, the people were largely apostate, yet Jerus was never so great a nation of the time to trouble the foes of Israel (Isa 7: 4 f; 8: 10-15; 20: 4). Early in his reign, the uprising of the Chaldaean Merodach-baladan against Assyria relieved Judah of her greatest danger, and Hezekiah entered into friendly relations with his new king of Babylon, showing his messengers all his treasures (Isa 39: 1-2). At this time or soon after, Hezekiah appears to have undertaken great works in fitting his capital for the troublous times which lay before him. He sealed the waters of Gilbon and brought them within the city to prevent the kings of Assyria from getting access to them (2 K 20: 20; 2 Ch 32: 30). See Siloam.

It is certain, if their tunnel was to be of any use, the southwestern hill must have been enclos ed, and it is at least highly probable that in the account (2 Ch 32: 5), he “built up all the wall that was broken down, and built towers thereon [m], and the other wall without,” the last phrase may refer to the stretch of wall along the edge of the southwestern hill to Siloam. On the other hand, if that was the work of Solomon, “the other wall” may have been the great buttressed dam, with a wall across it which closed the mouth of the Tyropoen, which was an essential part of his scheme of preventing a besieging army from getting access to water. He also strengthened Millo (q.v.), on the southeastern hill. Secure in these fortifications, which made Jerus one of the strongest walled cities in Western Asia, Hezekiah, assisted, as we may learn from Sennacherib’s descriptions, by Arab mercenaries, was able to buy off the great Assyrian king and to keep his city inviolate (2 K 18: 13-16). A second threatened attack on the city appears to be referred to in 2 K 19: 9-37.

16. Hezekiah under siege. He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah: and he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made and . . . called it Nehushtan: . . . a pillar, (i.e., a pillar of brass). . . . Manasseh succeeded his father when but 12, and reigned 55 years (688-643) in Jerus (2 K 21: 1). He was tributary to Esarhaddon.
and Ashurbanipal, as we know from their inscriptions; in one of the latter's he is referred to as king "of the city of Judah." The king of Assyria who, it is said (2 Ch 33 11; cf. Ant, X, iii, 2), carried Manasseh in chains to Babylon, was probably Ashurbanipal. How thoroughly the country was penetrated by Assyrian influence is witnessed by the two cuneiform tablets recently found at Gezer belonging to this Assyrian monarch's reign (PEFS, 1905, 206, etc.).

The same influence, extending to the religious sphere, is seen in the record (2 K 21 5) that Manasseh "built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of Jeh." There are other references to the idolatrous practices introduced by this king (cf. Jer 7 18; 2 K 23 5; 11.12, etc.). He also filled Jerusalem with the innocent blood of martyrs faithful to Jeh (2 K 21 16; cf Jer 19 4). Probably during this long reign of external peace the population of the city much increased, particularly by the influx of foreigners from less isolated regions. Of this king's improvements to the fortifications of Jerusalem we have the statement (2 Ch 33 14), "He built an outer wall, to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon in the valley, even to the entrance at the fish gate." This must have been a new or rebuilt wall for the whole eastern side of the city. He also compassed about the Ophel (q.v.) and raised it to a very great height.

Manasseh was the first of the Judaic kings to be buried away from the royal tombs. He was buried (as was his son Amon) "in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza." This may be the tomb referred to (Ezk 33 12) as being near the temple precincts.

In the reign of Josiah was found the "Book of the Law," and the king in consequence instituted radical reforms (2 K 22 2, 3). Kidron smoked with the burning of the Asherah and of the vessels of Baal, and Religions Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom was destroyed. At length after a reign of 31 years (2 K 22 30), Josiah, in endeavoring to intercept Pharaoh-nechoh from combining with the king of Babylon, was defeated and slain at Megido and was buried "in his own sepulchre" in Jerusalem—in the same grave where his father and grandfather were buried. Jehoahaz, after a reign of but 3 months, was carried captive (2 K 23 34) by Nechoh to Egypt, where he died—and apparently was buried among strangers (Jer 22 10-12). His brother Eliakim, renamed Jehoiakim, succeeded. In the 41st year of his reign, Egypt was defeated at Carchemish by the Babylonians, and as a consequence Jehoiakim had to change from subjection to Egypt to that of Babylon (1 K 23 35 ff.). During this time Jeremiah was active preying in streets and courts of Jerusalem (5 1, etc.) the approaching ruin of the city, messages which were received with contempt and anger by the king and court (Jer 36 23). In consequence of his revolt against Babylon, bands of Chaldaeans, Syrians, Moabites and Ammonites came against him (2 K 24 2), and his death was ignominious (2 K 24 6; Jer 22 18,19).

His son Jehoiachin, who succeeded him, went out with all his household and surrendered to the approaching Nebuchadnezzar (597), and was carried to Babylon where he passed more than 37 years (2 K 25 27-30). Jerusalem was despoiled of all its treasures and all its important inhabitants. The king of Babylon's nominee, Zedekiah, after 11 years rebelled against him, and consequently Jerusalem was besieged for a year and a half until "famine was sore in the city." On the 9th of Ab all the men of war "fled by night by the way of the gate between two walls, which was by the king's garden," i.e. near the mouth of the Tyropoön, and the king "went by the way of the Arabah," but was overtaken and captured "in the plains of Jericho." A terrible punishment followed his faithlessness to Babylon (2 K 25 1-7). The city and the temple were despoiled and burnt; the walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and none but the poorest of the land "be to vinedressers and husbandmen were left behind (2 K 26 8 f.; 2 Ch 36 17 f.). It is probable that the ark was removed also at this time.

With the destruction of their city, the hopes of the best elements in Judah turned with longing to the thought of her restoration. It is possible that some of the remnant left in the land may have kept up some First Return semblance of the worship of Jeh at the temple-site. At length, however, Cyrus the Persian became master of the Bab empire, among many acts of a similar nature for the shrines of Assyry and Bab gods, he gave permission to Jews to return to rebuild the house of Jeh (Ezr 1 1 f.). Over 40,000 (Ezr 1, 2) under Sheshbak, prince of Judah (Ezr 1 8,11), governor of a province, returned, bringing with them the sacred vessels of the temple. The daily sacrifices were renewed and the feasts and fasts restored (3 3-7), and later the foundations of the restored temple were laid (5 16). The building was undertaken in consequence of the opposition of the people of the land and the Samaritans, the building was not completed until 20 years later (6 15).

The graphic description of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem in 445 by Nehemiah gives us the fullest account we have of these fortifications at any ancient period. It is clear that Nehemiah set himself to restore the walls, as far as possible, in their ancient condition. The work was done hurriedly and under conditions of danger, half the workers being armed with swords, spears and bows to protect the others, and every workman was a soldier (Neh 4 13-16; 21). The rebuilding therefore was carried on by the Jews who had been left at all had not much of the material lain to hand in the piles of ruined masonry. Doubless the haste and limited resources resulted in a wall far weaker than that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed 142 years previously, but it followed the same outline and had the same general structure.

For the next 100 years we have scarcely any historical knowledge of Judah. A glimpse is afforded by the papyri of Elephantine, where we hear of an Ashinah community; and Governor in Upper Egypt petitioning Bagobi, the governor of Judaea, for permission to rebuild their own temple to Jeh in Egypt; incidentally they mention that they had already sent an unsuccessful petition to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues in Judah. In another document we gather that this petition to the Persian governor was granted. These documents must date about 411-407 BC. Later, probably about 390, we have somewhat ambiguous references to the destruction of Jerusalem and the capture of the Persians by Jews in the time of Artaxerxes (III) Ochus (358-337 BC).

With the battle of Issus and Alexander's Palestinian campaign (c 332 BC), we are upon super
historical ground, though the details of the account (Ant, XI, viii, 4) of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem itself are considered of doubtful authenticity. After his death (323 BC), Ptolemy I divided his empire among his sons, and a part of it went to his brother, the Seleucid Antiochus. Each became in turn its suzerain, and indeed at one time the tribute appears to have been divided between them (Ant, XII, iv, 1).

In 321 Ptolemy Soter invaded Pal, and, it is said (Ant, XII, i, 1), captured Jerusalem by a ruse, entering the city on the Sabbath as if anxious to visit the temple. Whether or not this is true, he carried into captivity many of his Jewish prisoners to Egypt and settled them there. In the struggles between the contending monarchies, although Pal suffered, the capital itself, on account of its isolated position, remained undisturbed, under the suzerainty of Egypt. In 217 BC, Ptolemy IV Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus III at Raphia, visited the temple at Jerusalem and offered sacrifices; he is reported (3 Mac 1) to have entered the "Holy of Holies." The comparative prosperity of the city during the Ptolemaic period is witnessed to by Hecataeus of Abdera, who is quoted by Jos; he even puts the population of the city at 120,000, which is probably an exaggeration.

In length in 198, Antiochus III the Great having conquered Coele-Syria in the epoch-making battle at Banias, the Jews of their own accord went over to him and supplied him with provisions necessary for his victorious army. Antiochus himself assisted him in besieging the Egyptian garrison in the Akra (q.v.) (Ant, XII, iii, 3). Jos produces letters in which Antiochus records his gratification at the reception given him by the Jews and grants various privileges (ib.). We have an account of the prosperity of the city about this time (190-180 BC) by Jesus ben Sira in the Book of Eccles; it is a city of crowded life and manifold activities. He refers in glowing terms to the great high priest, Simon ben Onias (226-199 BC), who (Eccles 50 i-4) had repaired and fortified the temple and strengthened the walls against a siege. The letter of Aristobulus, dated probably at the close of this great man's life (c 200 BC), gives a similar picture. The city was surrounded by walls, 8 miles in circumference, and had 40 stations. The very considerable prosperity and religious liberty which the Jews had enjoyed under the Egyptians were soon menaced under the new ruler; the taxes were increased, and very soon fidelity to the tenets of Judaism came to be regarded as treachery to the Seleucid rule. Under Antiochus Epiphanes the Hellenization of the nation grew apace (2 Mac 4 9-12; Ant, XII, v, 1); at the request of the Hellenizing party a "place of Epiphanes" was erected in Jerusalem (1 Mac 1 14; 2 Mac 4 71). The Gymnasium was built and was soon thronged by young priests; the Gr hat—the ples定—became the fashionable headress in Jerus. The Hellenistic party, which was composed of the aristocracy, was so loud in its professed devotion to the king's wishes that it is not to be wondered at that Antiochus, who, on a visit to the city, had been received with rapturous greetings, became enthroned in it as the god of the city. The actual open rupture began when tidings reached Antiochus, after a victorious though politically barren campaign against his enemies in Egypt, that his brother had risen in his behalf on the throne of Ptolemy. Jason, the renegade high priest, who had been hiding across the Jordan, had, on the false report of the death of Antiochus, suddenly returned and proclaimed himself king of the city. On this the Akra remained to Syria, and this was crowned with Menelaus and those of his followers who had escaped the sword of Jason. Antiochus lost no time; he hastened (170 BC) against Jerusalem with a great army, captured the city, massacred the people and despoiled the temple (1 Mac 1 20-24; Ant, XII, v, 3). Two years later Antiochus, balked by Rome in Egypt (Polyb. xix, 27; Livy xlv, 12), appears to have determined that in Jerusalem, at any rate, he would carry through among the Jews the religious reformation he had inaugurated in Egypt. He sent his chief collector of tribute (1 Mac 1 29), who attacked the city with strong force and, by means of of 168 BC, stratagem, entered it (ver 30). After he had despoiled it, he set it on fire and pulled down both dwellings and walls. He massacred the men, and many of the women and children he sold as slaves (1 Mac 1 31-35; 2 Mac 5 24). He sacrificed swine (or at least a sow) upon the holy altar, and caused the high priest to be slain. (Ant, XII, v, 4.) In everything he favored, in conjunction with the strong Hellenizing party, to organize Jerusalem as a Gr city, and to secure his position he built a strong wall, and a great tower for the Akra, and, having furnished it well with armor and victuals, he left his son, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (q.v.), there. But the Syrians had overreached themselves this time, and the reaction against persecution and attempted religious suppression produced the great uprising of the Maccabeans.

The defeat and retirement of the Syrian commander Lysias, followed by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, led to an entire reversal of policy on the part of the Council of the Syriac party. The boy-king, Antiochus V, a general and Rebellions amnesty was granted, with leave to restore the temple-worship in its ancestral forms. The following year (165 BC) Judas Maccabeus found "the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, the gates burned up, and shrubs growing in the courts of the temple; the priests' chambers pulled down" (1 Mac 4 38). He at once saw to the reconstruction of the altar and restored the temple-services, an event celebrated ever after as the "Feast of the Dedication" or Hanukkah (1 Mac 4 52-59; 2 Mac 10 11-11; Ant, XII, vii, 7; cf Jn 10 22). Judas also "built up the Temple of Mt. Zion," i.e. the temple-hill, making it a fortress with "high walls and strong towers round about," and set a garrison in it (1 Mac 4 41-61). The Hellenizing party suffered in the reaction, and the Syrian garrison in the Akra, Syria's one hold on Judaea, was soon invested, but after the defeat of Judas Maccabaeus in 163 BC the Syrian armies in the open, he could not and Capture exped this garrison. In 163 BC a great of the City Syrian army, with a camel corps and many elephants, came to the relief of the hard-pressed garrison. Lysias, accompanied by the boy-king, he poor Antiochus, who had arrived in his behalf on the throne of Judah, and destroyed the fortifications (1 Mac 6 34).
62. But even in this desolate state Judas and his followers were saved. A certain pretender, Philip, raised a rebellion in a distant part of the empire, and Lysias was obliged to patch up a truce with the nationalist Jews more favorable to Judas than before his defeat; the garrison in the Akra remained, however, to remind the Jews that they were not independent. In 161 BC another Syrian general, Nicanor, was sent against Judas, but he was at first won over to friendship and when, later, at the instigation of the Hellenistic party, he was compelled to attack Judas, he did so with haste, raised levies and was defeated at Adasa, a little N. of Jerusalem. Judas was, however, not long suffered to celebrate his triumph. A month later Baccidus appeared before Jerusalem, and in April, 161, Judas was slain in battle with him at Berea. The Roman garrison was 37 BC.

35. His Death (161 BC) was garrisoned by Syrians; nevertheless, by 152, Jonathan, Judas' brother, who was residing at Michmas, was virtual ruler of the land, and by astute negotiation between Demetrius and Alexander, the rival claimants to the throne of Antioch, Jonathan gained more than any of his family had ever done. He was appointed high priest and strategos, or deputy for the king, in Judaea. He repaired the city and restored the temple-fortress with squared stones (1 Mac 10.10–11). He made the walls higher and built up a great part of the eastern wall which had been destroyed and 'repaired that which was called Haphenatha' (1 Mac 12.36–37; Ant. XIII, v, ii); he also made a great mound between the Akra and the city to isolate the Syrian garrison (ib.).

36. Jonathan's Restoration (134 BC) Simon, who succeeded Jonathan, finally captured the Akra in 139, and, according to Jos (Ant., XIII, vi, 7), not only destroyed it, but partially leveled the very hill on which it stood (see, however, 1 Mac 14.30–37). John Hyrcanus I, 5 years later (134 BC), was besieged in Jerusalem by Antiochus Sidetes (134 BC) in the 4th year of his reign; during the siege the Syrian king rased 100 towers each 3 stories high against the northern wall. Possibly these may subsequent have been used for the foundations of the second wall. Antiochus was finally bought off by the giving of hostages and by heavy tribute, which Hyrcanus is said to have obtained by opening the sepulcher of the kings, 'Nevertheless the king broke down the fortifications that encompassed the city' (Ant., XIII, vii, 2–4).

During the more prosperous days of the Hasmonean rulers, several important buildings were erected. In the first place there was a great vane on the western (southwestern) hill overlooking the temple (Ant., XX, viii, 11), and connected with it at one time by means of a bridge across the Tyropoeon, and on the northern side of the temple citadel—which may (see VIII, 7 above) have been the successor of one here in pre-Cotton times—known as the Baris; this, later on, Herod enlarged into the Antonia (Ant., XV, xi, 4; BJ, V, v, 8).

In consequence of the quarrel of the later Hasmonean princes, further troubles fell upon the city. In 65 BC, Hyrcanus II, under the Roman intervention of Syllabus, who overcame his brother (Ant., XIV, ii, 1–5). Ten years later (63 BC) Pompey, having been met by the ambassadors of both parties, bearing presents, as well as of the Pharisees, came himself to compose the quarrel of the rival factions, and, being shut out of the city, took it by storm. He entered the "Holy of Holies," but left the temple treasures in the city unharmed. The walls of the city were subsequently demolished; Hyrcanus II was reinstated as high priest, but Aristobulus was carried off to Rome, and the city surrendered as a tributary to the Roman Empire (Ant., XIV, iv, 1–4; BJ, I, vii, 1–7). The Syrian proconsul, M. Lucinius Crassus, going upon his expedition against the Parthians in 55 BC, carried off from the temple the money which Pompey had left (Ant., XIV, vii, 1). The following year (67 BC) the temple had lain in ruins for 10 years had been gaining power as a self-appointed adviser to the weak Hyrcanus, was made a Roman citizen and appointed procurator in return for very meagre services which he had undertaken to render to Julius Caesar.

37. Surrender of Jerusalem to Antiochus Sidetes (134 BC) was besieged in Jerusalem by Antiochus Sidetes in the 4th year of his reign; during the siege the Syrian king razed 100 towers each 3 stories high against the northern wall. Possibly these may subsequent have been used for the foundations of the second wall. Antiochus was finally bought off by the giving of hostages and by heavy tribute, which Hyrcanus is said to have obtained by opening the sepulcher of the kings, 'Nevertheless the king broke down the fortifications that encompassed the city' (Ant., XIII, vii, 2–4).

In 65 BC, Hyrcanus II, under the Roman intervention of Syllabus, who overcame his brother (Ant., XIV, ii, 1–5). Ten years later (63 BC) Pompey, having been met by the ambassadors of both parties, bearing presents, as well as of the Pharisees, came himself to compose the quarrel of the rival factions, and, being shut out of the city, took it by storm. He entered the "Holy of Holies," but left the temple treasures in the city unharmed. The walls of the city were subsequently demolished; Hyrcanus II was reinstated as high priest, but Aristobulus was carried off to Rome, and the city surrendered as a tributary to the Roman Empire (Ant., XIV, iv, 1–4; BJ, I, vii, 1–7). The Syrian proconsul, M. Lucinius Crassus, going upon his expedition against the Parthians in 55 BC, carried off from the temple the money which Pompey had left (Ant., XIV, vii, 1). The following year (67 BC) the temple had lain in ruins for 10 years had been gaining power as a self-appointed adviser to the weak Hyrcanus, was made a Roman citizen and appointed procurator in return for very meagre services which he had undertaken to render to Julius Caesar.

40. Pompey's Storm of the Jerusalem Temple (52–50 BC) was taken by storm and the Parthians in 55 BC, carried off from the temple the money which Pompey had left (Ant., XIV, vii, 1). The following year (67 BC) the temple had lain in ruins for 10 years had been gaining power as a self-appointed adviser to the weak Hyrcanus, was made a Roman citizen and appointed procurator in return for very meagre services which he had undertaken to render to Julius Caesar.

41. Julius Caesar appointed procurator in return for very meagre services which he had undertaken to render to Julius Caesar.

42. Parthian and Barzapharnes captured and plundered Jerusalem (Ant., XIV, xiv, 3, 4) and reestablished Antigonus (BJ, i, xiii, 13). Herod, removed his tribe to Massada and, having been appointed king of Judaea by Antony, returned, after various adventures, in 37 BC. Assisted by Sosibius, the Roman proconsul, he took Jerusalem after a 5 months' siege by the promise of liberal reward he restrained the soldiers from sacking the city (Ant., XIV, xvi, 2–3).

During the reign of this great monarch Jerusalem assumed a magnificence surpassing that of all other ages.

43. Reign of Herod the Great (37–4 BC) rebuilt the fortress to the N. of the temple—the ancient Baris—on a great scale with 4 towers, the western one renamed it the Antonia in honor of his patron. He celebrated games in a new theater, and constructed a hippodrome (BJ, II, iii, 1) or amphitheater (Ant., XV, viii, 1). He must necessarily have strengthened and repaired the walls, but such work was done by the 4 great towers which he erected, Hippicus, Phasael and Mariamne, near the present Jaffa—a fortified tower, and the lofty octagonal tower, Psephinus, farther to the N.W. The development of Herod's plans for the reconstruction of the temple was commenced in 19 BC, but they were not completed till 64 AD (Jn 2:20; Mt 21:1.2; Lk 21:5.6). The sanctuary itself was built by 1,980 specially trained priests within a space of 18 months (11–10 BC). The conception was magnificent, and resulted in a mass of buildings of size and beauty far surpassing anything that had stood there before. Practically nothing of the older structures and some of the earlier modifications of the temple-enclosure now surviving in connection with the Haram belong to this period. In 4 BC—the year of the Nativity—occurred the disturbances following upon the destruction of the Golden Eagle
which Herod had erected over the great gate of the temple, and shortly afterward Herod died, having previously shut up many of the leading Jews in the hippodrome with orders that they should be slain when he passed away (BJ, I, xxxii, 6). The accession of Archelaus was signalized by Passover riots which ended in the death of 3,000, an after-result of the affair of the Golden Eagle.

45. Herod

Archelaus, by mismanagement and greed, raised the city about his ears, and the next Passover was celebrated by a massacre, street fighting and open robbery. Varus, the governor of Syria, who had hastened to the help of his subordinate, suppressed the rebellion with ruthless severity and crucified 2,000 Jews. Archelaus returned shortly afterward as ethnarch, an office which he retained until his exile in 6 AD. During the procuratorship of Coponius (6–10 AD) another Passover riot occurred in consequence of the aggravating conduct of some Samaritans.

During the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (29–37 AD) there were several disturbances, culminating in a riot consequent upon his taking some of the "corban" or sacred offerings of the temple for the construction of an aqueduct (Ant, XVIII, iii, 2)—probably part at least of the "low-level aqueduct" (see VII, 15, above). Herod Agrippa I inclosed the suburbs, which had grown up N. of the second wall and of the temple, by what Jos calls the "Third Wall" (see V, above).

His son, King Agrippa, built—about 56 AD—a large addition to the old Hasmonean palace, from which he could overlook the temple area. This act was a cause of offence to the Jews who built a wall on the western boundary of the Inner Court to shut off his view. In the quarrel which ensued the Jews were successful in gaining the support of Nero (Ant, XX, viii, 11). In 64 AD the long rebuilding of the temple-courts, which had been begun in 19 BC, was concluded. The 18,000 workmen thrown out of employment appear to have been given "unemployed work" in "paving the city with white stone" (Ant, XX, ix, 6–7).

Finally the long-smouldering discontent of the Jews against the Romans burst forth into open rebellion under the incompetent Gessius Florus, 66 AD (Ant, XX, xi, 1). Palaces and public buildings were fired by the enraged multitude, and after but two days' siege, the Antonia itself was captured, set on fire and its garrison slain (BJ, II, xvii, 6–7). Cestius Gallus, hastening from Syria, was soon engaged in a siege of the city. The third wall was captured and the suburb BEZETHA (q.v.) burnt, but, when about to renew the attack on the second wall, Gallus appears to have been seized with panic, and his partial withdrawal developed into an inglorious retreat in which he was pursued by the Jews down the pass to the Beth-horons as far as Antipatris (BJ, II, xix).

This victory cost the Jews dearly in the long run, as it led to the campaign of Vespasian and the eventual crushing of all their national hopes. Vespasian commenced the conquest in the north, and advanced by slow and certain steps. Being recalled to Rome as emperor in the midst of Titus (70 AD) was soon engaged in a siege of the city. The third wall was captured and the suburb BEZETHA (q.v.) burnt, but, when about to renew the attack on the second wall, Gallus appears to have been seized with panic, and his partial withdrawal developed into an inglorious retreat in which he was pursued by the Jews down the pass to the Beth-horons as far as Antipatris (BJ, II, xix).

49. The City Be- 

sieged by 

Titus (70 AD) 

None of the many calamities which had happened to the city are to be compared with this terrible siege. In none had the city been so magnificent, its fortifications so powerful, its population so crowded. It was Passover time, but, in addition to the crowds assembled for this event, vast numbers had hurried there, flying from the advancing Roman army. The loss of life was enormous; refugees to Titus gave 600,000 as the number dead (BJ, V, xiii, 7), but this seems incredible. The total population today within the walls cannot be more than 20,000, and the total population of modern Jerus, which covers a far greater area than that of those days, cannot at the most liberal estimate exceed 80,000. Three times this, or, a quarter of a million, seems incredible, and many would place the numbers at far less.

The siege commenced on the 14th of Nisan, 70 AD, and ended on the 8th of Elul, a total of 134 days. The enemy were divided into two internal factions. Simon held the upper and lower cities; John of Gischala, the temple and "Ophel"; the Idumaeans, introduced by the Zealots, fought only for themselves, until they relieved the city of their terrors. Yet another party, too weak to make its counsels felt, was for peace with Rome, a policy which, if taken in time, would have found in Titus a spirit of reason and mercy. The miseries of the siege and the destruction of life and property were at least as much the work of the Jews themselves as of their conquerors. On the 15th day of the siege the third wall (Agrippa's), which had been but hastily finished upon the approach of the Romans, was captured; the second wall was finally taken on the 24th day; on the 72d day the Antonia fell, and 12 days later the daily sacrifice ceased. On the 105th day—the ominous 9th of Ab—the temple and the lower temple area were burnt, and the last day found the whole city in flames. Only the destruction of the three great towers of Herod, Hip- 

city picus, Pharasz and Marianne, with the western walls, were spared to protect the camp of the Xth Legion to guard the site, and "in order to demonstrate to posterity what kind of city it was and how well fortified"; the rest of the city was dug up to its foundations (BJ, VII, i, 1).

60 years after its capture silence reigns over Jerus. We know that the site continued to be garrisoned, but it was not to any extent rebuilt. In 130 AD it was visited by Hychs, who found but few buildings standing. Two years later (152–53 AD) occurred the last great rebellion of the Jews in the form of Bar-Cochba ("son of a star"), who was encouraged by the suppression of this last effort for freedom by Julius Severus. The remaining traces of Judaism were stamped out, and it is even said (Talmud, T. Jerusalem, 7a) that the very site of the temple was ploughed up by T.
Rufus. An altar of Jupiter was placed upon the temple-site, and Jews were excluded from Jerusalem on pain of death.

53. Hadrian Builds the Second Temple

Hadrian rebuilt the city, giving it the name Capitolina. Some have supposed that it was probably determined by the southern slope of the hill, and that the site of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was transferred. At all events, it is certain that the temple walls were abandoned, and that the site of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was transferred. The temple was built on the site of the temple of Jupiter, which was destroyed by the Romans.

54. Constantinople Builds the Church of the Holy Sepulchre

Constantine, the emperor, built the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on the site of the temple of Jupiter. The church was built on the site of the temple of Jupiter, which was destroyed by the Romans.

55. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre

The church was built on the site of the temple of Jupiter, which was destroyed by the Romans.

56. Justinian Rebuilds the Walls of Jerusalem

The emperor Justinian, who was perhaps the greatest of the Christian emperors, rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem. The walls were rebuilt on the site of the temple of Jupiter, which was destroyed by the Romans.

57. The City of Jerusalem

In 1620, the city of Jerusalem was conquered by the Persians. The city was destroyed, and the walls were knocked down.

58. The Seljuk Turks and Their Cruelties

The Seljuk Turks, under the leadership of the sultan, conquered the city in 1382. They were followed by the Mongols, who conquered the city in 1240.
tion, and are worthy represented by several handsome buildings, e.g. the Protestant "Church of the Redeemer," built on the site and on the ground plan of a fine church belonging to the Knights of St. John, the new (Roman Catholic) Church of the Dormition on "Mount Zion," with an adjoining Benedictine convent, a very handsome Roman Catholic hospice outside the Damascus Gate, the Kaiserin Augusta Victoria Sanatorium on the Mount of Olives, the Bulgarian Church, and the "Bottom of the city, a large general hospital and a leper hospital, a consulate and two large schools. In influence, both secular and religious, the Germans have rapidly gained ground in the last 2 decades. British influence has much diminished, relatively. The British Ophthalmic Hospital, belonging to the "Order of the Knights of St. John," the Eng. Mission Hospital, belonging to the London Jewish Society, the Bishop's School and Eng. College connected with the Church Missionary Society. 3 Anglican churches, of which the handsome St. George's Collegiate Church adjoins the residence of the Anglican Bishop, and a few small schools comprise the extent of public buildings connected with British societies. France and the Roman Catholic church are worthy represented by

the Dominican monastery and seminary connected with the handsome church of St. Stephen—rebuilt on the plan of an old Christian church—by the Batisbon (Jesuit) Schools, the Hospital of St. Louis, the hospice and Church of St. Augustine, and the monastery and seminary of the "white fathers" or Frères de la mission algérienne, whose headquarters center round the beautifully re-

stored Church of St. Anne. Not far from here are the con-

vent and school of the Sœurs de Sion, at the Ecce Homo Church. Also inside the walls near the New Gate is the residence of the Lat Patriarch—a cardinal of the Church of Rome—with a church, the school of the Frères de la doctrine chrétienne, and the schools, hospi-

tal and convent of the Franciscans, who are recognized among their confreres as the "parish priests" in the city, having been established there longer than the numerous other orders.

All the various nationalities are under their respective consuls and enjoy extra-territorial rights. Besides the Turkish post-office, which is very insufficiently managed, the Austrians, Germans, French, Russians, and Italians all have post-offices open to all, with special "Levant" stamps. The American mail is delivered at the American post-office. There are four chief banks, French, Ger-

man, Ottoman, and Anglo-Pale (Jewish). As may be supposed, on account of the demand for land for Jewish settlements or for Christian schools or convents, the price of such property has increased rapidly and consider-

ably in recent years all owners of land—and Moslems have not been slow to copy the foreigners—have been to-

ken to inclosing their property with high and unpleasing walls, greatly spoiling both the walls around the city and the prospects from many points of view. The increased development of carriage traffic has led to considerable dust in the dry season, and mud in winter, as the roads are very soft limestones. The Jerusalem-Jaffa Railway (a Fr. company), 54 miles long, which was opened in 1892, has steadily increased its traffic year by year, and is now a considerable revenue, there is no public water-supply, and no public sewers for the new Jewish settlement. In the Rami, by choice of a town with ill-constructed mediaeval sewer, which opens just below the Jewish settlement in the Kidron and runs down the Wady en N自然界, is one of the most unhealthy of all, and the trans and electric lights for the streets, are all much-

talked of improvements. There are numerous hotels, besides extensive accommodations in the religious hos-

pices, and no less than 15 hospitals and asylums.

LITERATURE.—This is enormous, but of very unequal value and much of it out of date. For all purposes the best book of reference is Jesus from the Earliest Times to AD 70, 2 vols., by Principal G. A. Smith. It contains references to all the lit. It is impossible for the present writer adequately to ex-

press its indebtedness, and no attempt at acknowledg-

ment in detail has been made in this art. In supple-

ment of the above, Jerus. by Dr. Selah Morrill, and Jerus in Bible Times, by Professor Lewis H. Passan, will be found useful. The latter is a condensed account, esp. valuable for its illustrations and its copious references. Of the arts in the recent Bible Dictionaries, that by Conder in HDB is perhaps the most valuable. Of guide-books, Besekker's Guide to Pal and Syria (1911), by Sochin and Benzinger, and Barnabe Meitmann's (R.C.) New Guide to the Holy Land (1900), will be found useful; also Hanauer's Walks about Jerus. On Geography, Climate and Water-Supply: Hull's "Memoir on Physical Geography and Geology of Arabiac Petrae, Pal. and Adjoining Districts," PEF. and

Modern Jerusalem (with Pool of Hezekiah in Foreground)

scheid, "Die Niederschlegverhältnisse Pal in alter u. neuer Zeit," ZDPV (1902); Huntington, Pal and Its Transformation (1911); Andrew Watt, Climate in Hebron, etc. Journal of the Scottish Meteorological So-
ciety (1900-11); Schück, "Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerus," ZDPV, 1876; Wilson, "Water Supply of Jerus," Proceedings of the Victoria Institute, 1906; Mas-

terman, in B.W., 1905. On Archaeology and Topography: PEF, vol on Jerus, with accompanying maps and plans; Clermont-Ganneau, Archéologique Recherches, 1, 1899 (PEF); William, Holy City (1849); Robinson, Bib. Researches (1856); Wilson, Discovery of Jerus (1871); Warren, Underland Jerus (1876); Vincent, Underland Jer-

rusalem (1911); Gubbe, "Ausgrabungen in Jerus," ZDPV, Y, Blies and Dickie, Excavations in Jerus (1894-97); Sayers, Sacred Sites of the Gospel (1893); Mitchell, "The Wall of Jerus according to the Book of Neh," JBL, 1903; Wilson, Goldfuchsh and the Holy Sepulchre (1906); Rümelin, Materialien z. Topographie des alt. Jerus; also numerous reports in the PEF's Zeitschriften der deutschen Pal Vereins; and the Revue biblique.

On History: besides Bible, Apoc. works of Jes., and History of Tacitus; Beatty and Palmer, History of Jerus; Conder, Judas Maccabaeus and Latin Kingdom of Jerus; Le Strange, Pal under the Moslems (1889); G. F. Kent, Biblical Geography and History (1911), Bevan, Jerus. under the High-Priests; Watson, The Story of Jerus., P. W. G. Maserst.
have come into being. The picture is drawn from a twofold view: (1) the new Jerusalem is a restoration of Paradise (21:6, 22:1.14); it is also the ideal of the theocracy realized (21:3.12.14.22). The latter viewpoint explains the peculiar representation that the city descends "out of heaven from God" (21:2.10), which characterizes it, as, on one hand, a product of God's supernatural workmanship, and as, on the other hand, the culmination of the historic process of redemption. In other NT passages, where the theocratic point of view is less prominent, the antitypical Jerusalem appears as having its seat in heaven instead of as, here coming down from heaven to earth (cf Gal 4:26; Heb 11:10; 12:22). See also Revelation of John.

Jerusha, jē-rōo’sha (יְרוּשַׁא, yērōshā), "taken possession of," i.e. "married": In 2 K 15:33 = "Jerushah" (יְרֵוְשָּׁא, yēreshā-sha, same meaning) of 2 Ch 27:1, the mother of King Josiah of Judah. Zadok was her father's name; he may be the priest of 1 Ch 6:12 (Heb 5:35).

Jeshaiah, jē-shā’-ya, jē-shā’-a (יְשָׁיָע, yēshā’-yā), a Levite ancestor of Shelemoth, one of David's treasurers (1 Ch 26:25).

Jesharaiav (יְשָׁרָיָא, yēshā’rikā), a descendant of Elam; he went with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:7) = "Jesira" (RV), "Josias" (AV), 1 Esd 8:33.

Jeshua (יְשָׁוָע, yēshā’u), a Levite of the sons of Merari and a contemporary of Ezra (Ezr 8:19) = "Osnias" of 1 Esd 8:48.

Jeshua, jē-shā’-a, jē-shā’- a (יְשָׁוָע, yēshā’u), Jeh is deliverance or opulence: (1) AV "Jeshua," head of the 9th course of priests, possibly of "the house of Jeshua" (1 Ch 26:11; Ezr 2:26; Neh 7:30).

(2) A Levite of Hesekiah's time (2 Ch 31:15).

(3) Son of Jozadak = Joshua the high priest (Ezr 2:2; 3:28; 4:3; 4:5; 5:2; 10:18; Neh 7:7; 12:17.10.26); see Joshua (4) = "Jesus" (1 Esd 5:48 and Sir 49:12).

(4) A man of Pahath-moab, some of whose descendants returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:11) = "Jesus" (1 Esd 5:8).

(5) Head of a Levitical house which had oversight of the workmen in the temple (Ezr 4:20; 3:9; Neh 7:43). He is mentioned again in Neh 8:7 as taking part in explaining the Torah to the people, in 9:1 (cf 12:8) as leading in the worship, and in 10:9 (Heb 10) as sealing the covenant; this J. is called son of Azaniah (Neh 10:9). To these references should be added probably Neh 24, where commentators read, "Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel" for "Jeshua the son of Kadmiel." Perhaps Jozabad (Ezr 8:33) is a 'son' of the same Jeshua; cf Ezr 8:33 = 1 Esd 8:63, where AV is "Jesus," RV "Jesus." He is the same as Jessua (AV), Jesus (RV) (1 Esd 5:26).

(6) Father of Ezer, a repairer of the wall (Neh 3:19).

(7) Joshua, son of Nun (Neh 8:17) (q.v.).

Jeshua, jē-shā’-a, jē-shā’- a (יְשָׁוָע, yēshā’u), a place occupied by the children of Judah after their return from captivity (Neh 11:26), evidently, from the places named with it, in the extreme S. of Judah. It may correspond with the Shema of Josh 15:26,
and possibly to the Sheba of 19 2. The site may be Khirbet Sâ‘wèh, a ruin on a prominent hill, Tell es Sâ‘wèh, 12 miles E.N.E. of Beersheba. The hill is surrounded by a wall of large blocks of stone. PEF, III, 400-10, 5h XXV.

JESURUN, jē-shù′rûn, jē-shû′rûn (גֶּשֶׁר, “upright one”), Dt 32 15; 33 5; Isa. 44 2): LXX τρίτον “the beloved one” (ὕπατος, ἐγαπόμενος, the perf. part. passive of ἀγαπάω), and in LXX “David, dux populi.” Vulg. has διστατίσσω in 32 15, elsewhere rectissimus; Ac. Symm., Theod., have “upright.” For the form, Duhm compares נַעַלְתָם, Zebulun. (1) The name used to be explained as a diminutive form, a pet name, and some, e.g. Cornill, Schulte (OT Theol., ET, 11, 29, n.12) still explain it so, “the righteous little people.” But there is no evidence that the ending -שׂ had a diminutive force. (2) Most moderns take it as a poetical or ideal title of Israel, derived from נַעַל, yəshāh, “upright;” it is held to contain a tacit reference to the word Israel (יִשְׂרָאֵל, yisra‘ēl), of which the first three consonants are almost the same as those of “Jeshurun;” in Nu 23 10 the term “the righteous one” (יִשְׂרָאֵל, yisra‘ēl) is supposed to contain a similar reference. Most commentators compare also to the Book of Jashar,” and it has been held that “Jashar” is synonymous by a name by which Israel is called. See JASHAR.

Following Bacher (ZATW, 1885, 101 ff), commentators hold that in Isa this new name, a coinage due to the author of Second Isaiah and adopted in Dt, stands in contrast to Jacob, “the supplanter,” as his name was explained by the Hebrews of Hos 12 2-4. Israel is here given a new name, “the upright, pious one,” and with the new name goes a new chance in life, to live up to its meaning. Driver (Dt, 361) says that in Dt 32 15 “where the context is of declension from its ideal [it is] applied reprooffully. ‘Nomen Rrecti pro Israele ponens, ironica eos perstringit qui rectitudine defeecerant’ (Calv.). Elsewhere it is used as a title of honor.” AV has “Jesurun” in Isa 44 25.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JESIAH, jē-si′a (1 Ch 23 20 AV). See ISHIAH.

JESIAS, jē-i′as (Iézias, Iesias; AV JOSIAH [1 Esd 8 38]): Corresponding to Jeshiah, son of Athaliah (Ezk 8 7).

JESIMIEL, jē-sîm′i-el (יִשְׁמִיאֵל, yishmî‘ēl, “God establishes”): A prince of Simeon (1 Ch 4 36).

JESSE, jēs′ē (יְסֵי, yēsēyāh, meaning doubtful; according to Gesenius it = "wealthy;" Olshausen, Gram., §§ 277 f, conjectures יׇשֶּי, yěshēyāh, "Jeh exis;" Wellhausen [1 S 14 49] explains it as יְסֵי, yēsēyāh, "b'ghtshay [see ANISHIAH]; Jershiai, Jershiai, Ruth 4 17 22; 1 S 16 17; 17 28; 25 10; 1 S 20 1; 23 1; 1 K 12 16; 1 Ch 10 14; 12 18; Ps 22 50; Isa 11 10 [—Rom 15 12]; Mt 1 5:6; Acts 13 22): Son of Obed, grandson of Boaz, and father of King David. The grouping of the references to J. in 1 S is buttressed up with that of the groups of the whole narrative of David and Saul. See SAMUEL, BOOKS OF. There seem to be three main veins in the narrative, so far as J. is concerned.

(1) In 1 S 16 1-13, where J. is called the Bethlehemite. Samuel is sent to seek among J.’s sons a successor to Saul.

Both Samuel and J. fail to discern at first Jehel’s choice, Samuel thinking that he would be the eldest son (ver 6), while J. had not thought it worth while to call the youngest to the feast (ver 11).

(2) In 1 S 16 14-23, Saul is mentally disturbed, and is advised to get a harpist. David “the son of J. the Bethlehemite” is recommended by a courtier, and Saul sends to J. for David.

“And J. took ten leavens [so emend and translate, and not as RV, ‘an ass laden with bread’] in a bottle of wine, and a kid, and sent them” to Saul as a present with David, who becomes a courtier of Saul’s with his father’s consent.

(b) The next mention of J. is in three contemporaneous references by Saul to David as “the son of J.,” in 20 27.30.31, part of the quarrel-scene between Saul and Jonathan. (But it is not quite certain if ch 20 belongs to the same source as 16 14-23.)

In answer to the first reference, Jonathan calls his friend “David,” and Saul repeats the phrase “the son of J.,” abusing Jonathan personally (ver 30, where the meaning is uncertain). The reference to David as “the son of J.” here and in the following verse is contemptuous, not because of any reproach that might attach itself to J., but, as Budd remarks, because “an upstart is always contemptuously referred to under his father’s name” in courts and society. History repeats itself.

(c) Further references of a like kind are in the passage, 22 6-23, vis. in vs 7.8.13 by Saul, and repeated by Doeg in ver 9.

(d) The final one of this group is in 25 10, where Nahal sarcastically asks “Who is David? and who is the son of J.?”

(3) The parts of 17-18 5 which are omitted by LXX B, i.e. 17 12-13, 45-6.55-18 6. Here J. is mentioned as “an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-judah” (ver 12, not “that” “Ephrathite, which is a grammatically impossible tr of the MT), Ephrath or Ephrathah being another name for Bethlehem, or rather for the district. He is further said to have eight sons (ver 12), of whom the three eldest had followed Saul to the war (ver 13).

J. sends David, the shepherd, to his brothers with provisions (ver 17). Afterward David, on being brought to Saul and asked who he is, answers, “I am the son of thy servant J. the Bethlehemite” (ver 58). J. is also described (ver 12) as being “in the days of Saul an old man, advanced in years” (so emend and translate, not as RV, ‘stricken in years among men’). The mention of his having 8 sons in ver 12 is not in agreement with 1 Ch 2 13-15, which gives only 7 sons with 2 sisters, but where 8yrs gives 8, adding, from 27 18. Elimi which MT has there probably by corruption (Calv., Ch. 89).

1 S 14 10 should be τρίτον “J. and his seven sons to pass before Samuel” (not as RV, “three of J.’s sons”) as a wrong inference from 16 10; (c) the names of the 3 eldest in 16 10, 14; (d) ver 14; 12 he then changes 16 and reads 12; (12) “Now D. was the son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whose name was J., who was .... (years) old at the time of Saul. (15) And the 3 eldest sons of J. had marched with Saul to the war, (14) and David was the youngest. (15) and David had remained to feed his father’s sheep at Bethlehem. (16) Now the Philis came,” etc.

According to all these narratives in 1 S, whether all 3 are entirely independent of one another or not, J. had lived in Bethelm, probably outside of the town wall, like Boaz (see BOAZ) his grandfather (Ruth 4 17). In 22 34 David intrusts his father and mother to the care of the king of Moab, but from 20 29 some have inferred that J. was dead (although most critics assign 22 3 at any rate to the same stratum as ch 20).

Jonathan tells Saul that David wanted to attend a family sacrificial feast at Bethlehem (20 29). MT reads, "and he, my brother, has commanded me," i.e. "the members of the clan, as we have read further on in the verse," "Let me go away," no other verb, and see my brethren." As J.'s daughters, see ARIELAH, NAAMAH.

(4) Of the other references to J., the most noteworthy is that in 11 1: “There shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of
his roots shall bear fruit," i.e. out of Jesse's roots (cf. Rev 5:5).

"Why J. and not David?" asks Duhm; and he answers, "Because the Messiah will be a second David, rather than a descendant of David." Marti explains it to mean that he will be, not from David, but from a collateral line of descent. Duhm's explanation suggests a parallelism between David and Christ, of whom the former may be treated as a type similar to Aaron and Melchizedek in He. Saul might pour contempt upon "the son of J.," but Isaiah has given J. here a name above all Heb names, and thus does Providence mock "society." See also Root of Jesse.

David Francis Roberts

JESTING, jest'ing: Used from Tindale down as the tr of ερπανα, eutrapelia (Eph 5:4). Aristotle uses the original in his Ethics iv.14 as an equivalent of quick-witted, from its root meaning "something easily turned," adding that, since the majority of people love excessive jesting, the word is apt to be degraded. This is the case here, where it clearly has a flavor of the coarse or licentious.

JESU, jes'ū. See JHSV.

JESUITES, jes'ū-its. See JHSV.

JESURUN, jē-sū-run. See JESURUN.

JESUS, jē'zus ('Iēous, Iēsous, for Ιησοῦς, Iēshuā';

(1) Joshua, son of Nun (AV Acts 7:45; He 4:8;
cf 1 Mac 2:55; 2 Esd 7:37).
(2) (3) High priest and Le. See JESUSHA, 2, 5.
(4) Son of Sirach. See Sirach.
(5) An ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3:29, AV "Jose").
(6) (7) See the next three articles.

JESUS CHRIST, jē'zus krest (Iēsoûs Χριστός, Iēsoûs Christôs):

I. The Names

II. Order of Treatment

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

I. The Sources

1. In General
2. Date of Existence of Jesus
3. Extra-Christian Notices
4. The Gospels

(1) The Synoptics
(2) The Fourth Gospel

II. The Preparation

1. Both Gentle and Jewish
2. Of Preparation
3. Post-exilic Preparation

III. The Outward Situation

1. The Land
   Its Divisions
2. Political Situation
   Changes in Territory
3. The Religious Sects
   (1) The Pharisees
   (2) The Pharisees
   (3) The Sadducees
   (4) The Essenes

IV. The Chronicle

1. Dates of the Birth of Jesus
2. Date of Baptism
3. Length of Ministry
4. Date of Christ's Death

PART II. THE PROBLEMS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

I. The Miracles

1. "Modern" Attitude
2. Supernatural in the Gospels

II. The Messiahship

1. Resent of Jesus and Modern Criticism
2. A Growing Revelation

III. Kingdom and Apocalyptic

1. The Kingdom—Present or Future?
2. Apocalyptic Beliefs

IV. The Character and Claims

1. Denial of Christ's Moral Perfection
2. Sinlessness and the Messianic Claim

PART III. COURSE OF THE EARTHLY LIFE OF JESUS

1. Divisions of
2. Not a Complete "Life"

A. FROM THE NATIVITY TO THE BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION

I. The Nativity

1. Hidden Piety in Judaism
2. Birth of the Baptist
3. The Annunciation and Its Results
4. The Birth at Bethlehem

(1) The Census of Quirinius
(2) Jesus Born
5. The Incidents of the Infancy

(1) The Visit of the Shepherds
(2) The Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple
(3) Visit of the Magi
6. Flight to Egypt and Return to Nazareth
7. Questions and Objections

(1) The Virgin Birth
(2) The Genealogies

II. The Years of Silence—The Twelfth Year

1. The Human Development
2. Jesus in the Temple

III. THE FORERUNNER AND THE BAPTISM

1. The Preaching of John
2. The Coming Christ
3. Jesus Is Baptized

IV. THE TEMPTATION

1. Temptation Follows Baptism
2. Nature of the Temptation
3. Stages of the Temptation
4. Typical Character

B. THE EARLY JESSON MINISTRY

I. THE TESTIMONIES OF THE BAPTIST

1. The Synoptics and John
2. Threefold Witness of the Baptist

II. THE FIRST DISCIPLES

1. Spiritual Accrual
2. "Son of Man" and "Son of God"

III. THE FIRST EVENTS

1. The First Miracle
2. The First Passover, and Cleansing of the Temple
3. The Visit of Nicodemus
4. Jesus and John

IV. JOURNEY TO GALILEE—THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA

1. Withdrawal to Galilee
2. The Living Water
3. The True Worship
4. Work and Its Reward

C. THE GALLILEAN MINISTRY AND VISITS TO THE FARSTS

1. The Scene
2. The Time

First Period—From the Beginning of the Ministry in Galilee till the Mission of the Twelve

I. OPENING INCIDENTS

1. Healing of Nicanor's Son
2. The Visit to Nazareth
3. Call of the Four Disciples
4. At Capernaum
   a) Christ's Teaching
   b) The Demoniac in the Synagogue
   c) Demon-Possession: its Reality
   d) Peter's Father's Mother
   e) The Eventful Evening

II. FROM THE FIRST GALLILEAN CIRCUIT TILL THE CHOICE OF THE APOSTLES

1. The First Circuit
2. Capernaum Incidents
   a) Cure of the Paralytic
   b) Call and Feast of Matthew

3. The Unnamed Jerusalem Feast
   a) The Healing at Bethesda
   b) Son and Father
   c) The Threefold Witness
   d) Sabbath Controversy
   e) Plucking of the Ears of Grain
   f) The Man with the Withered Hand
   g) Withdrawing to the Sea

5. The Chasing of the Twelve
   a) The Apostle Function
   b) The Men

III. FROM THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT TILL THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM—A SECOND CIRCUIT

1. The Sermon on the Mount
   a) The Blessings
   b) True Righteousness—the Old and the New Law
   c) Religion and Hypocrisy—True and False Motive
   d) The True Good and Cure for Care
   e) Relation to the World's Evil—the Conclusion

2. Intervention Incidents
   a) Healing of the Centurion's Servant
   b) The Widow of Nain's Son Raised
   c) Embassy of John's Disciples—Christ and His Generation
   d) The First Anointing—the Woman Who Was a Sinner
3. Second Galilean Circuit—Events at Capernaum
   a) Galilee Revisited
   b) Cure of Demolanc—Discourse on Blasphemy
   c) The Sign of Jesus
   d) The Sign of Jocund Arrival at Bethany

IV. FROM THE CROSSING TO GADARA TO THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE—A THIRD CIRCUIT
1. Crossing of the Lake—Stillling of the Storm
   a) Aspirants for Discipleship
   b) The Storm Calmed
2. The Gadarene (Gerasa) Demoniac
3. Jairus’ Daughter Raised—Woman with Issue of Blood
   a) Jairus’ Appeal and Its Result
   b) The Afflicted Woman Cured
4. Incidents of Third Circuit
5. The Twelve Sent Forth—Discourse of Jesus
   a) The Commission
   b) Counsels and Warnings

Second Period—After the Mission of the Twelve till the Departure from Galilee

I. FROM THE DEATH OF THE BAPTIST TILL THE DISCOURSE ON THE BREAD OF LIFE
   1. The Murder of the Baptist and Herod’s Alarms
   2. The Feeding of the Five Thousand
   3. Walking on the Sea
   4. Gennesaret—Discourse on the Bread of Life
   Peter’s First Confession

II. FROM DISPUTES WITH THE PHARISEES TILL THE TRANSFORMATION
1. Jesus and Tradition—Outward and Inward Purity
2. Retirement to Tyre and Sidon—the Syrophoenician Woman
3. At Decapolis—New Miracles
   a) The Dead Man
   b) Feeding of the Four Thousand
4. Leave of the Pharisees, etc.—Cure of Blind Man
5. At Caesarea Philippi—the Great Confession
   First Announcement of Passion
6. The Transfiguration—the Epileptic Boy

III. FROM THE PRIVATE Journey TO GALILEE TILL RETURN FROM THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES
1. Galilee and Capernaum—Second Announcement of the Passion
   a) The Temple Tax
   b) Discourse on Greatness and Forgiveness
     (1) Greatness in Humility
     (2) Tolerance
     (3) The Erring Brother
     (4) Parable of Unmeriful Servant
2. The Feast of Tabernacles—Discourses, etc
   a) The Private Journey—Divided Opinions
   b) Christ’s Self-Discovery
   c) The Woman Taken in Adultery
   d) The Cure of the Blind Man
   e) The Good Shepherd

Chronological Note

D. LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM—JESUS IN PERSE

I. FROM LEAVING GALILEE TILL THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION
   1. Rejected by Samaria
   2. Mission of the Seventy
   3. The Lawyer’s Question—Parable of Good Samaritan
4. Discourses, Parables, and Miracles
   a) Original to Luke
   b) The Infirm Woman—the Dropped Man
   c) Parable of the Great Supper
5. Counting the Cost
6. Feast of the Dedication

II. FROM THE ABODE AT BETHANY TILL THE RAISING OF LIZARUS
   1. Parables of Lost Sheep, Lost Piece of Silver and Prodigal Son
   2. Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus
   3. The Summons to Bethany—Raising of Lazarus

III. FROM THE RETIREMENT TO EPHRAIM TILL THE ARRIVAL AT BETHANY
   1. Retreat to Ephraim
   2. The Journey Resumed
   3. Cure of the Lepers
4. Pharisaic Questionings
   a) Divorce
   b) Coming of the Kingdom
   c) Parable of the Unjust Judge
5. The Spirit of the Kingdom
   a) Parable of Pharisees and Publican
   b) Blessing of the Babes
   c) The Rich Young Ruler
6. Third Announcement of the Passion
7. The Rewards of the Kingdom
   a) Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard
   b) The Sons of Zededece
Jesus Christ: The Founder of the Christian religion; the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world; the Lord and Head of the Christian church.

1. The Names.—(1) "Jesus" (Iēsus) is the Gr equivalent of the Heb "Joshua" (יוֹשָׁבָה, yōshāḇaḥ), meaning "Jehovah is salvation." It stands therefore in the LXX and Apoc for "Joshua," and in Acts 7 45 and He 4 8 likewise represents the OT Joshua; hence in RV is in these passages rendered "Joshua." In Mt 1 21 the name is commanded by the angel to be given to the son of Mary, "for it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (see below on "Nativity"). It is the personal name of the Lord in the Gospels and the Acts, but generally in the Epistles appears in combination with "Christ" or other appellative (alone in Rom 3 26; 4 24; 1 Cor 12 3; 2 Cor 11 4; Phil 2 10; 1 Thess 4 14; He 7 22; 10 19, etc.).

(2) "Christ" (Christos) is the Gr equivalent of the Heb "Messiah" (מֶשֶׁה, mēšīaḥ), cf in the NT in Jn 1 41; 4 26, "Messiah.

2. Christ meaning "anointed" (see Messiah). It designates Jesus as the fulfiller of the Messianic hopes of the OT and of the Jewish people. It will be seen below that Jesus Himself made this claim. After the resurrection it became the current title for Jesus in the apostolic church. Most frequently in the Epistles He is called "Jesus Christ," sometimes "Christ Jesus" (Rom 8 1.2.39; 1 Cor 1 1-20; 4 15; Eph 1 1; Phil 1 1; Col 1 1-28 AV; 1 Thess 2 14, etc.), often "Christ" alone (Rom 1 16 AV; 5 6.8; 6 4.8.9; 8 10, etc.). In this case "Christ" has acquired the force of a proper name. Very frequently the term is associated with "Lord" (kuriōs) — "the [or 'our'] Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 11 17; 16 11 AV; 15 31 AV; 20 21; 28 31; Rom 1 7; 5 1.11; 13 14; 1 Cor 16 23, etc).

II. Order of Treatment.—In studying, as it is proposed to do in this art., the earthly history of Jesus and His place in the faith of the apostolic church, it will be convenient to pursue the following order:

First, as introductory to the whole study, certain questions relating to the sources of our knowledge of Jesus, and to the preparation for, and circumstances of, His historical appearance, invite careful attention (Part I).

Next, still as preliminary to the proper narrative of the life of Jesus, it is desirable to consider certain problems arising out of the presentation of that life in the Gospels with which modern thought is more specially concerned, as determining the attitude in which the narratives are approached. Such are the problems of the miracles, the Messiahship, the sinless character and supernatural claims of Jesus (Part II).

The way is then open for treatment in order of the actual events of Christ's life and ministry, so far as recorded. These fall into many stages, from His nativity and baptism till His death, resurrection and ascension (Part III).

A final division will deal with Jesus as the exalted Lord in the aspects in which He is presented in the teaching of the Epistles and remaining writings of the NT (Part IV).

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

I. The Sources.—The principal, and practically the only sources for our knowledge of Jesus Christ are the four Canonical Gospels—distinction being made in these between the first three (Synoptic) Gospels, and the Gospel of John. Nothing, either in the few notices of Christ in non-Christian authors, or in the references in the other books of the NT, or in later Christian lit., adds to the information which the Gospels already supply. The so-called apocryphal Gospels are worthless as historical documents (see s.v.); the few additional sayings of Christ (cf Acts 20 35) found in outside writings are of doubtful genuineness (cf a collection of these in Westcott's Intro to the Study of the Gospels, Appendix C; see also Louth). It marks the excess to which skepticism has gone that writers are found in recent years who deny the very existence of Jesus Christ (Kalt¬hoff, Das Christus-Problem, and Die Entstehung des Christenthums; Jensen, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, ET, 313 ff; Jensen is reviewed in the writer's The Resurrection of Jesus, ch 18). The extravagance of such skepticism is its sufficient refutation.

Of notices outside the Christian circles the following may be referred to.

(1) Josephus.—There is the famous passage of Ant. xi, 3, 3 commencing, "Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man," etc. It is not unlikely that Jos had some reference to Jesus, but most agree that the passage in question, if not entirely spurious, has been the subject of Christian interpolation (on the lit. and different views, see Schürer, Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Div II, vol II, 143 ff; in support of interpolation, Edersheim on "Josephus," in Dict. of. Christ. Biog).

(2) Tacitus.—The Rom historian, Tacitus, in a well-known passage relating to the persecution of Nero (Ann. xv.44), tells how the Christians, already "a great multitude" (ingens multitudo), derived their name "from one Christus, who was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator of Judaea, Pontius Pilate.

(3) Suetonius also, in his account of Claudius, speaks of the Jews as expelled from Rome for the raising of tumults at the instigation of one "Christus" (impius Christo), plainly a mistake for "Christus." The incident is doubtless that referred to in Acts 18 2.

The four Gospels, then, with their rich contents, remain as our primary sources for the knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus.

4. The Synoptics.—It may be taken that the result of the best criticism is that the first three Gospels (Mt, Mk, Lk) all fall well within the apostolic age (cf Harnack, Allchr. Lit., Pref; see Gospels). The favorite theory at present of the relations of these Gospels is that Mk is an independent Gospel, resting on the teaching of Peter; that Mt and Lk have as sources the Gospel of Mk and a collection of discourses, probably attributable to the apostle Matthew (now commonly called Q); and that Lk has a third, well-authenticated source (Lk 1 1-4) peculiar to himself. The present writer is disposed to allow more independence to the evangelists in the embodying of a tradition common to all; in any case, the sources named are of unquestionable authority, and furnish a strong guaranty for the reliability of the narratives. The supreme guaranty of their trustworthiness, however, is found in the narratives themselves; for when in (or any) age could imagine a figure so unique and perfect as that of Jesus, or invent the incomparable sayings and parables that proceeded from His lips? Much of Christ's teaching is high as heaven above the minds of men still.
The Fourth Gospel.—The Fourth Gospel stands apart from the Synoptics in dealing mainly with another set of incidents (the Jerusalem ministry), and discourses of a more private and intimate kind than those belonging to the Galilean teaching. Its sin, too, is evident—to show that Jesus is "the Son of God," and its style and mode of conception are very different from those of the Synoptic Gospels. Its contents touch their narratives in only a few points (as in Jn 6 4-21). Where they do, the resemblance is manifest. It is obvious that the reminiscences which the Gospel contains have been long brooded over by the apostle, and that a certain interpretative element blends with his narration of incidents and discourses. This, however, does not warrant us in throwing doubt, with so many, on the genuineness of the Gospel, for which the external evidence is exceptionally strong (cf Sanday, The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel; Drummond, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel; and see John, Gospel of). The Gospel is accepted here as a genuine record of the sayings and doings of Jesus which it narrates.

II. The Preparation.—In the Gospels and throughout the NT Jesus appears as the goal of OT revelation, and the point to which it was worked up (cf Lk 3:4-18, and a similar tendency in Jn). 1. Both the gentle and he came, Paul says, in "the fulness of time" (Gal 4 4). It has often been shown how, politically, intellectually, morally, everything in the Graeco-Roman world was ready such a new religion as Jesus brought into it (cf Baur's History of the Church in the First Three Centuries, ET, ch i). The preparation in Israel is seen alike in God's revelations to, and dealings with, the chosen people in the patriarchal, Mosaic, monarchical and prophetic periods, and in the development of Jewish mind in the centuries immediately before Christ. As special lines in the OT preparation may be noted the ideas of the Messianic king, a ruler of David's house, whose reign would be righteous, perpetual, universal (cf Is 11 1-9 7; 33 12, Jer 33 15-18; Ps 2 1-10, etc); of a Righteous Sufferer (Ps 22, etc), whose sufferings are in Is 53 declared to have an expiatory and redeeming character; and of a Messiah who upholds "the whole earth, and embraces all peoples" (cf Is 60; Ps 87; Dn 2 44; 7 27, etc). The kingdom, at the same time, is now conceived of under a more spiritual aspect. Its chief blessings are forgiveness and righteousness.

The age succeeding the return from exile witnessed a manifold preparation for the advent of Christ. Here may be observed the decentralization of the Jewish religious ideals through the rise of synagogue preparation worship and the widespread dispersion of the race; the contact with Hellenic culture (as in Philo); but esp. the marked sharpening of Messianic expectations. Some of these were of a crude apocalyptic character (see Apocalyptic Literature; Eschatology of the OT); many were political and revolutionary; but some were of a purer and more spiritual kind (cf Lk 2 25-38). To these purer elements Jesus attached Himself in His preaching of the kingdom and of Himself as its Lord. Even in the gentile world, it is told, there was an expectation of a great One who about this time would come from Judaea (Tac. Hist. v 13; Strabo, Geog. vi 3 5, etc). 2. The political persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Maccabean revolts made up of faction, intrigue, wars, murders, massacres, of growing degeneracy of rulers and nation, of repeated sackings of Jerusalem and terrible slaughters—thus Herod, the Idumean, misnamed "the Great," ascended the throne by favor of the Romans (37 BC), must be read in the books relating to the period (Ewald, History of Israel, V Vol. II, The Jews in the Time of Their Captivity, Div I, Vol I; Stanley, Jewish Church, III, etc.). Rome's power, first invited by Judas Maccabaeus (161 BC), was finally established by Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (63 BC). Herod's way to the throne was tracked by crime and bloodshed, and murder of those most nearly related to him marked every step in his advance. His taste for splendid buildings—palaces, temple (Mt 24 1; Jn 20), fortresses, cities (Sebaste, Caesarea, etc)—and lavish magnificence of his royal estate and administration, could not conceal the hideousness of his crafty, unscrupulous selfishness, his cold-blooded cruelty, his tyrannous oppression of his subjects. "Better be Herod's hog than his son," was the comment of Augustus, when he heard of the dying king's unnatural doings.

III. The Outward Situation.—Of all lands Pal was the most fitted to be the scene of the culminating revelation of God's grace in the person and work of Jesus Christ, as before it was fitted to be the abode of the people chosen to receive and preserve the revelations that prepared the way for that final manifestation. At once central and secluded—at the junction of the three great continents of the Old World, Asia, Africa and Europe—the highway of nations in war and commerce—touching mighty powers on every hand, Egypt, Syria, Assyria, kingdoms of Asia Minor, as formerly more ancient empires, Hittite and Babylonian, now in direct contact with Greece and Rome, yet singularly isolated by desert, Jordan, and Great Sea, from ready entrance of foreign influences, Pal has a place of its own in the history of revelation, which only a Divine wisdom can have given it (cf Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, Part II, ch ii; G. A. Smith, History of the Holy Land, Book I, chs i, ii; Lange, Life of Christ, I, 246 f.). Its divisions.—Pal, in the Roman period, was divided into four well-defined provinces or districts—Judaea, with Jerusalem as its center, in the S, the stronghold of Jewish conservatism; Samaria, in the middle, separated from Assyrian times by mixed peoples; Galilee (62 K 24 23-34), preponderatingly heathen in origin, yet now professing the Jewish religion, claiming Jewish descent (cf Jn 4 12), possessing a copy of the law (the temple, built by Manasseh, c 496 BC, was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, 106 BC); Galilee—"Galilee of the Gentiles" (Mt 4 15; cf Isa 9 1) —in the N, the chief scene of Christ's ministry, more cosmopolitan and more hospitable in spirit, through a large infusion of gentile population and contact with traders, etc.; of varied nationalities: these in Western Pal, while on the E, "beyond Jordan," was Perea, divided up into Perea proper, Batabne, Gaulonitis, Ituraea, Trachonitis, Decapolis, etc (cf Mt 4 25; 19 1; Mk 1). The tension of a conflict between Jews and Samaritans was intense (Jn 4 9). The language of the people throughout was Aramaic (q.v.), but a knowledge of the Gr tongue was widely diffused, especially in the N, where intercourse with Gr-speaking peoples was habitual (the NT writings are in Gr). Jesus doubtless used the native dialect in His ordinary teaching, but it is highly probable that He also knew Gr, and was acquainted with OT Scriptures in that language (the LXX). In this He may have seen behind, and used it in His preaching (of Roberts, Discourses on the Gospels). The miserable story of the vicissitudes of the Jewish people in the cent. succeeding the great persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabean revolts made up of faction, intrigue, wars, murders, massacres, of growing degeneracy of rulers and nation, of repeated sackings of Jerusalem and terrible slaughters—thus Herod, the Idumean, misnamed "the Great," ascended the throne by favor of the Romans (37 BC), must be read in the books relating to the period (Ewald, History of Israel, V; Milman, History of Jesus; Schürer, History of the Jews in the Time of Their Captivity, Div I, Vol I; Stanley, Jewish Church, III, etc). Rome's power, first invited by Judas Maccabaeus (161 BC), was finally established by Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (63 BC). Herod's way to the throne was tracked by crime and bloodshed, and murder of those most nearly related to him marked every step in his advance. His taste for splendid buildings—palaces, temple (Mt 24 1; Jn 20), fortresses, cities (Sebaste, Caesarea, etc)—and lavish magnificence of his royal estate and administration, could not conceal the hideousness of his crafty, unscrupulous selfishness, his cold-blooded cruelty, his tyrannous oppression of his subjects. "Better be Herod's hog than his son," was the comment of Augustus, when he heard of the dying king's unnatural doings.
Changes in territory.—At the time of Christ's birth, the whole of Galilee was united under Herod's rule, but on Herod's death, after a long reign of 37 (or, counting from his actual accession, 34) years, his dominions were, in accordance with his will, divided into three parts. The first, under Archelaus, a few towns excepted, fell to his son Archelaus (Mt 22), with the title of "etnarch"; Galilee and Perea were given to Herod Antipas, another son, with the title of "tetarch" (Mt 14; Lk 3 1.19; 23 7; Acts 13 1). Herod Philip, first son, received Ituraea, Trachonitis, and other parts of the northern trans-Jordanic territory, likewise as "tetarch" (Lk 3 1; cf Mt 14 3; Mk 6 17). A few years later, the tyranny of Archelaus provoked an appeal of his subjects to Augustus, and Archelaus, assuming to Rome his title (4 AD). Thereafter Judaea, with Samaria, was governed by a Roman procurator, under the oversight of the prefect of Syria.

In the religious situation the chief fact of interest is the place occupied and prominent part played by the religious sects—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and (though unmentioned in the Gospels, these had an important influence on Jewish life) the Essenes (assumed to be connected with the sect of the Essenes, a religious movement in the history of the church) the Essenes.

The result and characteristics of these sects can here only be alluded to (see special arts.).

(1) The scribes.—From the days of Ezra zealous attention had been given to the study of the law, and an order of men had arisen—the "scribes"—whose special business it was to guard, develop and expound the law. Through their labors, scrupulous observance of the law, and, with it, of the innumerable regulations intended to preserve the law, and apply it in detail to conduct (the so-called "tradition of the elders," Mt 15 2 ff), became the ideal of righteousness. The sects first appear in the Maccabean age. The Maccabean conflict reveals the existence of a party known as the "Assyrians" (Heb ἀσσυρίας), or "pious" ones, opposed to the calf Hellenizing tendencies of the times, and staunch observers of the law. These in the beginning gave brave support to Judas Maccabaeus, and doubtless then embraced the best elements of the nation.

(2) The Pharisees.—From them, by a process of deterioration too natural in such cases, developed the party of legalists known in the Gospels as the "Pharisees" ("separated"), on which Christ's sternest criticism is directed. The Pharisaic traditions and believed in neither resurrection, angel nor spirit (Acts 23 8). Usually the Pharisees are found combining with these to destroy Jesus (Mt 26 3-5.57).

(3) The Sadducees.—Alongside of the Pharisees were the "Sadducees" (probably from "Zadok")—rather a political and aristocratic clique than a religious sect, into whose possession the honors of the high-priesthood and other influential offices had passed. They are first met with by name under John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC). The Sadducees received only the law of Moses, interpreted it in a literal, secularist spirit, rejected the Pharisaic traditions and believed in neither resurrection, angel nor spirit. Usually they are found combining with these to destroy Jesus (Mt 26 3-5.57).

(4) The Essenes.—The third party, the "Essenes," differed from both (some derive also from the As- sidaeans) in living in fraternities apart from the general community, chiefly in the desert of Engedi, on the N.W. shore of the Dead Sea, though some were found also in villages and towns; in rejecting animal sacrifices, etc., sending only gifts of incense to the temple; in practising celibacy and community of goods; in the wearing of white garments; in certain customs (as great reverence for Abraham and Samuel) and extravagant of oriental influence. They forbade slavery, war, oaths, were given to occult studies, had secret doctrines and books, etc. As remarked, they do not appear in the Gospel, but on account of certain resemblances it may have sought to establish a connection between them and John the Baptist and Jesus. In reality, however, nothing could be more opposed than Essenism to the essential ideas and spirit of Christ's teaching (cf Schürer, as above, Div II, Vol II, 188 ff; Kuenen, Hibbert Lects on National Religion in Universal Religions, 199-208; Lightfoot, Colossians, 114-79).

IV. The Chronology.—The leading chronological questions connected with the life of Jesus are discussed in detail elsewhere (Cuvon or Talm. NT; Quirinius, etc.); here it is sufficient to indicate the general scheme of dating adopted in the present art., and some of the grounds on which it is preferred.

The chief questions relate to the dates of the birth and baptism of Jesus, the duration of the ministry and the date of the crucifixion.

Thus challenged by some (Caspari, Bosanquet, Conder, etc., put it as late as 1 BC) the usual date for the death of Herod the Great, 4 BC, may be assumed as correct (for grounds of this dating, see Schürer, op. cit, Div I, Vol I, 406-67). The birth of Jesus was before, and apparently not very long before, this event (Mt 2). It may therefore be established that probability in the latter part of the previous year (5 BC), the ordinary dating of the commencement of the Christian era being thus, as is generally recognized, four years too late. There is no certainty as to the month or day of the birth. The Christmas date, December 25, is first met with in the W. in the 4th cent. (the eastern date was January 6), and was then possibly borrowed from a pagan festival. December, in the winter season, seems unlikely, as unsuitable for the purpose. The date, 2 BC, is preferred by Andrews, Conder. A more probable date is a couple of months earlier. The synchronism with Quirinius (Lk 2 2) is considered in connection with the fact stretching back to Quirinius' visit of 8 BC, suggested by Ramsay, Mackinlay and others, on the grounds of the assumed Roman census, astronomical phenomena, etc, appear to leave too long an interval before the death of Herod, and conflict with other data (Lk 3 1 (see below).

John is said by Luke to have begun to preach and baptize "in the fifteenth year of Tiberius" (Lk 3 1), and Jesus "was about thirty years of age" (ver 23) when He was baptized. Baptized by John, and entered on His ministry. If the 15th year of Tiberius is dated, as seems most likely, from his association with Augustus as colleague in the government, 785 AUC, or 12 AD (Tac. Ann. i.3; Suet. on Augustus, 97), and if Jesus may be supposed to have been baptized about 6 months after John commenced his work, these data combine in bringing us to the year 780 AUC, or 27 AD, as the year of Our Lord's baptism, in agreement with our former conclusion as to the date of His birth in 5 BC. To place the baptism of Jesus at 30 or 31 years of age at His baptism—an unwarrantable extension of the "about"—in accord with this is the statement in Jn 2 20 that the temple had been 46 years in building (it began in 20-19 BC) at the time of Christ's first Passover; therefore in
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780 AUC, or 27 AD (cf Schürer, op. cit., Div I, Vol I, 410).

The determination of the precise duration of Our Lord's ministry involves more doubtful elements. 3. Length which would, with some of the early of Ministry Fathers, compass the whole ministry into little over a single year (Browne, Hort, etc)—a view which involves without authority the rejection of the mention of the Passover in Jn 6—there remains the choice between a two years' and a three years' ministry. Both had three years' ministry becomes necessary. It is claimed, however, that in this case the "feast" would almost certainly have been named. It still does not follow, even if a minor feast—say Purim—is intended, that we are shut up to a two years' ministry. Mr. Turner certainly goes beyond his evidence in asserting that "while two years must, not more than two years can, be allowed for the interval from Jn 2 13.23 to Jn 11 55." The two years' scheme, as involves, will be seen on consideration of details, a serious over-estimating and arbitrary transposing of material which has no bearing on the need of longer time. We shall assume that the ministry lasted for three years, reserving reasons till the narrative is examined.

On the hypothesis now accepted, the crucifixion of Jesus took place at the Passover of 30 AD. On the two years' scheme it would fall a year earlier. On both sides it is Christ's agreement that it occurred on the Friday Death of the week of the Passover, but it is a disputed whether the Friday was the 14th or the 15th day of the month. The Gospel of John is pleaded for the former date, the Synoptics for the latter. The question will be considered in connection with the time of the Resurrection. Meanwhile it is to be observed that the 15th of the correct date, there seems reason to believe that the 16th of Nisan fell on a Friday in the year just named, 783 AUC, or 30 AD. We accept this pro-visionally as the date of the crucifixion.

PART II. THE PROBLEMS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

1. The Miracles.—Everyone is aware that the absence of miracle in the Gospels is a chief ground of the rejection of its history by the representatives of the "modern" school. It is not questioned that it is a supernatural person whose picture is presented in the Gospels. There is no real difference between the Synoptics and John in this respect. "Even the oldest Gospel," writes Bousset, "is written from the standpoint of faith; already for Mark, Jesus is not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in the world!" (Was wissen wir von Jesus? p. 45, 57.) But in interpreting the "modern" spirit, declares that no account embracing supernatural events can be accepted as historical. "The main characteristic of this modern mode of thinking," he says, "rests upon the determination to try to explain everything that takes place in the world by natural causes, or—to express it in another form—it rests on the determined assertion of universal laws to which all phenomena, natural and spiritual, are subject" (What Is Religion? ET, 283).

With such an assumption it is clear that the Gospels are condemned before they are read. Not only is Jesus there a supernatural person, but He is presented as supernatural in nature in character, in works, in the Gospels as a supernatural person, and He performs miracles; He has a supernatural birth, and a supernatural resurrection. All this is swept away. It may be allowed that He had remarkable gifts of healing, but these are in the class of "faith cures" (thus Harnack), and not truly supernatural. When one seeks the justification for this self-confident dogmatism, it is difficult to discover it, except on the ground of a pantheistic or monistic theory of the universe which excludes the personal God of Christianity. If God is the Author and Sustainer of the natural system, which He rules for moral ends, it is impossible to see why, for high ends of revelation and redemption, a supernatural economy should not be engraved on the natural, achieving ends which could not otherwise be achieved. This does not of course touch the question of evidence for any particular miracle, which must be judged of from its connection with the person of the worker, and the character of the apostle witnesses. The well-meant effort to explain all miracles through the "action of uncles" is, as what Dr. Sanday calls "making both ends meet" (Life of Christ in Recent Research, 302)—breaks down in the presence of such miracles as the instantaneous cleansing of the leper, the restoration of sight to the blind, the raising of the dead, acts which solely imply an exercise of creative power. In such a life as Christ's, transcendence of the ordinary powers of Nature is surely to be looked for.

II. The Messiahship.—A difficulty has been found in the fact that in all the Gospels Jesus knew Himselves to be the Messiah at least from 1. Reserve the time of His baptism, yet did not, of Jesus even to His disciples, unreservedly acknowledge Him to be the Messiah. Peter's great confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16.13 ft). On this seeming secrecy the bold hypothesis has been built that Jesus in reality never made the claim to Messiahship, and that, so far as the present writer has been able to ascertain, contrary to Mk (the original Gospel) are unhistorical (Wrede; cf. on this and other theories, Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, ET; Sunday, The Life of Jesus in Recent Research). So extreme an opinion is rejected by most; but modern critics vie with each other in the freedom with which they treat the testimony of the evangelists on this subject. Baldensperger, e.g., supposes that Jesus did not attain full certainty on His Messiahship till near the time of Peter's confession, and arbitrarily transposes the earlier sections in which the title "Son of Man" occurs till after that event (Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 2d ed, 246). Bousset thinks that Jesus adopted the Messianic role as the only one open to Him, but bore it as a "burden" (cf. his Jesus). Schweitzer connects it with apocalyptic ideas of a wildly fantastic character (op. cit., ch xix).

There is, however, no need for supposing that Peter's confession marks the first dawn of this knowledge in the mind of Jesus.

2. A Rather was it the exalted expression Growing of a faith already present, which had Revelation long been maturing. The baptism and temptation, with the use of the title "Son of Man," the tone of authority, His teaching, His miracles, and many special incidents,
show, as dearly as do the discourses in John, that Jesus was from the beginning fully conscious of His vocation, and His title sprang, not from any doubt in His own mind as to His right to it, but from His desire to avoid false associations till the true nature of His Messiahship should be revealed. The Messiahship was in process of self-revelation throughout to those who had eyes to see it (cf Jn 6 66-71). What it involved will be seen later.

III. Kingdom and Apocalypse. — Connected with the Messiahship is the idea of the "Kingdom of God" or of Heaven," which forms modern times would interpret in a purely eschatological sense, in the light of Jewish apocalyptic conceptions of the present or future Kingdom. (Johannes Weiss, Schweitzer, etc.) The kingdom is not a thing of the present, but wholly a thing of the future, to be introduced by convulsions of Nature and the Parousia of the Son of Man. The language of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come," is quoted in support of this contention, but the next petition should guard against so violent an inference: "Thy will be done," Jesus teaches His disciples to pray, "as in heaven, so on earth" (Mt 6 10). The kingdom is the reign of God in human hearts and lives. This world is as well as it will not be wrong to define it as consisting essentially in the supremacy of God's will in human hearts and human affairs, and in every department of these affairs. As Jesus describes the kingdom, it has, in the plain meaning of His words, a present being on earth, though its perfection is in eternity. The parables in Mt 13 and elsewhere exhibit it as founded by the sowing of the word of truth (Sower), as a mingling of good and evil elements (Tares), as growth from small beginnings (Mustard Seed), as gradually leavening humanity (Leaven), as of priceless value (Treasure; Pearl; cf Mt 6 33), as terminating in a judgment (Tares, Dragnet); as perfected in the world to come (Mt 13 43). It was a kingdom spiritual in nature (Lk 17 20-21), universal in range (Mt 8 11; 21 43, etc), developing from a principle of life (Mt 4 26-29), and issuing in victory over all opposition (Mt 21 44).

It is difficult to pronounce on the extent to which Jesus was acquainted with current apocalyptic beliefs, or allowed these to color the imagery of parts of His teachings. These beliefs certainly did not furnish the substance of His teaching, and it may be doubted whether they more than superficially affected even its form. Jewish apocalyptic knew nothing of a death and resurrection of the Messiah and of His return in glory to bring in an everlasting kingdom. What Jesus taught on these subjects sprang from His own Messianic consciousness, with the certainty He had of His triumph over death and His exaltation to the right hand of God. It was in OT prophecy, not in late Jewish apocalyptic, that His thoughts of the future triumph of His kingdom were grounded, and from the vivid imagery of the prophets He borrowed most of the clothing of these thoughts. Isa 55, e.g., predicts not only the rejection and death of the Servant of Jehovah (vs 7-9, 12), but the prolongation of His days and His victorious reign (vs 10-12). Dnl, not the Book of En, is the source of the title, "Son of Man," and of the imagery of coming on the clouds of heaven (Dnl 7 13). The ideas of resurrection, etc., have the ground of the OT (see Ezek.).

With the extravgant, unspiritual forms into which these conceptions were thrown in the Jewish apocalyptic books His teaching had nothing in common. The new apocalyptic school represented by Schweitzer reduces the history of Jesus to folly, fanaticism and horror in the use of the title, and hopes the Messiahship should be revealed. The Messiahship was in process of self-revelation throughout to those who had eyes to see it (cf Jn 6 66-71). What it involved will be seen later.

IV. The Character and Claims. — Where the Gospels present us in Jesus with the image of a flawless character — in the words of the writer to the Hebrews, "holy, guileless, without spot or flaw, separated from sinners" (He 4:14) — modern criticism is driven by an inexorable necessity to deprive Jesus of His sinlessness, and to impute to Him the error, frailty, and moral infirmity that belong to the human. Schweitzer's portrayal of Christ's moral perfection. To do so would be to admit a miracle in humanity, and we have heard that miracle is by the highest rational necessity excluded. This, however, is precisely the point on which Schweitzer's hypothesis falls. He has not only failed to examine in isolation the mode of presentation most obviously broken down. The ideal of perfect holiness in the Gospels, which has fascinated the conscience of Christendom for 18 cen., and attests itself anew to every candid reader, is not thus lightly to be got rid of. Schweitzer has explained away the invention of a church gathered out (without the help of the ideal) promiseously from Jews and Gentiles. It was not the church of all such a church — that created Christ, but Christ that created the church (see Schweitzer, especially 7 26). The Gospels must be read in pieces before this image of a perfect holiness can be effaced from them.

1. The sinlessness assured. — The sinlessness of Jesus is a datum in the Gospels. Over against a sinful world He stands as a Saviour who is Himself without sin. His is the one life in humanity in which is presented a perfect knowledge and unbroken fellowship with the Father, undeviating obedience to His will, unwavering devotion under the severest strain of temptation and suffering to the highest ideal of goodness. The ethical ideal was never raised to so absolute a height. He is the Son of God, and the miracle is that, high as it is in its unsullied purity, the character of Jesus corresponds with it, and realizes it. Word and life for one in history perfectly agree. Jesus, with the keenest sensitiveness and most searching of His enemies, is conscious of no sin in Himself, confesses no sin, disclaims the presence of it, speaks and acts continually on the assumption that He is without it. Those who knew Him best declared Him to be without sin (1 Pet 2 22; 1 Jn 3 5; cf 2 Cor 5 21). The Gospels must be read in pieces before this image of a perfect holiness can be effaced from them.

(1) What this implies. — How is this phenomenon of a sinless personality in Jesus to be explained? It is itself a miracle, and can only be made credible by a creative miracle in Christ's origin. It may be argued that a Virgin Birth does not of itself secure sinlessness, but it will hardly be disputed that at least a sinless personality implies miracle in its production. It is precisely because of this that the modern spirit feels bound to reject it. In the Gospels it is not the Virgin Birth by itself which is invoked to explain Christ's sinlessness, but the supernatural conception by the Holy Spirit (Lk 1 35). It is because of His miraculous birth that is a virgin one. No explanation of the supernatural element in Christ's Personality is more rational or credible (see below on "Nativity").
If Jesus from the first was conscious of Himself as without sin, and if, as the converse of this, He knew Himself as standing in an unbroken filial fellowship with the Father, His special vocation and mission, the kingdom of God to which He was sent, and which was the mission of His life, the task He undertook, and that for which He was crowned with thorns and crucified, was for His people, and the things that He knew He knew for them, and from and for them. Here is the true germ of His Messianic consciousness, from which everything subsequently is unfolded. He stood in a rapport with the Father which opened His spirit to a full, and accurate, appreciation of the Father's will regarding Himself, His mission, the kingdom He came to found, His sufferings as the means of salvation to the world, the glory that awaited Him when His earthly work was done. In the light of this revelation He read the OT Scriptures and saw His course there made plain. When the hour had come He went to John for baptism, and His brief, eventful ministry, which should end in the cross, began. This is the reading of events which introduces consciousness and purpose into the life of Jesus, and it is this we mean to follow in the sketch now to be given.

PART III. COURSE OF THE EARTHY LIFE OF JESUS

The wonderful story of the life of the world's Redeemer which we are now to endeavor to trace falls naturally into several divisions:

1. Divisions
   A. From the Nativity to the Baptism and Temptation
   B. The Early Judaeo Ministry
   C. The Galilean Ministry and visits to the Feasts.
   D. The Last Journey to Jerusalem.
   E. The Passion Week—Betrayal, Trial, and Crucifixion.
   F. The Resurrection and Ascension.

To avoid misconception, it is important to remember, that, rich as are the narratives of the Gospels, materials do not exist for a complete biography or "Life" of Jesus. There is a gap, broken only by a single incident, from His infancy till His 30th year; there are cycles of events out of myriads left unrecorded (Jn 21 25); there are sayings, parables, and numerous character sketches without particular occasion; there are general summaries of periods of activity comprised in a few verses. The evangelists, too, present their materials each from his own standpoint—Matthew from the theocratic, Mark from that of Christ's practical activity, Luke from the universalistic and human-sympathetic, John from the Divine. In reproducing the history respect must be had to this focusing from distinct points of view.

A. FROM THE NATIVITY TO THE BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION

1. The Nativity.—OT prophecy expired with the promise on its lips, "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me. And the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." (Mt 3 1, cf Is 40 3; Jn 1 23, 28, 35); and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye desire, behold, he cometh, saith Jebovah of hosts. (Mal 3 1). In the years immediately before Christ's birth the air was tremulous with the sense of impending great events. The fortunes of the Jewish people were at their lowest ebb. Pharisic formalism, Sadducean unbelief, fanatical Zealotry, Herodian syphismantism, Roman oppression, were fated to have crushed out the last sparks of spiritual religion. Yet in numerous quiet circles in Judaea, and even in remote Galilee, little godly bands still nourished their souls on the promises looking for the consolation of Israel! and the redemption of Jerusalem." (Lk 2 25, 38). Glimpses of these are vouchsafed in Zacharias and Elisabeth, in Simeon, in Anna, in Joseph and Mary (Lk 1, 2; Mt 1 18 ff). It was in hearts in these circles that the stirrings of the prophetic spirit began to make themselves felt anew, preparing for the Advent (cf Lk 2 27, 36).

In the last days of Herod—perhaps in the year 748 of Rome, or 6 BC—the aged priest Zacharias, of the course of Abijah (1 Ch 24 10), 2. Birth of the Baptist was ministering in the temple at the altar of incense at the hour of evening prayer. Scholars have reckoned, if on somewhat precarious grounds, that the ministry of the order to which Zacharias belonged fell in this year in the month of April or in early October (of Andrews, Life of Our Lord). Now a wonderful thing happened. Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth, noted for their blameless piety, were up to this time childless. On this evening an angel appeared at the side of the altar of incense, announced to Zacharias that a son should be born to them, in whom should be realized the prediction of Malachi of one coming in the spirit and power of Elijah to prepare the way of the Lord (cf Mal 4 5); his name was to be called John. Zacharias hesitated to believe, and was stricken with dumbness till the promise should be fulfilled. It happened as the angel had foretold, and at the circumcision and naming of his son his tongue was again loosened. Zacharias, filled with the Spirit, poured forth his soul in a hymn of praise—the Benedictus (Lk 1 5 25, 57, 80; cf John the Baptist).

Meanwhile yet stranger things were happening in the little village of Nazareth, in Galilee (now en Najira). There resided a young maiden of purest character, named Mary, betrothed to a carpenter of the village (cf Mt 13 55), called Joseph, results (Lk 1: who, although in so humble a station, 26 56; Mt was of the lineage of David (cf Is 11 18 25 1). Mary, most probably, was likewise of Davidic descent (Lk 1 32; on the genealogies, see below). The fables relating to the parentage and birth of Mary and her early life, found in the Apocryphal Gospels may safely be discarded. To this maiden, three months before the birth of the Baptist, the same angel visitant (Gabriel) appeared, hailing her as "highly favored" of God, and announcing to her the birth of the Son of the Holy Spirit, she should become the mother of the Saviour. The words "Blessed art thou among women," in AV of ver 28 are omitted by RV, though found below (ver 42) in Elisabeth's salutation. They give, in any case, no support to Mariolatry, stating simply the fact that Mary was more honored than any other woman of the race in being chosen to be the mother of the Lord.

(I) The amazing message. —The announcement itself was of the most amazing import. Mary herself was staggered at the thought that, as a virgin, she should become a mother (ver 34). Still more surprising were the statements made as to the Son she was to bear. Conceived of the Holy Spirit (Lk 1 35; Mt 1 18). He would be great, and would be called "the Son of the Most High" (Lk 1 32) —"the Son of God" (ver 35); there would be given to Him the throne of His father David, and His reign would be eternal (vs 32 33; cf Is 9 6 7). He would be "holy" from the womb (Lk 1 15); His name was to be called Jesus (ver 31; cf Mt 1 21), denoting Him as Saviour. The holiness of Jesus is here put in connection with His miraculous conception, and surely rightly. In no case in the history of mankind has nature generation issued
in a being who is sinless, not to say superhuman. The fact that Jesus, even in His human nature, was supernaturally begotten—was “Son of God”—does not exclude the higher and eternal Sonship according to the Divine nature (Jn 1 18). The inauguration of such a Divine Person, Paul and John depict, implied a miracle in human origin. On the whole message being declared to her, Mary accepted what was told her in meek humility (Lk 1 38).

(2) The visit to Elisabeth.—With the announcement to herself, there was given to Mary an indication of what had befallen her kinswoman Elisabeth, and Mary's first act, on recovering from her astonishment, was to go in haste to the home of Elisabeth in the hill country of Judaea (vs 39 ff). Very naturally she was not at that stage of sympathy in speaking to Joseph of what had occurred, but waited in quietness and faith till God should reveal in His own way what He had done. The meeting of the two holy women was the occasion of a new outburst of gratitude toward God. Nothing in the Gospel, says Josephus, happened to be left out of the story of Elisabeth's visit which might not be considered a matter of unshakable satisfaction (Josephus, Jewish War, 2:1).

(3) Joseph's perplexity.—Here a new trial awaited her. Mary's condition of motherhood could not long be concealed, and when Joseph first became aware of it, the shock to a man so just (Mt 1 19) would be terrible in its severity. The disappearance of Joseph from the later gospel history suggests that he was a good deal older than his betrothed, and it is possible that, while strict, upright and conscientious, his disposition was not at that stage of sympathy so as to be called a case required. It is going too far to say with Lange, “He encountered the modest, but unabashable firm Virgin with decided doubt; the first Ebionite”; but so long as he had no support beyond Mary's word, his mind was in a state of agonized perplexity. His first thought was to give Mary a private “bill of divorce” to avoid scandal (ver 19). Happily, his doubts were soon set at rest by a Divine intimation, and he hesitated no longer, but took Mary to be His bride (Lk 1:26).

4. The Birth at Bethlehem.—Matthew gives no indication of where the events narrated in his first chapter took place, first mentioning Nazareth on the occasion of the return of the holy family from Egypt (2:23). In 2:1 he transports us to Bethlehem as the city of Christ's birth. It is left to Luke to give an account of the circumstances which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem—thus fulfilling prophecy (Mic 5 2; Mt 2 6; Lk 2:1-7)—at this critical hour, and to record the lowly manner of Christ's birth there.

(1) The census of Quirinius.—The emperor Augustus had given orders for a general enrolment throughout the empire (the fact of periodic enrolments in the empire is well established by Professor W. M. Ramsay in his Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?, and this is stated to have been given effect in Judaea when Quirinius was governor of Syria (Lk 2 12). The difficulties connected with the enrolment or census here mentioned are discussed in the art. Quirinius. It is known that Quirinius did conduct a census in Judaea in 6 AD (cf Acts 5 37), but the census at Mary's birth is distinguished from this by Luke as “the first enrolment.” The difficulty was largely removed when it was ascertained, as it has been to the satisfaction of most scholars, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria—first, the Herod's death, 4-1 B.C. and again in 6-11 AD. The probability is that the census was begun under Varus, the immediate predecessor of Quirinius—or even earlier under Saturninus—but was delayed in its application to Judaea, under Herod's jurisdiction, and completed by Quirinius, with whose name it is officially connected. That the enrolment was made by each one going to his own city (ver 3) is explained by the fact that the census was not made according to the Roman method, but according to earlier customs of the Jewish people, in accordance with Jewish usages (cf Ramsay).

(2) Jesus born.—It must be left undecided whether the journey of Mary to Bethlehem with Joseph was required for any purpose of registration or simply out of her unwillingness to be separated from Joseph in so trying a situation. To Bethlehem, in any case, possibly by Divine monition, she came, and there, in the ancestral city of David, in circumstances the lowest conceivable, brought a most marvelous child. In unadorned language—very different from the embellishments of apocryphal story—Luke narrates how, when the travelers arrived, no room was found for them in the “inn”—the ordinary housing for travelers, a house for swaddling clothes, a square enclosure, with an open court for cattle, and a raised recess round the walls for shelter of visitors—and how, when her babe was born, Mary wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger. The weary pair, according to Luke, been crowded out of, and not merely within, the inn, there is every probability that the birth took place, not, as some suppose, in the courtyard of the inn, but, as the oldest tradition asserts (Justin Martyr, Dial, with Trypho, ver 34), in one of the houses of the neighborhood, used for similar purposes of lodgment and housing of cattle. High authorities look favorably on the “cave of the nativity” still shown, with its inscription, Hic de virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est, as marking the sacred spot. It, with the incredibly mean surroundings was “the only begotten of the Father” ushered into the world He came to redeem. How true the apostle's word that He “emptied” Himself (Phil 2 7)! A problem lies in the very circumstances of His birth, of such unparalleled nature to care for such a One, which only the thought of a voluntary humiliation for saving ends can solve.

Born, however, though Jesus was, in a low condition, the Father did not leave Him totally without witness to His Sonship. There were the shepherds watching their flocks by night in the fields near Bethlehem the first disclosure was made. The season, one would infer, could hardly have been winter, though it is stated that there is frequently an interval of dry weather in Judaea at that time, in the middle of December and the middle of February, when such
a keeping of flocks would be possible (Andrews). The angel world is not far removed from us, and as angels announced the birth of Christ, so, when He was born, they were among men (cf. the adoration of the Magi), and the shepherds (cf. Luke 2). The angels of God made the night vocal with their songs. First, an angel appearing in the midst of the Divine glory—the “Shekinah”—announced to the sorely alarmed shepherds the birth of a “Saviour who was Christ the Lord” at Bethlehem; then a whole chorus of the heavenly host broke in with the refrain, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased” (lit. “men of good pleasure”—since, the Christmas hymn of the tinkling shepherd cranes, Lk 2:14). The shepherds, guided as to how to recognize the babe (ver. 12), went once, and found it to be even as they had been told. Thence they hastened to spread abroad the tidings—the first believers, the first worshippers, the first preachers (vs 15-20). Mary cherished the sayings in the stillness of her heart.

(2) The circumcision and presentation in the temple. Jewish law required that on the 8th day the male child should be circumcised, and on the same day He received His name (cf. Lk 1:58-59). In Jesus, though entirely pure, underwent the rite which denoted the putting off of fleshly sin (Col 2:11), and become bound, as a true Israelite, to render obedience to every Divine commandment. The name “Jesus” was given Him by the priest, (Lk 2:21) when the ceremony of presentation in the temple at Jerusalem, when Mary had to offer for her purifying (Lev 12; Mary’s was the humbler offering of the poor, “a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons” Lev 12:8; and when the first-born son had to be redeemed with 5 shekels of the sanctuary (Nu 18:15-16; about $3.60). The observance was an additional token that Christ—personally sinless—did not shrink from full identification with our race in the responsibilities of its sinful condition. Ere it was completed, however, the ceremony was lifted to a Diviner level, and a new attestation was given of the divinity of Christ. Mary, by the action and inspired utterances of the holy Simeon, and the aged prophetess Anna, to Simeon, a righteous and devout man, “looking for the consolation of Israel,” it had been revealed that he should not die till he had seen the Lord’s Christ, and, led by the Spirit into the temple at the very time when Jesus was being presented in Him the One for whom he had waited, and, taking Him in his arms, gave utterance to the beautiful words of the Nunc Dimittis—“Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord,” etc (Lk 2:25-32). He told also how this child was set for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and how, through Him, a sword should pierce through Mary’s own soul (vs 34-35). Entering at the same hour, the prophetess Anna—now in extreme old age (over 100); a constant frequenter of the temple, ver 37—conspired his words, and spoke of Him to all who, like herself, looked “for the redemption of Jerusalem.”

(3) Visit of the Magi.—It seems to have been after the presentation in the temple that the incident took place recorded by Matthew of the visit of the Magi. The Magi, a learned class belonging originally to Chaldaea or Persia (see Magi), had, in course of time, greatly degenerated (cf. Simon Magus, Acts 8:9), but those who now came to seek Christ from the distant East were of a noble race. They appeared in Jesus’ infancy saying, “Where is He that is born King of the Jews?” and declaring that they had seen His star in the East, and had come to worship Him (Mt 2:2). Observers of the nightly sky, any significant appearance in the heavens would at once attract their attention. Many (Kepler, Ideler, etc.; cf. Ramsay, op. cit., 215 ff) are disposed to connect this “star” with a remarkable conjunction—or series of conjunctions—of planets in 7-6 BC, in which case it is possible that two years may have elapsed (cf. Josephus, Antiquities, 2, 300; cf. Tertullian, De Pass. Dom. 7.7; vs 7.16) from their observation of the sign. On the other hand, the fact of the star reappearing and seeming to stand over a house in Bethlehem (ver 9) rather points to a distinct phenomenon (cf. Betlehem,听话, St.). The inquiry of the Magi at once awakened Herod’s alarm; accordingly, having ascertained from the scribes that the Christ should be born at Bethlehem (Mic 5:2), he summoned the Magi, questioned them as to when exactly the star appeared, then sent them to Bethlehem to search out the young child, hypocritically pretending that he also wished to worship Him (Mt 2:8). Herod had faith enough to believe the Scriptures, yet was foolish enough to think that he could thwart God’s purpose. Guided by the star, which now appeared, the wise men came to Bethlehem, offered their gifts, and afterward, warned by God, returned by another road, without reporting to Herod. It is a striking picture—Herod the king, and Christ the King; Christ a power even in His humblest, inspiring terror, attracting homage! The faith of these sages, unrepelled by the lowly surroundings of the child they had discovered, worshipping, and laying at His feet their gold, frankincense and myrrh, is a splendid antithesis of Herod’s enmity. On the 40th day God became the one among the wisest as well as the humblest of our race. Herod, finding himself, as he thought, befooled by the Magi, avenged himself by ordering a massacre of all the male children of two years old, and under, in Bethlehem and its neighborhood (ver 16). This slaughter, if not recorded elsewhere (cf., however, Macrobius, quoted by Ramsay, op. cit., 219), is entirely in keeping with the cruelty of Herod’s disposition. Meanwhile, Joseph and Mary had been withdrawn from the scene, and connected the performance of the Bethlehem mothers with Rachael’s weeping, Jer 31:15). The safety of Mary and her threatened child was provided for by a Divine warning to retire for a time to Egypt (mark the recurring expression, “the young child and his mother” Egypt and return to Israel).—the young child leading the way, vs 14-20 (21), whither, accordingly, Nazareth (Mt 2:15-16) was their return (vs 23). Herod’s death brought permission to return, but as Archelaus, Herod’s son (the worst of them), reigned in Judaea in his father’s stead (not king, but “archon”), Joseph was directed to withdraw to Galilee, because it concerned him about that he and Mary, with the babe, found themselves again in Nazareth, where Luke anew takes up the story (2:39), the thread of which had been broken by the incidents in Mt. Matthew sees in the return from Egypt a refuling of the experiences of Israel (Hos 11:1), and in the settling in Nazareth a connection with the OT prophecies of Christ’s lowly estate (Isa 11:1, nēger, “branch” Zec 3:8; 6:12, etc).

The objections to the credibility of the narratives of the Virgin Birth have already partly been adverted to. (See further the arts. on Mary; Virgin Birth, etc.)

7. Questions. The Virgin Birth and Occasions. (1) The Virgin Birth. The narratives in Mt and Lk are attested by al MSS and SS genuine parts of their respective Gospels, and as contained in the earliest MSS and Lk is generally recognized as resting on an Aram. basis, which, from its dictum and the primitive character of its conceptions, belongs to the earliest age. While in Luke’s narrative everything is presented from the standpoint of St. Paul, in Mt. it is Joseph who is regarded as the virgin mother is the source of information in the one case, and Joseph himself in the other. The narratives are complementary, not competitive. Mt and Lk do not contain narratives of the Virgin Birth.
cannot be wondered at, when it is remembered that Mark's Gospel begins of purpose with the Baptism of John, and that the Fourth Gospel aims at setting forth the circumstances of the earthly nativity. "The Word became flesh" (Jn 1:14)—everything in that. Neither can one object to that Paul does not in his letters or public preaching base upon so essentially private a fact as the infancy of Christ. Yet in this respect, when a man probably still lived. With the exception of the narrowest sect of the Jewish Ebionites and some of the gnostic sects, the Virgin Birth was universally accepted in the early church.

The genealogies (Mt 1:1–17; Lk 3:38–89).—Difficulty is felt with the genealogies in Mt and Lk (one derivation one explanation). It is interesting to trace the descent of Jesus from David and Abraham (Lk from Adam), yet entirely apart in the pedigree after David art. Genealogies of the Old Testament. A favorite view is that Mt exhibits the legal, Lk the natural descent of Jesus. There is plausibility in the supposition that though, in form, a genealogy of Joseph, Lk's is really the genealogy of Mary. It was not customary, it is true, to make out pedigrees of females, but here the case was clearly exceptional, and the passing of Joseph to the temple of a marriage in Law. Viewed in the light of the Incarnation, the list to be made out in his name. Celsus, in the 2d cent., appears thus to have understood it when he derides the notion that through so lowly a woman as the carpenter's wife, Jesus should trace His lineage up to the God of glory. The objection, of course, proceeds on the same assumption. Of art. on "Genealogies" in Kitto, 11.

II. The Years of Silence—the Twelfth Year. With the exception of one fragment of incident, that of the visit to Jerusalem and the Temple in His 12th year—the Canonized Human Deeds of Jesus made from the return to Nazareth (Lk 2:40–52) till His baptism by John. This long period, during which the Apocryphal Gospels crowd with silly fables (see Apocryphal Gospels), the inspired records leave to be regarded as what it was—a period of quiet development of mind and body, of outward uneventfulness, of silent preparation in the midst of the Nazareth surroundings. Jesus "grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him . . . advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men" (Lk 2:40, 52).

The inspiration was a true acceptance of humanity, with all its sinless limitations of growth and development. Not a hint is offered of that omniscience or omnipotence which theology has not infrequently imputed to Jesus even as child, but the schooldays was probably that of the ordinary village child (He could read, Lk 4:17 ff, and, Jn 8:6–8); He wrought at the carpenter's bench (cf Mk 6:3; Justin Martyr, following tradition, speaks of Him as making ploughs and yokes, Dial. 88). His gentle, loving, and gracious character endeared Him to all who knew Him (Lk 2:52). No stain of sin clouded His vision of Divine things. His after-history shows that His mind was nourished on the Scriptures; nor, as He pondered psalms and prophets, could His soul remain unvisited by presentsment, growing to convictions, that He was the One in whom their predictions were destined to be realized.

Every year, according to the custom of the Jews, Joseph and Mary went, with their friends and neighbors, in companies, to Jerusalem to the Passover. When Jesus was 12 years old, it would seem that, for the first time, He was permitted to accompany them. It would be to Him a strange and thrilling experience. Everything He saw—the hallowed sites, the metey crowd, the service of the temple, the very shocks His moral consciousness would receive from contact with those in the wilderness—His feeling of His own unique relation to the Father. Everything was for the time suspended and merged into His thought in this higher one. It was His Father's city whose streets He trod; His Father's house He visited for prayer; His Father's ordinances the crowds were assembled to observe; His Father's name, too, they were dishonoring by their formalism and hypocrisy. It is this exalted mood of the boy Jesus which explains the scene that follows—the only one rescued from oblivion in this child's growth and development.

When the time came for the busy caravan to return to Nazareth, Jesus, acting, doubtless, from highest impulse, "tarried behind" (ver 43). In the large company His absence was not at first missed, but when, at the halting-place, it became known that He was not with them, His mother and Joseph returned in deep distress to Jerusalem. Three days elapsed before they found Him in the place where naturally they should have looked first—His Father's house. There, in one of the halls or chambers where the rabbis were wont to teach, they discovered Him seated "in the midst," at the feet of the men of learning, hearing them discourse, asking questions, as pupils were permitted to do, and giving answers which awakened astonishment by their penetration and wisdom (ver 46, 47). Those who heard Him may well have thought that before them was one of the great rabbis of the future! Mary, much surprised, asked in remonstrance, "Son, why hast thou dealt thus with us?" evoking from Jesus the memorable reply, "How is it that you sought me? knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" or "about my Father's business?" (Av 48, 49). Here was the revelation of a self-consciousness that Mary might have been prepared for in Jesus, but perhaps, in the common intercourse of life, was tending to lose sight of. The lesson was not unneeded. Yet, once it had been given, Jesus went back with Joseph and Mary to Nazareth, and "was subject unto them, and Mary did not forget the teaching of the incident (ver 51).

III. The Forerunner and the Baptism.—Time passed, and when Jesus was nearing His 30th year, Judaea was agitated by the message of a stern preacher of righteousness who had appeared in the wilderness by the Jordan, proclaiming the imminent approach of the kingdom of heaven, summoning to repentance, and baptizing those who confessed their sins. Tiberius had succeeded Augustus on the imperial throne; Judaea, with Samaria, was now a Roman province, under the procurator Pontius Pilate. John the Baptist was divided between the tetrarch Herod (Galilee) and Philip (the eastern parts). The Baptist thus appeared at the time when the land had lost the last vestige of self-government, was politically divided, and was in great ecclesiastical confusion. Nurtured in the deserts (Lk 4:80), John's very appearance was a protest against the luxury and self-seeking of the age. He had been a Nazarene from his birth; he fed on the simplest products of nature—locusts and wild honey; his coarse garb of camel's hair and leathern girdle was a return to the dress of Elijah (2 K 1:8), in whose spirit and power he appeared (Lk 1:17; see John the Baptist).

The coming Christ.—John's preaching of the kingdom was unlike that of any of the revolutionaries of his age. It was a kingdom which could be built not only through moral preparation. It availed nothing for the Jew simply that he was a son of Abraham. The Messiah was at hand. He (John) was but a voice crying in the wilderness to prepare the way for that Greater than himself. The work of the Christ would be one of judgment and of mercy. He would lay by the axe at the root of the tree—would winnow the chaff from the wheat—yet would baptize with
the Holy Spirit (Mt 3 10-12; Lk 3 15-17). Those who professed acceptance of his message, with its condition of repentance, John baptized with water at the Jordan or in its neighborhood (cf Mt 3 6; Jn 1 29, 33). 

John’s startling words made a profound impression. All classes from every part of the land, including Pharisees and Sadducees 

2. Jesus Is Baptized 

(Mt 3 7), came to his baptism. John 

was not deceived. He saw how little change of heart underlay it all. The 

17; Mk 1: Regenerator had not yet come. But 

9-11; Lk 3:21-32) one day there appeared before him 

Who intuited the question 

was borne 

indeed, 

Christ whose coming it was his to herald. John, up to this time, does not seem to have personally known Jesus (cf Jn 1 31). He must, however, have heard of Him; he had, besides, received a sign by which the Messiah should be recognized (Jn 1 33); and now, when Jesus presented Himself, Divinely pure in aspect, asking baptism at his hands, the conviction was instantaneous thinly flashed on his mind, that this was He. But how should be, a sinful man, baptize this Holy One? “If I have need to be baptized, are you going to baptize me?” (Mt 3 14). The question is one which forces itself upon ourselves—How should Jesus seek or receive a “baptism of repentance”? Jesus Himself puts it off the ground of meekness, “Suffer me to fulfi all righteousness” (ver 15). The Head was content to enter by the same gateway as the members to His specific vocation in the service of the kingdom. In submitting to the baptism, He formally identified Himself with the expectation of the kingdom and with its ethical demands; separated Himself from the evil of His nation, doubtless with confession of its sins; and, devoted Himself to His life-task in bringing in the Messianic salvation. The significance of the rite as marking His consecration to, and entrance upon, His Messianic career, is seen in what follows. As He ascended from the water, while still “praying” (Lk 3 21), the heavens were opened, the Spirit of God descended like a dove upon Him, and there was a voice from on high declared: “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Mt 3 16.17). It is needless to inquire whether anyone besides John (cf Jn 1 36) and Jesus (Mt 3 16; Mk 1 10) received this visitation, or received these words; for others, the vision was primarily intended. To Christ’s consecration of Himself to His calling, there was now added the spiritual equipment necessary for the doing of His work. He went forward with the seal of the Father’s acknowledgment upon Him. 

IV. The Temptation.—On the narrative of the baptism in the first three Gospels there follows at once the account of the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness. The psychological naturalness of the incident is generally acknowledged. The baptism of Jesus was a crisis in His experience. He had been ploughed by the Spirit for His work; the heavens had been opened to Him; and His mind was agitated by new thoughts and emotions; He was conscious of the possession of new powers. There was need for a period of retirement, of still reflection, of coming to a complete understanding with Himself as to the meaning of the task to which He had been committed, the manner in which He should employ, the attitude He should take up toward popular hopes and expectations. He would wish to be alone. The Spirit of God led Him (Mt 4 1; Mk 1 12; Lk 4 1) whither His own spirit also impelled. It is with a touch of similar motive

that Buddhist legend makes Buddha to be tempted by the evil spirit Mara after he has attained enlightenment. 

The scene of the temptation was the wilderness of Judea. Jesus was there 40 days, during which, it is told, He neither ate nor drank. 

2. Nature 

(cf the fasts of Moses and Elijah, of the 

Ex 34 18; 34 28; Dt 9 18; 1 K 19 8) Temptation 8). Mk adds, “He was with the wild beasts” (ver 15). The period was probably one of intense self-concentration. During the whole of it He endured temptations of Satan (Mt 4 1; Mk 1 13); but the special assaults came at the end (Mt 4 2 ff; Lk 4 2 ff). We assume here a real tempter and real temptations—the question of diabolic agency being considered after. This, however, does not settle the form of the temptations. The struggle was probably an inward one. It can hardly be supposed that Jesus was literally transported by the devil to a pinnacle of the temple, then to a high mountain, then, presumably, back again to the wilderness. The narrative must have come from Jesus Himself, and embodies an ideal or parabolic element. “The history of the temptation,” Lange says, “Jesus afterwards communicated to His disciples in the form of a real narrative, clothed in symbolic language” (Comm. on Mt, 83, ET). 

The stages of the temptation were three—in each in its own way a trial of the spirit of obedience. 

(1) The first temptation was to distrust. Jesus, after His long fast was an hungry. He had become conscious also of super-

3. Stages natural powers. The point on which of the temptation laid hold was His Temptation sense of hunger—the most overwhelming of appetites. “If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread.” The design was to excite distrustful and rebellious thoughts, and lead Jesus to use the powers entrusted to Him in an unlawful way, for private and selfish ends. The temptation was promptly met by a quotation from Scripture: “Man shall not live by bread alone,” etc (Mt 4 4; Lk 4 4; cf of Dt 8 3). If Jesus was in this position, it was His Father who had brought Him there for purposes of temptation. “If man hath not bread, how can he be sustained on bread; a life, found in depending on God’s word, and obeying it at whatever cost. 

(2) The second temptation (in Lk the third) was to presumption. Jesus is borne in spirit (cf Ezk 40 1,2) to this dizzy elevation He is invited to cast Himself down, relying on the Divine promise: “He shall give His angels charge over thee,” etc (cf Ps 91 11,12). In this way an easy demonstration of His Messiahship would be given to the crowds below. The temptation was to overstep those bounds of humility and dependence which were imposed on Him as Son; to play with signs and wonders in His work as Messiah. But again the tempter is foiled by the word: “Thou shalt not make trial of (try experiments with, propose tests, put to the proof) the Lord thy God” (Mt 4 7; Lk 4 12; cf of Dt 6 16). (3) The third temptation (Lk’s second) was to worldly sovereignty, gained by some small concession to Satan. From some lofty elevation—no place on a geographical map—the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them are flashed before Christ’s mind, and all are offered to Him on condition of one little act of homage to the tempter. It was the temptation to choose the easier path, certain of a path leading to falsehood, and Jesus definitely repelled it by the saying: “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve” (Mt 4 10; Lk 4 8). Jesus had chosen His path. The Father’s way of the cross would be adhered to. 

Typical character.—The stages of the tempta-
tion typify the whole round of Satanic assault on man through body, mind, and spirit (Lk 4:13; cf 1 Jn 2:16), and the spirit of Messiah temptation. Jesus was constantly being tempted (a) to spare Himself; (b) to gratify the Jewish sign-seekers; (c) to gain power by sacrifice of the right. In principle the victory was gained over all at the commencement. His way was henceforth clear.

B. THE EARLY JUDEAN MINISTRY

I. THE TESTIMONIES OF THE BAPTIST.—While the Synoptics pass immediately from the temptation of Jesus to the ministry in Galilee after the imprisonment of the Baptist (Mt Synoptics 4: 12; Mk 1:14-15; Lk 4:14), the Fourth Gospel furnishes the account, full of interest, of the earlier ministry of Jesus in Judea while the Baptist was still at liberty.

The Baptist had announced Christ’s coming; had baptized Him when He appeared; it was now his privilege to testify to Him as having come. (Jn 1:4-5, 18-19.)

2. Threefold Term: John’s Work—John’s work was assumed proportions which made it impossible for the ecclesiastical authorities any longer to ignore him (Lk 1:7-17; the deputation consisting of priests and Levites was accordingly sent to John, where he was baptizing at Bethany beyond Jordan, to put him categorically questions. John’s work was to identify the Baptist, test him, and give the answer. He was not the Christ, not Elijah, not the prophet. His answer grows plainer every time, “I am not the Christ”; “I am not”; “No,” Who was he then? The answer was emphatic. He was but a “voice” (cf Is 40:3)—a preparer of the way of the Lord. In their midst already stood One—not necessarily in the crowd at that moment—with whose greatness his was not to be compared (vs 26-27). John utterly effaces himself before Christ.

The day after the interview with the Jewish deputation, John saw Jesus coming to him—probably fresh from the temptation—and bore a second and wonderful testimony to His Messiahship. Identifying Jesus with the Baptist’s prophecies, and stating the ground of His knowledge in the sign God had given him (vs 29-34), he said, “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.” (ver 29). The words are rich in suggestion regarding the character of Jesus, and the nature, universality and efficacy of His work (cf 1 Jn 3:5). The “Lamb” may point specifically to the description of the vicariously Suffering Servant of Jehovah in Is 53.11. The third testimony was borne again on the morrow, when John was standing with two of his disciples (one Andrew, ver 40, the other doubtless the evangelist himself). Pointing to Jesus, the Baptist repeated his former words, “Behold, the Lamb of God.” While the words are the same, the design was different. In the Disciple Testimony, Christ and the Duty of the same, the design was different. In the Disciple first “behold” the idea is the recognition of Christ; in the second there is a calling to follow Jesus. On this hint the disciples immediately acted (ver 37). It is next to be seen how this earliest “following” of Jesus grew.

II. THE FIRST DISCIPLES.—John’s narrative shows that Jesus gathered His disciples, less by a series of interviews, than by His daily ministry. The history confutes the idea that it was first toward the close of His ministry that Jesus became known to His disciples as the Messiah. In John’s account of the Baptist it was the Christ that the Baptist introduced Jesus; it was the Christ that the disciples accepted and confessed Him (vs 41-45, 49).

The first of the group were Andrew and John—the unnamed disciple of ver 40. These followed Jesus in consequence of their Master’s testimony. It was, however, the few and John—bears—converse they had with Jesus. (Jn 1:35-40) (vs 3-40) —the 10th hour, i.e. 10 AM—is one of the small traits that mark St. John.

John and Andrew had no sooner found Christ for themselves ("We have found the Messiah," ver 41) than they hastened to tell others of their discovery. Andrew at once went to Simon, his brother, and Discipleship brought him Jesus (John 1:35-40). John sought Nathanael (ver 45)."Christ’s" Personal unerring eye read at once the quality of the Testimony of the man whom Andrew introduced (vs 41-42) to Him. "Thou art Simon "Rock" or "Stone" (ver 42)." Mt 16.18, therefore, is not the original bestowal of this name, but the confirmation of it. The name is the equivalent of "Peter" (Pétreos), and was given to Simon, not with any official connotation, but because of the strength and clearness of his convictions. His general steadfastness is not disproved by His one unhappy failure. (Was it thus the apostle acquired the name "Peter"?)

The fourth disciple, Philip, was called by Jesus Himself, when He went to depart for Galilee (ver 43). This may have had a double reason:

1) Philip—on Philip (like the foregoing, he also the Result was from Bethsaida of Galilee, ver 44), of Scriptural but that which chiefly decided him was the correspondence of what he found (vs 43-44) in Jesus with the prophetic testimonies (ver 45).

Philip sought Nathanael (of Cana of Galilee, 21)—the same probably as Bartholomew the Apostle—and told him he had found of whom Moses in the law and the prophets had written (ver 45). Nathanael doubted, on the ground that the Messiah was not likely to have His origin in an obscure place like Nazareth (ver 46; cf 7:52). Philip’s wise answer was, "Come and see": and when Nathanael came, the Lord met him with a word which speedily rid him of his hesitations. First, Jesus attested His seeker’s sincerity ("Behold, an Israelite indeed," etc, ver 47); then, on Nathanael expressing surprise, revealed to him His knowledge of a recent secret act of meditation or devotion ("when thou wast under the fig tree," ver 48). The sign was sufficient to convince Nathanael that he was in the presence of a superhuman, nay a Divine, Person. The Christ—"Son of God . . . . King of Israel" (ver 49). Jesus met his faith with further self-disclosure. Na-
than anael had believed on comparatively slight evidence; he would see greater things: heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (ver 51). The allusion is to Jacob's dream (Gen 28:10-12), a Scripture which had possibly been the theme of Philip's, which done in his privacy. Jesus puts Himself in place of that mystic ladder as the medium of reopened communication between heaven and earth.

The name "Son of Man"—a favorite designation of Jesus for Himself—appears here for the first time in the Gospel. John disputed whether it was a current Messianic title (see Son of Man), and had this force on the lips of Jesus Himself, denoting Him as the possessor of a true humanity, and as standing in a representative relation to mankind universally. It is probably borrowed from the Apocalypse, which has a similar title (Revelations 1:13).

2. "Son of Man" and "Son of God"

Apocalyptic Literature. The higher title, "Son of God," given to Jesus by Nathanael, could not, of course, as yet carry with it the transcendental associations of John's Prologue (1:14-18), but it evidently conveyed an idea of superhuman dignity and unique relation to God, such as the better class of minds would seem to have attributed to the Messiah (cf John 5:18, 10:33; cf. Acts 7:66).

III. The First Events.—An interval of a few weeks is occupied by a visit of Jesus to Cana of Galilee (John 2:1-11) and a brief sojourn in Capernaum (vers 12); after which Jesus returned to Jerus.

1. The First Galilee (ver 11). The marriage was a miracle—doubtless that of some relative of the (Jn 2:1-11) family, and the presence of Jesus at the feast, with His mother, brethren and disciples (as Joseph no more appears, it may be concluded that he was dead), is significant as showing that His religion is not one of antagonism to natural relations. The marriage festivities lasted seven days, and toward the close the wine provided for the guests gave out. Mary interpreted with an indistinct suggestion that Jesus might supply the want. Christ's reply, lit. "Woman, what is that to thee and to me?" (ver 4), is not intended to convey the least tinge of reproof (cf Westcott, in loc.), but intimates that Mary's actions were haphazard and to be guided by a rule other than hers (cf Luke 2:51). This, however, as Mary saw (ver 5), did not preclude an answer to her desire. Six waterpots of stone stood near, and Jesus ordered these to be filled with water (the quantity was large; about 50 gallons); when the water was drawn off it was found changed into a nobler element—a wine purer and better than could have been obtained from any natural vintage. The ruler of the feast, in ignorance of its origin, expressed surprise at its quality (ver 10). Theileia—"a sign" (ver 11)—and may be contrasted with the first miracle of Moses—turning the water into blood (Ex 7:20). It points to the contrast between the old dispensation and the new, and to the work of Christ as a transforming, curing and glorifying of the natural, through Divine grace and power.

After a brief stay at Capernaum (ver 12), Jesus went up to Jerus to keep the Passover. There it was His design formally to manifest Himself. Other "signs" He had at the feast, leading many to believe on Him—not, however, with a deep or enduring faith (vers 23-25)—but the special act by which He signalized His appearance was His public cleansing of the temple from the irreligious trafficking with which it had come to be associated.

A like incident is related by the Synoptists at the close of Christ's ministry (Matthew 21:12-18; Mark 11:15-18; Luke 19:44-46), and it is a question whether the act was actually repeated, or whether the event does not constitute the special act of the early ministry, simply record it out of its chronological order. In any case, the act was a fitting inauguration of the Lord's work. A regular sacrificial market was held in the outer court of the temple. Here the animals needed for sacrifice could be purchased, foreign money exchanged, and the doves, which were the offerings of the poor, be obtained. It was a busy, tumultuous, noisy and unholy scene, and the "zeal" of Jesus burned within Him—had doubtless often done so before—as He witnessed it. Arming Himself with a scourgery of cords, less as a weapon of defence, than as a symbol of authority, He descended with resistless energy upon the wrangling throng, drove out the dealers and the cattle, overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and commanded the doves to be taken away. Let them not profane His Father's house (John 2:14-16). No one seems to have opposed. All felt that a prophet was among them. He resisted the overpowering authority with which He spoke and acted. By and by, when their courage revived, they asked Him for a "sign" in evidence of His right to do such things. Jesus gave them no sign such as this demanded, but uttered an enigmatic word, and left them to reflect on it, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (ver 19). The authenticity of the saying is sufficiently vouched for by the perverted use made of it at Christ's trial (Matthew 26:61). It is a word based on the foresight which Christ had that the conflict now commencing was to end in His rejection and death. "The true way to destroy the Temple, in the eyes of Jesus, was to slay the Messiah.... If it is in the person of the Messiah that the Temple is laid in ruins, it is in His person it shall be raised again" (Godet).

The disciples, after the resurrection, saw the meaning of the word (John 2:22).

As a sequel to these stirring events Jesus had a nocturnal interview with the publican Nicodemus—a Pharisee, a ruler of the Jews, a "teacher of Israel" (ver 10), apparently no noble: longer young (ver 4). His coming by night, according to Jesus' saying (John 3:1-39); but the interesting thing is that he did come, showing that he had been really impressed by Christ's words and works. One recognizes in him a man of candor and uprightness of spirit, yet without adequate apprehensions of Christ. Himself, and of the nature of Christ's kingdom. Jesus was prepared to acknowledge as a Divinely commissioned teacher—one whose mission was accredited by miracle (ver 2). He was interested in the kingdom, but, as a morally living man, had no doubt of his fitness to enter into it. Jesus had but to teach and He would understand.

1. The new birth. Jesus in His reply laid His finger at once on the defective point in His visitor's relation to Himself and His kingdom: "Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (ver 3); "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (ver 5). Nicodemus was staggered at this demand for a spiritual new birth, but Jesus declared that proselytes were baptized on being received into the Jewish church, and their baptism was called a "new birth." Nicodemus would therefore be familiar with the expression, but could not see that it had any applicability to himself. Jesus teaches him, on the other hand, that he also needs a new birth,
and this, not through water only, but through the Spirit. The change was mysterious, yet plainly wrought in secret to convince those who did not understand these "earthly things"—the evidence of which lay all around him—how should he understand "heavenly things," the things pertaining to salvation?

(2) "Heavenly things."—These "heavenly things" Jesus now proceeds to unfold to Nicodemus: "As Moses lifted up the serpent, so will it be with the Son of Man; he will be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have life in his name" (Jn 3:14-15). The "lifting up" is a prophecy of the cross (cf. 12:32-34). The brazen serpent is the symbol of sin conquered and destroyed by the death of Christ. What follows in 3:16-21 is probably the evangelist's expansion of this theme—God's love of the sorrows of man (ver. 16). God's purpose not the world's condemnation, but its salvation (vs 17, 18) the self-judgment of sin (vs 19 ff).

Retiring from Jerusalem, Jesus commenced a ministry in Judaea (ver. 22). It lasted apparently about 6 months. The earlier Gospels pass over it. This is accounted for by the fact that the ministry in Judaea was still preparatory. Jesus had publicly asserted His Messianic authority. A little space is now allowed to test the result.

Meanwhile Jesus descends again to the work of preparing His people for the preparatory. His ministry was now a stage hardly distinguishable from John's. He summons to the baptism of repentance. His disciples, not Himself, administer the rite (3:23; 4:2) hence the sort of rivalry that sprang up between His baptism and that of the forerunner (3:22-26). John was baptizing at the time at Aenon, on the western side of the Jordan; Jesus somewhere in the neighborhood. Soon the greater teacher began to eclipse the less. "All men came to Him" (ver. 26). John's reply foretold the next step. John, baptizing in the Jordan, said, "I am not the Christ. I lay the nature of things that Jesus must increase; I must decrease (vs 27-30)."

Explanatory words follow (vs 31-36). I. IV. Journey to Galilee—the Woman of Samaria. Toward the close of this discourse the Baptist appears to have been cast into prison for his faithfulness in reproving Herod Antipas for taking his brother Philip's wife (cf Jn 3:24; Mt 14:3). Just at the time of the departure to Galilee in Jn 4 with that narrated in Mt 3:13, though some think the imprisonment of the Baptist did not take place till later. The motive which Jn gives was the hostility of the Pharisees, but it was the imprisonment of the Baptist which led Jesus to commence, at the time He did, an independent ministry. The direct road to Galilee lay through Samaria; hence the memorable encounter with the woman at that place.

Jesus being wearied, paused to rest Himself at Jacob's well, near a town called Sychar, now 'Askar. It was about the sixth hour—or 6 o'clock in the evening. The time of year is determined by ver 35 to be December, though there is no reason for not taking this literally). It suits the evening hour that the woman of Samaria came out to draw water. (Some, on a different reckoning, take the hour to be noon.) Therefore as occurring at an interval of only 3 or 4 months after the return. This seems impossible in view of the crowding of events. Perhaps a plot of time—opening incidents, stay in Capernaum (Mt 4:11), three circuits in "all Galilee" (Mt 4:23-25); Lk 8:1-4; Mt 9:38-39; Mt 6:12, Lester E. Sumption, "Sermon on Mount: Gadara"; and the dislocations it necessitates, e.g., the sudden appearance of the Roman centurion's servant (about Passover time) must be placed after the feeding of the multitude etc. It is simpler to adhere to the three years' scheme.

A division of the Galilean ministry may only be made into two periods—one preceding, the other suc-
cooling the Mission of the Twelve in Mt 10 11. One reason for this division is that after the Mission of the Twelve the book of Luke is the same as in the first three evangelists till the final departure from Galilee.

First Period—From the Beginning of the Ministry in Galilee till the Mission of the Twelve

1. Opening Incidents.—From sympathetic Samaria (Jn 4 39), Jesus journeyed to unsympathetic Galilee, and first to Cana, where His first miracle had been wrought. The reports of His miracles had of late made Him a household word (Jn 4:43-54 45), and it was mainly His reputation as a miracle-worker which led a nobleman—a courtier or officer at Herod’s court—to seek Him at Cana on behalf of his son, who was near to death. Jesus rebuked the sign-seeking spirit (ver 48), but, on the fervent appeal being repeated, He bade the nobleman go his way: his son lived. The man’s prayer had been, ‘Come down’; but he had faith to receive the word of Jesus (ver 50), and on his way home received tidings of his son’s recovery. The nobleman, with his whole household, was won for Jesus (ver 53). This is noted as the second of Christ’s Galilean miracles (ver 54).

A very different reception awaited Him at Nazareth, ‘His own country,’ to which He went next for a time. He could scarcely take the incident recorded in Lk 4 16-30 to be the same as that Visit to in Mt 13 54-58, though Matthew’s narrative of the Nazareth (Mt 4:13; Lk 4:16-30) is founded on His entering the synagogue, as was His wont, the reputed He had won led to His being asked to read. The Scripture He selected (or which came in the order of the day) was Isa 61 1 ff. (the fact that Jesus was able to read from the synagouge-coll is interesting as bearing on His knowledge of Heb.), and from this He proceeded to amaze His hearers by declaring that this Scripture was now fulfilled in their ears (ver 21). The ‘words of grace’ He uttered are not given, but it can be understood that, following the prophet’s guidance, He would hold Himself forth as the predicted ‘Servant of Jehovah,’ sent to bring salvation to the poor, the bound, the broken-hearted, and for this purpose endowed with the fulness of the Spirit. The idea that the passage in Isa is that of the year of jubilee, when debts were canceled, inheritances restored, and slaves set free, and Jesus told them He had come to inaugurate that ‘acceptable year of the Lord.’ At first He was listened with admiration, then, as the magnitude of the claims He was making became apparent to His audience, a very different spirit took possession of them. ‘Who was this that spoke thus?’ ‘Was it not Joseph’s son’ (ver 22). They were disappointed, too, that Jesus showed no disposition to gratify them by working before them any of the miracles of which they had heard so much (ver 23). Jesus saw the gathering storm, but met it resolutely. He told His hearers He had not expected any better reception, and in reply to their reproach that He had wrought miracles elsewhere, but had wrought none among them, quoted examples of prophets who had done the same thing (Elijah, Elisha, vs 24-28). This completed the exasperation of the Nazarenes, who, springing forward, dragged Him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, and would have thrown Him down, had something in the aspect of Jesus not restrained them. With one of those looks we read of occasionally in the Gospels, He seemed to have overawed His townsmen, and, passing through the midst of them, left the place (vs 28-30).

After leaving Nazareth Jesus made His way to Capernaum (probably Tell Hum), which thereafter seems to have been His headquarters. He “dwelt” there (Mt 4 13). It is called in Mt 9 1, “His own city.” Before teaching in Capernaum itself, however, He appears to have opened His ministry by evangelizing along the shores of Lake Galilee (Mt 4:17-22; Mk 1:16-22; Lk 5:1-11). His first step in gathering His chosen disciples more closely around Him. Hitherto, though attached to His person and cause, the pairs of fisher brothers, Simon and Andrew, James and John—these last the “sons of Zebedee”—had not been in constant attendance upon Him. Since the return from Jesus, they had gone back to their ordinary avocations. The four were “partners” (Lk 5 10). They had “hired servants” (Mk 1 20); therefore were moderately well off. The time had now come when they were to leave “all,” and follow Jesus entirely.

Luke alone records the striking miracle which led to the call. Jesus had been teaching the multitude from a boat borrowed from Simon, and a) The Draught of Fishes (Lk 5:1-10) and b) “Fishers of Men” (Mk 1:16-20; Lk 5:1-9). The miracle gave Jesus opportunity for the word He wished to speak. It is here that Mt and Mk agree in the story, and both tell that Jesus had been brought to shore when first, to gratify the fishermen and to take fishers of men. At once all was left—boats, nets, friends—and they followed Him. Their experience taught them to have large expectations from Christ.

Jesus is now found in Capernaum. An early Sabbath—perhaps the first of Its kind in the city—was marked by notable events.

4. At Capernaum (Mt 4:13; Lk 4:31) The Sabbath found Jesus as usual teaching the people in the synagogue—now as teacher. The manner of His teaching they had especially noticed: “He taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes” (Mk 1 22). The scribes gave forth nothing of their own. They but repeated the dicta of the great authors of the past. It was a surprise to the people to find in Jesus One whose wisdom, like waters from a clear fountain, came fresh and sparkling from His own lips. The authority also with which Jesus spoke commanded attention. He sought support in the opinion of no others, but gave forth His statements with firmness, decision, dignity and emphasis.

While Jesus was teaching an extraordinary incident occurred. A man in the assembly, described as possessed by “an unclean spirit” (Mk 1 23; Lk 4 33), broke forth in crees, addressing Jesus by name (“Jesus, thou Nazarene”), speaking of Him as the Holy One of God,” and asking “What have we to do with thee? Art thou come to destroy us?” The diseased consciousness of the sufferer bore a truer testimony to Christ’s dignity, holiness and power than most of those present could...
have given, and instinctively, but truly, construed
His coming as meaning destruction to the empire of
the demons. At Christ’s word, after a terrible passage
from the naked evil, but, however, the man escaped unhurt (Lk 4:35), the demon was cast out. More than
ever the people were “amazed” at the word which had such power (Mk 1:27).

Demon-possession—its reality.—This is the place to
say a word on this terrible form of malady—demon-
possession—not as often in the Gospels. Was it a
reality? or a hallucination? Did Jesus believe in it?
Was He influenced by the Gospels, and not answer the
last question in the affirmative. Was Jesus, then,
mighty hard to believe. If there is one subject on which Jesus might be expected to have clear
vision—on which we might trust His insight—it
was His relation to the spiritual world with which He
stood in so close rapport. Was He likely then to be mis-
taken when He spoke so clearly from the
quantities, of its hidden forces of evil? There is in itself
no improbability—rather analogy suggests the highest
probability—of realms of spiritual existence outside our
sensitive ken. That evil should enter this spiritual
world, and that human life should be deeply implicated with that evil—that its forces should have a mind and will organiz-
ing and directing them—are not beliefs to be dismissed
with scorn. The presence of such beliefs in the time of
Christ is commonly attributed to Baal, Pers or other
foreign cults. It may be questioned, however, whether the main cause was not something far more real—an
actual and permitted “hour and the power of the darkness” (Lk 1:33) in the world of evil, discovering itself in
manifestations in the bodies and souls of men, that could be a supernatual cause (see Demonic Possession). (The present writer discusses the subject in an art. in the Sunday School Times for June 4, 1910. It is difficult to say that the instance in the Gospels have no modern parallels. See a striking paper in Good News, May 6, 1910, cf. Dr. Norman MacLeod, Enquired for 1867, on “The English Demonic.”) It should be
noted that all diseases are not, as is sometimes affirmed, the only demonic influence. The distinction between
other diseases and demonic possession is clearly main-
tained in this Sunday’s lesson (Lk 8:1; 1:11, etc.). Insanity, epilepsy, blindness, dumbness, etc., were frequent accompaniments of possession, but they are not identified with it.

Jesus, on leaving the synagogue, entered the
house of Peter. In Mk it is called “the house of Simon Andrew” (Lk 4:36, Peter),

b) Peter’s marriage (cf 1 Cor 9:5), and apar-
ently his mother-in-law and brother
Mother
lived with him in Capernaum. It was
(Mt 8:14; Lk 4:38-39), an anxious time in the household, for
15; Mk 1:29—“a great fever,” as Luke the physi-
cian calls it. Taking her by the hand, Jesus rebuked the fever, which
instantaneously left her. The miracle, indeed, was a double one. Not only was she stayed, but her strength was at once restored. “She rose up and
ministered unto them” (Lk 4:39).

The day’s labors were not yet done; were, in
fact, scarcely begun. The news of what had taken
place quickly spread, and soon the
The day’s labors were not yet done; were, in
fact, scarcely begun. The news of what had taken
place quickly spread, and soon the

large crowd pressed upon the dwelling house. It was
an extraordinary spectacle was presented
The
Eventful of the ‘whole city’ gathered at the door
of the dwelling, bringing their sick of
ever kind to be healed. Demonic
oses were present, and even the healed
were subject to relapse
or multiples of others as well. The
Lord’s compassion was unbounded.
He rejected none. He labored un-
weariedly till every one was healed. His sympathy was individual: “He laid his hands on every one of
them” (Lk 4:40).

II. From First Galilean Circuit till Choice of
the Apostles.—The chronological order in this sec-
tion is to be sought in Mk and Lk;

1. The First Circuit (Mk 1:14-20), preparatory for
the preaching of Christ.

a) The Opening of Christ’s Ministry
(Mt 4:17; Mk 1:14) The eventful

Sabbath evening in Capernaum, Jesus
Lk 4:42—took steps for a systematic visitation
of the towns and villages of Galilee.

b) The Task He Set Before Himself was prayer (Mk 1:35; many instances show that
Christ’s life was steeped in prayer). His disciples
followed Him, and reported that the multitudes
sought Him. Jesus intimated to them His intention of
passing to the other side in the morning. It was a work like any methodically con-
ducted (cf Mk 6:4; “went round about the vil-
lages,” lit. “in a circle”). Galilee at this time was extraordinarily populous (cf Jos, EJ, III, ii, 2), and the
time occupied by the circuit must have been
considerable. Mk’s condensed picture (4:25-26) shows that Christ’s activities during this circuit was
incredibly great. He stirred the province to its
depths. His preaching and miracles drew enor-
mous crowds after Him. This tide of popularity
afterward turned, but much of the seed sown may have produced fruit at a later day.

The one incident recorded which seems to have belonged to this tour was a sufficiently typical one. While Jesus was in a certain city
b) Cure of a man “full of leprosy” (Lk 5:12) the
Lepers came and threw him down there
(Mt 8:4-2; Lk 5:12) did not even ask Jesus to heal him,
entrusted to the care of the leper, who
was the very essence of His importance. Jesus,
moved by his earnestness, touched him, and the
man was made whole on the spot. The leper was
enjoined to keep silence—Jesus did not wish to pass
for a mere miracle-worker and made the man show
himself to the priests and offer the appointed sacrifices (note Christ’s respect for the legal institu-
tions). The leper failed to keep Christ’s charge, and published his cure abroad, no doubt much
to his own spiritual detriment, and also to the hind-
rance of Christ’s work (Mk 1:45).

His circuit ended, Jesus returned to Capernaum
(Mk 2:1; lit. “after days”). Here again His
fame at once drew multitudes to see
and hear Him. Among them were
new persons of more unfriendly spirit.

Incidents Pharisees and doctors, learning of the
new rabbi, had come out of “every
village of Galilee and Judaea and Jerusalem” (Lk
5:17), to hear and judge of Him for themselves.
The chief incidents of this visit are the two now
to be noted.

In a chamber crowded till there was no standing
room, even round the door, Jesus wrought the cure
upon the paralytic man. The scene
b) Cure of a man was a dramatic one. From Christ’s the

words “son,” lit. “child” (Mk 2:5) of the paraly-
ic (Mt 9:2) we infer that the paralytic was young,
but his disableness seems to have been
by the easy manner
with the doorways blocked, to get
the man brought to Jesus, but his four
bearers (ver 3) were not easily daunted. They
climbed the flat roof, and, removing part of the
covering above where Jesus was, let down the man
into the midst. Jesus, pleased with the inventivity
and perseverance of their faith, responded to
their wish. But, first, that the spiritual and
temporal might be set in their right relations, and
the attitude of His hearers be tested, He spoke the
higher words: “Son, thy sins are forgiven” (ver 5).

At once the temper of the scribes was revealed. Here was manifest evasion. Anyone could say,
“Thy sins are forgiven.” Worse, it was blas-
pheous, for “who can forgive sins but one, even
God?” (ver 7). Unconsciously they were conceding
to Christ the Divine dignity He claimed. Jesus per-
ceives at once the thoughts of the cavilers, and proceeds to expose their malice. Accepting their own test, He proves His right to say, "Thy sins are forgiven," by now saying to the palsied man, "Take up thy bed and walk" (vs. 9.11). At once the man arose, took his bed, and went forth whole. The multitude were "amazed" and "glorified God" (ver. 12).

The call of Matthew apparently took place shortly after the cure of the paralytic man. The feast was possibly later (cf. the conclusion of the Feast of Mt 9:18), but the call and the feast Matthew are best taken together, as they are (Mt 9:9–13; Mk 2:1) in all three narratives.

b) Call and narrative (Mk 2:13–17). The feast of Alpheus by Mark. By occupation he was a "publican" (Lk 5:27), collector of custom-dues in Capernaum, an important center of traffic. There is no reason to suppose that Matthew was not a man of thorough uprightness, though naturally the class to which he belonged was held in great odium by the Jews. Passing the place of toll on His way to or from the lake-side, Jesus called Matthew to follow Him. The publican must by this have overheard His word, and could not but keenly feel His grace in calling one whom men despised. Without an instant’s delay, he left all, and followed Jesus. From publican, Matthew became apostle, then evangelist.

Then for the feast of the joy of his heart, Matthew made a feast for Jesus. To this feast he invited many of his own class—"publicans and sinners" (Mt 9:10). Scribes and Pharisees were loud in their remonstrances to the disciples at what seemed to them an outrage on all propriety. Nor could their hearts understand the breadth of grace. Christ’s reply was conclusive: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick," etc. (Mk 2:17, etc.).

(3) Fasting and joy.—Another line of objection was encountered from disciples of the Baptist. They, like the Pharisees, "fasted of" (Mt 9:14), and they took exception to the unconstrained way in which Jesus and His disciples entered into social life. Jesus defends His disciples by adopting a manner of His own (Mk 2:29). "I will show you another more excellent (ver. 20). A deeper answer follows. The spirit of His Gospel is a free, spontaneous, joyful spirit, and cannot be confined within the old forms. To attempt to confine His religion within the outworn forms of Judaism would be like putting a patch of undressed cloth on an old garment, or pouring new wine into old wineskins. The garment would be rent; the wineskins would burst (ver. 21.22)."
The new spirit must make forms of its own.

At this point is probably to be introduced the visit to Jerus to attend "a feast," or, according to another reading, "the feast" of the Jews, recorded in Jn 6. The feast may, if the article is admitted, have been the Passover (April), though in Feast that case one would expect it to be named; it may have been Purim (March), only this is not a feast Jesus might be thought eager to attend; it may even have been Pentecost (June). In either case it would succeed the Sabbath controversies to be mentioned later. Fortunately, the determination of the actual feast has little bearing on the teaching of the chapter.

Bethesda ("house of mercy") was the name given to a pool, fed by an intermittent spring, possessing healing properties, which was situated
c) The Healing at i.e. near the temple, on the E. Porches Bethesda were erected to accommodate the invalids who desired to make trial of the waters (the mention of the angel, ver 4, with part of ver 3, is a later gloss, and is justly omitted in RV). On one of these porches lay an impotent man. His infirmity was of long standing—38 years. But his heart sick, for he had no friend, when the waters were troubled, to put him into the pool. Others invariably got down before him. Jesus took pity on this man. He asked him if he would be made whole; then by a word of power healed him. The cure was instantaneous (vs. 9.9). It was the Sabbath day, and as the man, at Christ’s command, took up his bed to go, he was challenged as doing that which was unlawful. The healed man, however, rightly perceived that He who was able to work so great a cure had authority to say what should and should not be done on the Sabbath. Meeting the man after in the temple, Jesus bade him "sin no more"—a hint, perhaps, that his previous infirmity was of his own evil. Jesus Himself was now challenged by the authorities for breaking the Sabbath. Their strait, artificial rules would not permit even of Jesus as the "Son of Man," and "a notorious assertion of His Divine dignity. He first justified Himself by the example of His Father, who works continually in the upholding and government of the universe (ver. 17)—the Sabbath is a day from earthy labors, for Divine, heavenly labor (Westcott, when he increased the offence by its suggestion of "equality" with the Father, so that His life was threatened (ver 18). He spoke yet more explicitly of His unique relationship to the Father, and of the Divine prerogatives it conferred upon Him. The Jews were right: if Jesus were not a Divine Person, the claims He made would be blasphemous. Not only was He admitted to intimacy with the Divine counsel (vs. 20.21; cf. Mk 11.27), but to Him, He averred, and speaking of the given of life (vs. 21.26), of judgment (vs. 22.27), of resurrection—spiritual resurrection now (vs. 24.25), resurrection at the last day (vs. 28.29). It was the Father’s will that the Son should be honored even as Himself (ver. 23).

These stupendous claims are not made without adequate attestation. Jesus cites a threefold witness: (1) the witness of the Baptist, whose testimony they had been all along to understand. (2) The Threefold witness, willing for a time to receive (vs. 32–35); (3) the witness of the Father, who by witnessing to Himself (vs. 36–38); (3) the witness of the Scripture, for these, if read with spiritual discernment, would have led to Him (vs. 39.42–47). Moses, whom they trusted, would condemn them. Their rejection of Jesus was due, not to want of light, but to the state of the heart: "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in yourselves" (ver 42); "How can ye believe," etc. (ver 44).

Shortly after His return to Galilee, if the order of events has been rightly apprehended, Jesus became involved in new disputes with the Pharisees about Sabbath-keeping. Partly in the interest of the charges brought against Him at the feast in Judaea. Christ’s conduct, and the principles involved in His replies, throw valuable light on the Sabbath institution.
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The first dispute was occasioned by the action of the disciples in plucking ears of grain and rubbing them in their hands as they passed through the cornfields on a Sabbath. (The note of time "second-first" in Lk 6:1 AV, is omitted in RV. In any case the ripened grain points to a Sabbath, 1 S 21:6; the priests' service on the Sabbath—"One greater than the temple" was there, Mt 12:6), in illustration of the truth that necessity overrides positive enactment; next, falls back on the broad principle of the design of the Sabbath as made for man—for his highest physical, mental, moral and spiritual well-being: "The sabbath was made for man," etc (Mk 2:27). The claims of mercy are paramount. The end is not to be sacrificed to the means. The Son of Man, therefore, asserts lordship over the Sabbath (ver 26).

The second collision took place on "another sabbath" (Lk 6:6) in the synagogue. There was present a man with a withered hand.

b) The Man with the Withered Hand (Mt 12:10-14; Mk 3:1-6; Lk 6:6-11) was healed on the Sabbath day (vs 11,12), then, bidding the man stand forth, retorted the question on themselves, "Is it lawful to do a work of healing on the sabbath day?" (Mt 12:10). Jesus met the question by an appeal to their own practice in permitting the rescue of a sheep that had fallen into a pit on the Sabbath.

c) Withdrawal to the Sea (Mt:12:15-21; Mk 3:7-9) of His disciples, to escape the Pharisees who were seeking a way to entangle Him in some unanswerable question.

The work of Jesus was growing on His hands, and friends and enemies were rapidly taking sides. The time accordingly had come for selecting and attaching to His person a definite number of followers—not simply disciples—who might be prepared to carry on His work after His departure.

5. The Choosing of the Twelve (Mt: 10; Mk 3:14; Lk: 10:1; Acts 1:13) was made in the early morning, on the Mount of Beatitudes, after a night spent wholly in prayer. (Lk 6:12). “Apostle” means “one sent.” On the special function of the apostle it is sufficient to say here that those thus set apart were chosen for the special end of being Christ’s witnesses and accredited ambassadors to the world.

a) The Apostolic testimony to what Christ had been, said and done— to the facts of His life, death and resurrection (cf Acts 1:22: 23:22-32; 3:15; 10:39; 1 Cor 16:3-15, etc), but, further, as instructed by Him, and endowed with His Spirit (cf Lk 24:49; Jn 14:16.17.26, etc), of being the depositaries of His truth, sharers of His authority (cf Mt 10:1; Mk 13:15), messengers of His gospel (cf 2 Cor 5:18-21), and His instruments in laying broad and strong the foundations of His church (cf Eph 2:20; 3:5). So responsible a calling was never, before or after, given to mortal men.

Four lists of the apostles are given—in Mt, Mk, Lk, and Acts (1:13, omitting Judas). The names are given alike in all, except that "Judas, the son (or brother) of James" is omitted in Mk 6:16; Acts 1:13 is called by Mt "Lebbæus," and by Mk "Thaddæus." The latter names are cognate in meaning, and all denote the same person. "Bartholomew" (son of Tolmas) is probably the Nathanael of John (cf Lk 10:2; Jn 21:2). The epithet "Cananaean" (Mt 10:4; Mk 3:18) marks "Simon" as then or previously a member of the party of the Zealots (Lk 6:15). In all the lists Peter, through his gifts of leadership, stands first; Judas Iscariot, the betrayer, is last. There is a tendency to arrangement in pairs: Peter and Andrew; James and John; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew; lastly, James, the son of Alphaeus; Judas, son or brother of James, Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot. There are pairs of brothers (three, if "brother" be read with Judas), and at least one pair of friends (Philip and Nathanael).

All the apostles were men from the humbler ranks, yet not illiterate, and mostly comfortably circumstanced. All were Galileans, except Cephas, the betrayer, whose name "Iscariot," i.e. "man of Keroth," marks him as a Judaean. Of some of the apostles we know a good deal; of others very little; yet we are warranted in speaking of them all, Judas excepted, as men of honest minds, and sincere piety. The band held within it a number of men of strongly contrasted types of character. Allusion need only be made to the impetuous Peter, the calculating Judas, the matter-of-fact Philip, the cautious Thomas, the zealous Simon, the conservative Matthew, the administrative Judas. The last-named—Iscariot—is the dark problem of the apostolate. We have express testimony that Jesus knew him from the beginning (Jn 6:64). Yet He chose him. The character of Judas, when Jesus received him, was doubtful, undeveloped. He could not himself suspect the dark possibilities that slept in him. His association with the apostles, in His absence, was for the good. His peculiar gift was, for the time, of service. In choosing him, Jesus must be viewed as acting for, and under the direction of, the Father (Jn 5:16; 17:12). See special arts. on the several apostles.

III. From the Sermon on the Mount till the Parables of the Kingdom—a Second Circuit. The choice of the apostles inaugurates a new period of Christ’s activity. Its first Circuit was the Sermon on the Mount. The most precious fruit was the delivery to the apostles of the message and parables. In the Sermon on the Mount the hill is identified by Sinai and Mount of the Law, and the parables of the kingdom are delivered. The hill is identified by Sinai and Mount of the Law, and the parables of the kingdom are delivered.
of the higher horns, exactly suits the conditions of the narrative. The sick being healed, Jesus seated Himself a little higher up, He discipled near and addressed the assembly (cf. Mt 7:28-29). The season of the year is shown by the mention of the "lilies" to be the summer.

Its scope.—His words were weighty. His aim was at the outset to set forth in terms that were unmistakable the principles, the laws and dispositions of His kingdom; to expound its righteousness, both positively, and in contrast with Pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy. Only the leading points are indicated here (see BEATTITUDES; SERMON ON MOUNT; ETERN; MATTHEW JESUS as is His wont, groups material part of which is found in other connections in Lk, but it is well to study the whole in the well-ordered form in which it appears in the First Gospel.

In marked contrast with the lawgiving of Sinai, Christ's first words are those of blessing. Posing at once to the dispositions of the heart,

e) The Blessings (Mt 5:9-11; Lk 6:20-26)

He shows on what inner conditions the blessings of the kingdom depend. His blessings pertain to spirit, mourning; meekness, hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc. reverse all the world's standards of judgment on such matters.

In the possession of these graces consists true godliness and character; through them the heirs of the kingdom become the salt of the earth, the light of the world. The obligation rests on them to let their light shine (cf Mk 4:21-23; Lk 8:16; 11:33).

Jesus defines His relation to the old law—not a Destroyer, but a Fulfiller—and proceeds to exhibit the nature of the true righteousness in contrast to Pharisaic literalism and formalism. Through adherence to the latter they killed the spirit of the law. With an absolute authority—"But it say unto you"—Jesus leads everything back from the outward letter to the state of the heart. Illustrations are taken from murder, adultery, swearing, retaliation, hatred of enemies, and a spiritual expansion is given to every precept. The sinful thought or desire holds in it the essence of transgression. The world's standards are again reversed in the demands for non-resistance to injuries, love of enemies and requital of good for evil.

Pursuing the contrast between the true righteousness and that of the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus next draws attention to motive in religion. The Pharisees are simple in having regard only to the letter of the law, but in acting in morals and religion from a false motive.

False Motive (Mt 6:1; Lk 11:1-8)

He had furnished the antidote to their literalism; He now assails their ostentation and hypocrisy. Illustrations are taken from almsgiving, prayer and fasting, and in connection with prayer the Lord's Prayer is given as a model (Lk introduces this in another context, 11:2-4).

The true motive in religious acts is to please God; the same motive should guide us in the choice of what is to be our supreme good.

d) The True Good and Care (Mt 6:1-18; Lk 11:9-12; 22-34; 23-34)

Earthly treasure is not to be put above heavenly. The kingdom of God and righteousness are to be first in mind. The eye is to be single. The true cure for worldly anxiety is then found in trust of the heavenly Father. His children are more to God than angels are to Him. The absence of God in nature is so conspicuously manifest.

Seeking first the kingdom they have a pledge—no higher conceivable—that all else they need will be granted along with it (this section on trust, again, Lk places of Mt 6:33).

Jesus finally proceeds to speak of the relation of the disciple to the evil of the world. That evil has been considered in its hostile attitude to the disciple (Mt 5:38 ff); the question is now as to the disciple's free relations toward it. Jesus indicates the duties of the disciple's bearing himself wisely toward evil—with charity, with caution, with prayer, in the spirit of ever doing as one would be done by and of being on his guard against it. The temptation is great to follow the worldly crowd, to be misled by false teachers, to put profession for practice. Against these perils the disciple is energetically warned. True religion will ever be known by its fruits. The discourse closes with the powerful similitude of the wise and foolish builders. Again, as on an earlier occasion, Christ's auditors were astonished at His teaching, and at the authority with which He spoke (Mt 7:28-29).

A series of remarkable incidents are next to be noticed.

1. The Healing of the Centurion's Servant (Mt 8:1, 5, 13; Lk 7:1-10)

It had been a day of manifold incidents, and exhausting labors for Jesus. A walk of perhaps 7 miles brought Him back to Capernaum, the crowds accompanying, and the second great miracle to which He hears a new appeal for help than His love replies, "I will come and heal him." The suppliant was a Roman centurion—one who had endeared himself to the Jews (Lk 7:5)—and the request was for the healing of a favorite servant, paralyzed and tortured with pain. First, a deputation sought Christ's good offices, then, when Jesus was on the way, a second message came, awakening even Christ's astonishment by the magnitude of its faith.

The centurion felt he was not worthy that Jesus should come under his roof, but let Jesus speak the word only, and his servant would be healed. "I have not found so great faith," Jesus said, "no, not in Israel." The word was spoken, and, on the return of the messengers, the servant was found healed.

The exciting events of this day gathered so great a crowd round the house where Jesus was as left Him no leisure even to eat, and His friends, made anxious for His health, Widow of Nain's Son (Mt 9:11-17)

It was probably to escape from this local excitement that Jesus, "soon afterwards," is found at the little town of Nain, a few miles S.E. of Nazareth.

A great multitude still followed Him. Here, as He entered the city, occurred the most wonderful of the works He had yet wrought. A young man—the only son of a widowed mother—was being carried out for burial. Jesus, in compassion, stopped the mournful procession, and, in the calm certainty of His word being obeyed, bade the young man arise. On the instant life returned, and Jesus gave the son back to his mother. The amazement of the people was tenfold intensified. They felt that the old days had come back: that God had visited His people.

It was apparently during the journey or circuit which embraced this visit to Nain, and as the result of the fame of the works emanating from His town (cf. the allusion to the dead being raised in Christ's reply to John), that the embassy was sent from the
Baptist in prison to ask of Jesus whether He was indeed He who should come, or would they look for another. It was a strange question c) Embassy on the lips of the forerunner, but is of John's Disciples—probably to be interpreted as the ex-
pressing of a lingering doubt that Christ and His Gene-
ration (Mt 11:2-30; Lk 7:19-35) had not turned out as He expected. It was the peaceful, merciful character of Christ's work which stumped John. The gloom of his prison wrought with his disappointment, and he sent this message for the satisfaction of himself and his disciples.

(1) Christ's answer to John.—If doubt there was, Jesus treated it tenderly. He did not answer direc-
tly, but bade the two disciples who had been sent to go back and tell John the things they had seen and heard—the blind receiving their sight, the lame walking, the deaf cured, the dead raised, the Gospel preached. Little doubt the Messiah had come when works like these—the very works predicted by the prophets (Isa 35:5,6)—were being done. Blessed were those few who did not forsake Him. The fact of stumbling in Him, Jesus, however, did more. By his em-
bassy John had put himself in a somewhat false po-

sition before the multitude. But Jesus would not have His faithful follower misunderstood. His was no fickle, fickle nature. He was not a prophet and more than a prophet; yea, a man than whom a greater had not lived. Yet, even as the new dispensation was higher than the old, one "little" in the kingdom of heaven—one sharing Christ's human, self-denying disposition—was greater even than John (Mt 11:11).

(2) A perverse people—Christ's grace. —The im-
plied contrast between Himself and John led Jesus fur-
to denounce the perverse spirit of His own generation. The Pharisees and lawyers (Lk 7:30) had rejected John; they were as little pleased with Him. Their behavior was like children objecting to one game because it was merry, and to another because it was sad. The flood of outward popu-

larity did not deceive Jesus. The cities in which His greatest works were wrought—Corazain, Beth-
saida, Capernaum—remained impenetrant at heart. The heavier would be their judgment; worse even than that on Tyre and Sidon, or on Sodom itself. Over against the unbelieving Jew-
erty and declares His grace (Mt 11:25-30). All authority was His; He alone knew and could reveal the Father (no claims in Jn are higher). Let the heavy laden come to Him, and He would give them rest (parts of these passages appear in another con-
nexion in Lk 10:12-21).

Yet another beautiful incident connected with this journey is preserved by Lk—the anointing of Jesus in Simon's house by a woman who was a sinner. In Nain or some other city visited by Him, Jesus was not a right-thinking man, much less a prophet, or He would have rebuked this misbehavior from such a person. Jesus met the thought of Simon's heart by speaking to him the parable of the Two Debtors (vs 41,42). Of two men who had been freely for-
given, one 500, the other the 50 shillings, which would love his creditor most? Simon gave the obvious answer, and thus that loving, forgiving, tender side of Jesus and the woman's passionate love was immediately pointed out. Her greater love was due to the greater forgiveness; though, had Simon only seen it, he perhaps needed for-
giveness even more than she. Her faith saved her and she was dismissed in peace. But again the question arose, Jesus, no doubt, wrought numerous miracles on demoniacs (cf. Mary Magdalene, etc.). He is said to have cast 7 demons—perhaps a cure 

b) Cure of a demon by a form of speech to indicate the Demoniac—severity of the possession). The demo-
Discourse of Blasphemy—of Blasphemy—

(Lk 8:1-4) Revisited (Lk 8:1-4). The circuit was an extensive one—went through cities and villages (lit. "according to city and village") preaches. During this journey Jesus was attended by the Twelve, and by devoted women (Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Herod's steward, and others) who ministered to Him of their substance (vs 2,3). At the close of this circuit Jesus returned to Capernaum.

3. Second Galilean Circuit—Events at Capernaum (Lk 8:1-4). Luke introduces here (Lk 8:1-4) a second Galilean circuit of Jesus, after the return from which a new series of exciting incidents took place at Ca-

pernaum.

Jesus, no doubt, wrought numerous miracles on demoniacs (cf. Mary Magdalene, etc.). He is said to have cast 7 demons—perhaps a cure of a demon by a form of speech to indicate the severity of the possession). The demoniac discourse of Blasphemy—of Blasphemy—
the prince of demons (see s.v.). A quite similar incident is narrated in Mt 9:32-34; and Lk 9:32-34; and Lk gives the discourse that follows in a later con-
nection (11:14ff). The accusation may well have been repeated more than once. Jesus, in reply, points out first, the absurdity of supposing Satan to be engaged in warring against his own kingdom (Mt 18:25ff; here was plainly a stronger than Satan); then utters the momentous word about blaspheming against the Holy Spirit. All other blasphemies—even that against the name of man (Mt 12:32)—may be forgiven, for they may proceed from ignorance and misconception; but deliberate, perverse rejection of the light, and attributing to Satan what was manifestly of God, was a sin which, when matured—and the Pharisees came perilously near committing it—admitted of no forgiveness, either in this world or the next, for the very capacity for truth in the soul was by such sin destroyed. Mk has the strong phrase, "is guilty of an eternal sin" (3:29).

Pertinent words follow as to the root of good and evil in character (Mt 12:33-37). See BLASPHEMY.

The sign of Jonah.—Out of this discourse arose the usual Jewish demand for a "sign" (Mt 12:38; cf Lk 11:29-32), which Jesus met by declaring that no sign would be given but the sign of the prophet Jonah—an allusion to His future resurrection. He reiterates His warning to the people of His generation for their rejection of greater light than had been enjoyed by the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba.

Two incidents, not dissimilar in character, interrupted this discourse—one the cry of a woman in the audience (if the time be the same, Lk 11:27, 28), "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," etc.
to which Jesus replied, "Ye rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it"; the other, a message that His mother and brethren
c) Christ's (doubtful anxiety for His safety) de-
mother and
to speak with Him. To this,
Brehren
stretching out His hand toward His discples, "Behold, my mother and my brethren" (Mt 3 34), etc.
Kinship in the spiritual kingdom consists in fidelity to the will of God, not in ties of earthly relationship.
On the same day on which the preceding disc-
courses were observed, Jesus was preaching the multitudes, passed to the shore, and entering a
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and in his right mind." Yet, with fatal short-sightedness, they besought Jesus to depart from their borders. The man was sent home to declare to his friends the great things the Lord had done to him.

Repelled by the Gerasenes, Jesus received a warm welcome on His return to Capernaum on the western shore (Mt 8:21). It was probably at this point that the Shew, the Counsel of parts, gave the feast formerly referred to.

3. Jairus' Daughter Raised — It was in connection with this feast, Woman Matthew himself informs us (9:18), with Issue of blood (Mt 9:19-26); His little daughter, about 12 years old (Lk 8:42), was at the point of death; indeed, while Jesus was coming, she died. The ruler's faith, though real, was not equal to the centurion's, who believed that Jesus could heal without being present. Jesus came, and having expelled the professional mourners, in sacred privacy, only the father and mother, with Peter, James, and John being permitted to enter the death-chamber, raised the girl to life. It is the second miracle on record of the raising from the dead.

On the way to the ruler's house occurred another wonder—a miracle within a miracle. A poor woman, who had a specially distressing one, alike as regards the nature of her malady, the length of its continuance, and the fruitlessness of her application to the physicians to it up to Jesus, confident that if she could but touch the border of His garment, she would be healed. The woman was ignorant; her faith was blended with superstition; but Jesus, reading the heart, gave her the benefit she desired. It was His will, however, that, for her own good, the woman thus cured should not obtain the blessing by stealth. He therefore brought her to open confession, and cheered her by His commendatory word.

At this point begins apparently a new evangelistic tour (Mt 9:35; Mk 6:6), extending methodically to "all the cities and villages." To it 4. Incidents belong in the narratives the healing of two blind men (of the case of Bart' in Circuit (Mt 9:27-33; 13:53-58; a demoniac who was dumb— 

b) The Afflicted Woman Cured

The nature of her malady, the length of its continuance, and the fruitlessness of her application to the physicians to it up to Jesus, confident that if she could but touch the border of His garment, she would be healed. The woman was ignorant; her faith was blended with superstition; but Jesus, reading the heart, gave her the benefit she desired. It was His will, however, that, for her own good, the woman thus cured should not obtain the blessing by stealth. He therefore brought her to open confession, and cheered her by His commendatory word.

At this point begins apparently a new evangelistic tour (Mt 9:35; Mk 6:6), extending methodically to "all the cities and villages." To it 4. Incidents belong in the narratives the healing of two blind men (of the case of Bart' in Circuit (Mt 9:27-33; 13:53-58; a demoniac who was dumb—a similar case to that in Mt 12:22; and a second rejection at Nazareth (Mt, Mk). The incident is similar to that in Lk 4:16-30, and shows, if the events are different, that the people's hearts were unchanged. Of this circuit Mt gives an affecting summary (9:35-38), emphasizing the Lord's compassion, and His yearning for more laborers to reap the abundant harvest.

Partly with a view to the needs of the rapidly growing work and the training of the apostles, and partly as a witness to Israel (Mt 10:6, 23), Jesus deemed it expedient to send the Twelve on an independent Fourth—Dis-mission. The discourse in Mt attached course of to this event seems, as frequently, to be a compilation. Parts of it are

5. The Twelve Sent

Jesus (Mt 10:6, 23) sent them to an independent mission. The discourse in Mt attached course of to this event seems, as frequently, to be a compilation. Parts of it are

- 10:6; given by Luke in connection with the 7-13; Lk 9: mission of the Seventy (Lk 10:1 ff; 1-6; of Lk the directions were doubtless similar 10:2-24; both cases); parallel 12:2-12, (Lk 12:2-12; 21:12-17, etc; of Mk etc) 13:9-13.

The Twelve were sent out two by two. Their work was to be a copy of the Master's — to preach the gospel and heal all manner of sickness. They were to go forth free from all encumbrances—no money, no scrip, no changes of raiment, no staff (save that in their hand, Mk 6:8), sandals only on their feet, etc. a) The Commission for support on those to whom they preached. They were for the present to confine their ministry to Israel. The saying in Mt 10:23, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come," apparently has reference to the judgment on the nation, not to the final coming (cf 16:28).

The mission of the Twelve was the first step of Christianity as an aggressive force in society. Jesus was permitted to have the whole future that was to come and out of it. He warns His apostles of the whole future that was to come and out of it. He warns His apostles

Warnings—faithfully of the dangers that awaited them; exhorts them to prudence and circumspection ("wise as serpents," etc); holds out to them Divine promises for consolation; directs them when persecuted in one place to flee to another; points out to them from His own case that such persecutions were only to be expected. He assures them of a coming day of revelation; bids them at once fear and trust God; impresses on them the duty of courage in confession; inculcates in them supreme love to Himself. That love would be tested in the dearest relations. In itself peace, the gospel would be the innocent occasion of strife, enmity and persecution. The Master warned His disciples that though Christ's disciples will not fail of their reward.

When Christ had ended His discourse He proceeded with His own evangelistic work, leaving the disciples to inaugurate theirs (Mt 11:1).

Second Period—After the Mission of the Twelve till the Departure from Galilee

I. From the Death of the Baptist to the Discourse on Bread of Life. Shortly before the events now to be narrated, John the Baptist had been fouly murdered in his prison by Herod Antipas at the instigation of Herodias, whose unlawful marriage and Herod's with Herod had unscrupulously condemned. Jos gives as the place of 14:1-12; the Baptist's imprisonment the fortress of Mashaerus, near the Dead Sea (Ant, XVIII, v 2); or John may have died 7:5-9; cf late; the eulogies of the people would ere this have killed John, but was restrained by fear of the people (Mt 14:5). The hate of Herodias, however, did not slumber. Her relentless will contrasts with the vacillation of Herod, as Ladey Macbeth in Shakespear contrasts with Macbeth. A birthday feast gave her the opening she sought for. Her daughter Salome, pleasing Herod by her dancing, obtained from him a promise on oath to give her whatever she asked. Prompted by Herodias, she boldly demanded John the Baptist's head. The weak king was shocked, but, for his oath's sake, granted her what she craved. The story tells how the Baptist's disciples reverently buried the remains of their master, and went and told Jesus. Herod's conscience did not let him rest. When rumors reached him of a wonderful teacher and miracle-worker in Galilee, he leaped at once to the conclusion that it was John risen from the dead. Herod cannot have heard much of Jesus before. An evil conscience makes men curious among men. The Baptist's fate, and of Herod's fears, and now proposed to His disciples a retirement to a desert place across the
lake, near Bethsaida (on the topography, cf. Stanley, op. cit., 375, 381). As it proved, however, the multitudes had had the place before them (Mk 6:33).

2. The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mt 14:13-21; Mk 6:30-44; Lk 9:10-17; Jn 6:1-14). The purpose of rest was frustrated, but Jesus did not complain. He pitied the shepherds less state of the people, and went out to teach and heal them.

The day wore on, and the disciples suggested that the fasting multitude should disperse, and seek victuals in the nearest towns and villages. This Jesus, who had already fed Philip by asking how the people should be fed (Jn 6:5), would not permit. With the scanty provision at command—5 loaves and 2 fishes—He fed the whole multitude. By His blessing the food was multiplied till all were satisfied, and 12 baskets of fragments, carefully collected, remained over. It was a stupendous act of creative power, no rationalizing of which can reduce it to natural dimensions.

The enthusiasm created by this miracle was intense (Jn 6:14). Mt and Mk relate (Lk here fails for a time out of the Synopsis) that Jesus hurriedly constrained His disciples to enter into their boat and recross the lake—though a storm was gathering—while He Himself remained by the mountain alone in prayer. Jn gives the key to this action in the statement that the people were about to take Him by force and make Him a king (ver 15). Three hours after dark found them helpless still in the midst of the lake, "distressed in rowing" (Mk 6:48), deeply anxious because Jesus was not, as on a former occasion, with them. At last, at the darkest hour of their extremity, Jesus was seen approaching in a way unlooked-for—walking on the water. Every new experience of Jesus was a surprise to the disciples. They were at first terrified, thinking they saw a spirit, but straightforward the well-known voice was heard, "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid." In the rebond of his feelings the impulsive Peter asked Jesus to permit him to come to Him on the water (Mt). Jesus said, "Come," and for the first moment or two Peter did walk on the water; then, as he realized his unwonted situation, his faith failed, and he began to sink. Jesus saved him, caught him, and assisted him back into the boat. Once again the sea was calm, and the disciples found themselves safely at land. To their adoring minds the miracle of the loaves was eclipsed by this new marvel (Mk 6:50).

On the return to Gennesaret the sick from all quarters were brought to Jesus—the commencement apparent of a new, more general ministry of healing (Mk 6:56). Meanwhile—here we depend on Mt—the people on the other side of the lake, when they found that Jesus was gone, took boats hastily, and came over to Capernaum. They found Jesus apparently in the synagogue (ver 59). In reply to their query, "Rabbi, when didst thou hither?" Jesus first rebuked the motive which led them to follow Him—not because they had seen in His miracles "signs" of greater blessings, but because they had eaten of the loaves (ver 56)—then spoke to them His great discourse on the bread from heaven. "Work," He said, "for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you" (ver 27). When asked to authentify His claims by a sign from heaven like the manna, He replied that the manna also (given not by Moses but by God) was but typical bread, and surprised them by declaring that He Himself was the true bread of life from heaven (vs 35-51). The bread was Christ's flesh, His transfiguration, and His defilement. His flesh and blood must be eaten and drunk (a spiritual appropriation through faith, ver 63), if men were to have eternal life. Jesus of set purpose had put His doctrine in a strong, testing manner. The time had come when His hearers must make their choice between a spiritual acceptance of Him and a break with Him altogether. What He had said strongly offended them, both on account of the claims implied (ver 42), and on account of the doctrine taught, which, they were plainly told, they could not receive. He might have spared them of their carnalitv of heart (vs 43.44.61-64). Many, therefore, went back and walked no more with Him (vs 60.61.66); but their detection only evoked from the chosen Twelve a yet more confident confession of their faith. "Would ye also go away?"

Peter's first confession.—Peter, as usual, spoke for the rest: "Lord, to whom shall we go? . . . We have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God" (ver 60). Here, and not first at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:16), is Peter's brave confession of His Master's Messiaship. Twelve thus confessed Him, but even of this select circle Jesus was compelled to say, "One of you [Judas] is a devil" (Jn 6:70.71).

II. From Disputes with the Pharisees till the Transfiguration.—The discourse in Capernaum seems to mark a turning-point in the Lord's ministry in Galilee. Soon after we find Him ceasing from public teaching, and devoting Himself to the instruction of His disciples (Mt 15:21; Mk 7:24, etc.). Meanwhile, that Christ's work in Galilee was attracting the attention of the central authorities, is shown by the fact that scribes and Pharisees came up to Him and tried to entice Him to a public act of defilement (Mk 7:1-23).

1. Jesus and the Pharisees.—Jesus was specially blamed for allowing His disciples to eat bread with "common," purity (Mt 15:1-20; Mk 7:1-23) i.e. unwashed hands. Here was a point on which the Pharisees laid great stress (Mk 7:3.4). Ceremonial abolutions (washing "diligently," etc.) were binding on the person and things) formed a large part of their religion. These washings were part of the "oral tradition" said to have been delivered to Moses, and transmitted by a succession of elders. Jesus set aside all these ceremonial distinctions as unimportant. In Mk 7:6 He even questioned regarding it, He drew a sharp distinction between God's commandment in the Scriptures and man's tradition, and accused the Pharisees (in St. Trophimus) of "Corban" (q.v.), in support, vs 10-12) of making "void" the former through the latter. This led to the wider question of wherein real defilement consisted. Christ's rational position here is that it did not consist in anything outward, as in meats, but consisted in what came from within the man: as Jesus explained afterward, in the outcome of his heart or moral life: "Out of the heart of men evil thoughts proceed," etc (vs 20-23). Christ's saying was in effect the abrogation of the old ceremonial distinctions, as Mk notes: "making all meats clean" (ver 19). The Pharisees, naturally, were deeply offended at His sayings, but Jesus was unmoved. Every plant not of the Father's planting must be rooted up (ver 13).

From this point Jesus appears, in order to escape notice, to have made journeys privately from place to place. His first retreat was to the borders, or neighborhood, of Tyre and Sidon. From Mt 7:31 it is to be inferred that He entered the heathen ter-
ritory. He could not, however, be hid (Mt 7:24). It was not long ere, in the house into which He had entered, there reached Him the story of a woman who had cast herself to Him, a Greek (or Gentile, Greek-speaking), but Syrophoenician by race. 2. Retirement to Tyre and Sidon—the Her "little daughter" was grievously afflicted with an evil spirit. Flinging her woman herself at His feet, and addressing (Mt 15:21—28; Mk 7:24—28; Lk 17:17-19; Jn 4:25—26; Acts 7:26) "Son of David," she besought Him (Mt 28:9; Mk 9:24; Lk 17:17) His mercy for her child. At first (Mt 21—28) Jesus seemed—yet only seemed—to repel her, speaking of Himself as sent only to the lost sheep of Israel, and of the unmeasurableness of giving the children's bread to the dogs (the Gr softens the expression, "the little dogs"). With a beautiful urgency which won for her the boon she sought, the woman seized on the word as an argument in her favor. "Even the dogs under the table eat of children's crumbs." The child at Jesus' word was restored. Christ's second retreat was to Decapolis—the district of the ten cities—E of the Jordan. Here also He was soon discovered, and were brought to Him, whom He cured (Mt 15:30). Later, He fed the crowds. 3. At Decapo- lis—New Miracles (Mt 15:29—20). The charge to those present not to blaspheme the dead was disregarded. Jesus desired no cheap popularity. The next miracle closely resembles the feeding of the Five Thousand at Bethsaida, but the place and numbers are different; 4,000 instead of 5,000; 7 loaves and a few fishes, instead of 5 loaves and 2 fishes; 7 baskets of fragments instead of 12 (Mark's term denotes a larger basket). There is no mention for doubting the distinctness of the incidents (cf Mt 16:9-10; Mk 8:19-20). Returning to the plain of Gennesaret (Magdala, Mt 15:39 AV; parts of Dalmanutha, Mk 8:1), Jesus soon found Himself assailed by His old adversaries. Pharisees and Sadducees were now united. They came "trying" Jesus, and asking from Him a "sign from heaven"—some mode of speech by signs to the (Mt 16:1—12; Mk 8:27—28). The levirate to Bethsaida. On the way He warned His disciples against the leaven of the spirit they had just encountered. The disciples misunder- stood, thinking that Jesus referred to their forographic way that they had only one loaf. The levirate Christ referred to, in fact, represented three spirits: (1) the Pharisaic leaven—formalism and hypocrisy; (2) the Sadducean leaven—rationalistic skepticism; (3) the Herodic leaven (Mk 6:15) spiritual expediency and temporizing. Arrived at Bethsaida, a miracle was wrought on a blind man resembling in some of its features the cure of the deaf man at Decapolis. In both cases Jesus took the patients apart; in both there was strict injunction not to noise the cure abroad. Another peculiarity was the gradual- ness of the cure. It is probable that the man had not been blind from his birth, else he could hardly have recognized men or trees at the first opening. It needed that Jesus should lay His hands on Him before He saw all things clearly. The next retirement of Jesus with His disciples was to the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, near the source of the Jordan. This was 5. At Caesarea—the northernmost point of His journey- rea of Philippiings. Here, “on the geographical —The Great frontier between Judaism and heathen—Confession ism (Ladd), Our Lord put the—First An—momentous question which called forth nouncement Peter's historical confession. of Passion (1) The voices of the age and the exter- nal—truth.—The question put to the (Mt 16:13—20).—The answer given by the (Mt 16:28).—The charge to those present not to blaspheme the (Mt 16:9-10; Mk 8:27—28; Lk 9:18—21) 'Son of man,' as already said, was the familiar name given by Jesus to Himself, to which a Messianic significance might or might not be attached, according to the prepos- sessions of His hearers. First the age of the world was recited to Jesus: "Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah," etc. Next, in answer to the further question: "But who say ye that I am?" there rang out from Peter, in the name of all, the unchanging truth: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." In clearness, boldness, decision, Peter's faith had attained a height not reached before. The confession embodies two truths: (1) the Divinity, (2) the Messiahship, of the Son of man. Jesus did honor to the confession of His apostle. Not flesh and blood, but the Father, had revealed the truth to him. Here at length was "rock" on which He could build a church. Reverting to Peter's original name, Simon, Simon, Peter declared, with a play on the name "Peter" (petros, "rock," "piece of rock") He had before given him (Jn 14:2), that on this "rock" (petra), He would build His church, and the gates of Hades (hostile evil powers) would not prevail against it (Mt 16:18). The proper reason reared an unwarrantable structure of pretensions on this passage in supposing the "rock" to be Peter personally and his successors in the see of Rome (none such existed; Peter was not bishop of Rome). It is not Peter the individual, but Peter the confessing apostle—Peter as representative of all —that Christ names "rock"; that which constituted him a foundation was the truth he had confessed (cf Eph 2:20)—This is the first NT mention of a "church" (ekklasia, Christian church), therefore, is founded (1) on the truth of Christ's Divine Sonship; (2) on the truth of His Messiah- ship, or of His being the anointed prophet, priest and king of the new age. A society of believers confessing these truths is a church; no society which denies these truths deserves the name. To this confessing community Jesus, still addressing Peter as representing the apostolate (cf Mt 18:18), gives authority to bind and loose—to admit and to exclude. Jesus, it is noted, bade His disciples tell no man of these things (Mt 16:20; Mk 8:30; Lk 9:21). (2) The cross and the discipline.—The confession of Peter prepared the way for an advance in Christ's teaching. From that time, Matthew notes, Jesus began to speak plainly of the approaching suffer- ings and death (Mt 16:21). These are in all three
solemn announcements of the Passion (Mt 16 21–23; 17 22–23; 20 17–19 //). Jesus foresaw, and clearly foretold, what would befall Him at Jesus. He would be killed by the authorities, but on the third day would rise again. On the first announcement, following His confession, Peter took it upon him to expostulate with Jesus: “Be it far from thee, Lord,” etc (Mt 16 22), an action which brought upon him the stern rebuke of Jesus: “Get thee behind me, Satan,” etc (ver 23). The Rock-man, in his fall to the maxims of a worldly expediency, is now identified with Satan, the tempter. This principle, that duty is only to be done the way it is, not the way it seems to be, is not only repudiated for Himself, but bids His disciples repudiate it also. The disciple, Jesus says, must be prepared to deny himself, and take up his cross. The cross is the symbol of anything distressing or painful to bear. There is a saving of life which is a losing of it, and what shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his (true, higher) life? As, however, Jesus had spoken, not only of dying, but of rising again, so now He encourages His disciples by anticipating His future coming in glory to render to every man according to His deeds. That final coming might be distant (cf Mt 24 36); but (so it seems most natural to interpret the saying 16 28;) there were those living who would see the nearer pledge of that, in Christ’s coming in the triumphs and successes of His kingdom (of Mk 9 1; Lk 9 27; Mt 26 64).

About eight days after the announcement of His passion by Jesus, took place the glorious event of the Transfiguration. Jesus had spoken of His future glory, and here was a Transfiguration of it. In strange contrast the procession of this event is the scene of glory on the summit of the mountain the Saul of Saul to the beloved of Moses. Jesus had ascended the mountain with Peter, James and John, for prayer. It was while He was praying, the wondrous change happened. For once the very spirit of the Beloved was with Him, and the Holy Ghost was begotten from the Father (Jn 1 14) was permitted to burst forth, sussing His person and garments, and changing them into a dazzling brightness. His face did shine as the sun; His raiment became white as light (“as snow,” AV, Mk.). Heavenly visitants, recognized from their converse as Moses and Elijah, appeared with Him and spoke of His decease (Lk). A voice from an enveloping cloud attested: “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” Little wonder the disciples were afraid, or that Peter in his confusion should stammer out: “It is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tabernacles [booths].” This, however, was not permitted. Earth is not heaven. Glimpses of heavenly glory are given, not to view from duty on earth, but to prepare for the trials connected therewith. The spectacle that met the eyes of Jesus and the chosen three as they descended was distressing in the extreme. A man had brought to Jesus a son to be healed. The child was dumb. The disciples were not able to help the man of law and order, and a poor sufferer and dumb—to the disciples to see if they could cast out the evil spirit that possessed him, but they were not able. Their failure, as Jesus showed, was a failure of faith. They could not afford a handle to the gain-sayers, who were not slow to take advantage of it (Mk 9 14). The man’s ap-

peal was now to Jesus, “If thou canst do anything,” etc (ver 22). The reply of Jesus shifted the “canst,” to the right moment and way (ver 23). Such little faith as the man had revolved under Christ’s word: “I believe; help thou mine unbelief.” The multitude pressing around, there was no call for further delay. With one energetic word Jesus expelled the unclean spirit (ver 25). The first effect of Christ’s approach had been to induce a violent paroxysm (ver 20); now the spirit terribly convulsed the frame it was compelled to relinquish. Jesus, taking the boy’s hand, raised him up, and he was found well. The lesson drawn to the disciples was, the personal absence of faith (Mt 17 19 20) and power of prayer (Mk 9 28 29).

III. From Private Journey through Galilee till Return from the Feast of Tabernacles.—Soon after the last-mentioned events Jesus passed privately through Galilee (Mk 9 30), returning later to Capernaum.

1. Galilee and Capernaum

During the Galilean journey Jesus made to His disciples His 2d announcement of His approaching sufferings and death, accompanied as before by the assurance of His resurrection. The disciples still could not take in the meaning of His words, though what He said made them “exceeding sorry” (Mt 17 23). The announcement of His passion (Mk 8 31–33; Mt 16 21–23; Mk 9 30–33; Lk 9 22–36; 23; 44 46) was marked by an incident which raised the question of Christ’s relation to the temple institutions. The collectors of the temple asked of Peter: “What shall your Master give for the half-shekel?” (Gr didrachma, or double drachm, worth about 32 cents or 1s. 4d.). The origin of this tax was in the half-shekel of atonement-money for the temple. The Collectors of the temple (Ex 30 11–16), which, though a special Tax was made, was the basis of later assessment (2 Ch 24 4–10; in Nehemiah’s time the amount was one-third of a shekel, Neh 10 32), and its object was the upkeep of the temple worship (Schütter). The usual time of payment was March, but Jesus had probably been absent and the inquiry was made not for some months later. Peter, hasty as usual, probably reasoning from Christ’s ordinary respect for temple ordinances, answered at once that He did pay. “He had paid no more, however, than He had said that Jesus might have something to say on it, if formally challenged. Occasion therefore was taken by Jesus gently to reprove Peter. Peter had but recently acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God. Do kings of the earth take tribute of their sons? The half-shekel was suitable to the subject-relations, but not to the relation of a son. Nevertheless, last occasion of stumbling being given, Jesus could well waive this right, as, in His humbled condition, He had waived so many more. Peter was ordered to cast his hook into the sea, and Jesus foretold that the fish he would bring up would have in its mouth the necessary coin (Gr stater, about 64 cents or 2s. 6d.). The tax was paid, yet in such a way as to show that the payment of it was an act of condescension of the king’s Son. On the way to Capernaum a dispute had arisen among the disciples as to who should be greatest in the Messianic kingdom. It was John who said: “Behold, we saw a certain man casting out devils in thy name, and we forbad him, because he was not following us.” (Mk 9 40). It was not, however, John who obtained the pre-eminence, but James and John, who cast themselves on the Son of Man’s breast as a king, to demonstrate their spirit of ambitious rivalry, and to inculcate much-needed lessons on greatness and kindred matters.
(1) Greatness in humility.—First, by the example of a little child, Jesus teaches that humility is the root-disposition of His kingdom. It alone admits to the kingdom, and conducts to honor in it. He is greater than the number of His own; most (Mt 18:4), and is the servant of all (Mt 9:35). He warns against slighting the “little ones,” or causing them to stumble, and uses language of terrible severity against those guilty of this sin.

(2) Tolerance.—The mention of receiving little ones in Christ’s name led John to remark that he had seen one casting out demons in Christ’s name, and had forbidden him, because he was not of their company. “Forbid him not,” Jesus said, “for there is no man who shall do a mighty work in my name, and he shall have nothing of me. For he that is not against us is for us” (Mt 9:39.40).

(3) The erring brother.—The subject of offences leads to the question of sins committed by one Christian brother against another. Here Christ inculcates kindness and forbearance; only if private representations and the good offices of brethren fail, is the matter to be brought before the church; if the brother repents he is to be unstonen forgivens (“seventy times seven.”) Mt 18:21-16. If the church is compelled to interpose, its decisions are valid, under condition, however, of prayer and Christ’s presence, vs 18-20.

(4) Parable of the Unmerciful Servant.—To enforce the burden of forgiveness, Jesus asks the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23-35). Himself forgiven much, this servant refuses to forgive his fellow a much smaller debt. His lord visits him with severest punishment. Only as we forgive others can we look for forgiven s.

The Gospel of Jn leaves a blank of many months between chs 6 and 7, covered only by the statement, “After these things, Jesus walked in Galilee” (7:1). In this year of His ministry Jesus went neither to the Feast of Tabernacles the feast of the Passover nor to Pentecost.

—Dis—

The Feast of Tabernacles was now at hand (October). To this Jesus went up, and Jn preserves for us a full record of 21:1. His appearance, discourses and doings there.

The brethren of Jesus, still unpersuaded of His claims (ver 5), had urged Jesus to go up with them to the feast. “Go up,” in their sense, included a purifying and self- examination. Jesus replied that His time for this had not yet come. Afterward He went up quietly, and in the midst of the feast appeared in the temple as a teacher. Of the comments made about Jesus at the feast before His arrival vividly reflect the divided state of opinion regarding Him. “He is a good man,” thought some. “Not so,” said others. “But He leadeth the multitude astray.” Jesus was justly in the best of company. Whence came the saving of all, Nicaea (ver 57). A Divine being could put forth such a claim as that. The Jews objected that they had only His witness to Himself. Jesus replied that no other could bear adequate witness of Him, for He alone knew Whence He came and Whither He went. The Father also had borne witness of Him (ver 18). This discourse, delivered in the “treasury” of the temple (ver 20), was soon followed by another, no man yet daring to touch Him. This time Jesus warns the Jews of the fate their unbelief would entail upon them: “Ye shall die in your sins” (ver 24). Addressing Himself next specially to the Jews who believed in Him, He urged them to continuance in His word as the condition of true freedom. Refutation is crowned by the suggestion that the Jews, Abraham’s seed, were not free. Jesus made clear that the real bondage was that of sin; only the Son could make spiritually free (vs 34-36). Descent from Abraham meant nothing, if the spirit was of the devil (vs 39-41). A new conflict was provoked by the saying, “If a man keep my word, he shall never see death” (ver 51). Did Jesus make Himself greater than Abraham? The controversy that ensued resulted in the sublime utterance, “Before Abraham was born, I am” (ver 58). The Jews could have stoned Him, but Jesus eluded them, and departed.

The Feast of Tabernacles was past, but Jesus was still in Jera. Passing by on a Sabbath (ver 14), He saw a blind man, a beggar (ver 8), well known to have been blind from his birth. The narrative of the cure and examination of this blind man is
adduced by Paley as bearing in its inimitable circumstantiality every mark of personal knowledge on the part of the historian. The man was cured in strange but symbolic fashion by the anointing of his eyes with clay (ch 9). The Cure of the Blind Man (thereby apparently sealing them more firmly), then washing in the Pool of Siloam, became an object of immediate interest, and every effort was made by the Pharisees to shake his testimony as to the miracle that had been wrought. The man, however, held to his story, and his parents could only corroborate the fact that their son had been born blind, and now saw. The Pharisees themselves were divided, some reasoning that Jesus could not be of God because He had broken the Sabbath—the old charge; others, Nicodemus-like, standing on the fact that a man who was a sinner could not do such signs (vs 15.16). The healed man applied the logic of common-sense: ‘If this man were not from God, he could do nothing’ (ver 33). The Pharisees, impatient to deny the wonder, could only cast him out of the synagogue. Jesus found him, and brought him to full confession of faith in Himself (vs 33–38).

Yet another address of Jesus is on record arising out of this incident. In continuation of His reply to the question of the Pharisees (9, 40), c) The Good Shepherd (10:1–21) is gathered at night into an inclosure surrounded by a wall or palisade. This is the ‘fold’ which is under the care of a porter, who opens the door, and a ‘shepherd’ in the morning. As contrasted with the legitimate shepherds, the false shepherds ‘enter not by the door,’ but climb over some other way. The allusion is to priests, scribes, Pharisees and generally to all, in any age, who claim an authority within the church unsanctioned by God (Godet). Jesus now gathers up the truth in its relation to Himself as the Supreme Shepherd. From His fundamental relation to the church, He is not only the Shepherd, but the Door (vs 7–14). To those who enter by Him there is given security, liberty, provision (ver 9). In his capacity as Shepherd Christ is preeminently all that a faithful shepherd ought to be. The highest proof of His love is that, as the Good Shepherd, He laid down His life for His own (vs 14–17). This laying down of His life is not an accident, but is His free, voluntary act (vs 17.18). Again there was division among the Jews because of these remarkable sayings (vs 19–21).

Chronological note.—Though John does not mention the fact, there is little doubt that, after this visit to Jerus, Jesus returned to Galileel, and at no long interval from His return, took His final departure southward. The chronology of this closing period in Galilee is somewhat uncertain. Some would place the visit to the Feast of Tabernacles before the withdrawal to Caesarea Philiippipp, or even earlier (of Andrews, Life of Our Lord, etc); but the order adopted above appears preferable.

D. LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM—JESUS IN Perea

An interval of two months elapses between vs 21 and 22 in Jn 10—from the Feast of Tabernacles (October) till the Feast of the Dedication (December). This period witnessed the final withdrawal of Jesus from Galilee. Probably while yet in Galileel He sent forth the seventy disciples to proclaim His way in the cities to which He should come (Lk 10 1). Repulsed on the borders of Samaria (Lk 9 51–53), He passed over into Perea ("beyond Jordan"), where He exercised a considerable ministry. The addresses of His entry into Jerusalem belongs in great part to Luke, who seems to have had a rich special source relating to it (9 51–19 27).

The discourses in Lk embrace many passages and sections found in other connections in Mt, and it is difficult, often, to determine their proper chronological place, if, as doubtless sometimes happened, portions were not repeated.

I. From Leaving Galileel till the Feast of the Dedication.—Conscious that He went to suffer and die, Jesus suddenly set His face to go to Jerusalem. The route was first by Samaria—a place of opportunity to approach the sinner (Lk 9: 51–55). The emissaries of His messianic intention to return to Jerus (ver 53). James and John wished to imitate Elijah in calling down fire from heaven on the rejecters, but Jesus rebuked them for their thought (RV omits the reference to Elijah, and subsequent clauses, vs 55, 66).

In the present connection Luke inserts the incidents of the three aspirants formerly considered (9 57–62; cf p. 1645). It was suggested that the second and third cases of the Seventy (Lk 10:1–20) taken by Jesus in the sending out of 70 disciples, who should go before Him, two by two, to announce His coming in the cities and villages, and to visit the unconverted. The passage indicates how large a following Jesus had now acquired. (Some see a symbolical meaning in the number 70, but it is difficult to show what it is.) The directions given to the messengers are similar to those formerly given to the Twelve (9 1–5; cf Mt 10); a passage also found in Mt in a different connection (11 21–24) is incorporated in this discourse, or had originally its place in it (vs 13–15).

In this mission Jesus no longer made any secret of His Messianic character. The messengers were to proclaim that the kingdom of God was come near to them in connection with His impending visit (ver 9). The mission implies that a definite route was marked out by Jesus for Himself (of 13 22), but this would be subject to modification according to the reception of His emissaries (vs 10.11.16). The circuit need not have occupied a long time with so many engaged in it. The results show that it aroused strong interest. Later the disciples repeatedly asked Him of this victory over the demons (ver 17). Jesus bade them rejoice rather that their names were written in heaven (ver 20). Again a passage is inserted (vs 21.22) found earlier in Mt (11 25–27; cf also vs 23.24, with Mt 13 16–17).

Jesus had now passed "beyond the Jordan," i.e. into Perea, and vast crowds waited on His teaching (of Mt 19 1 f; Mk 10 1; Lk 12 1). 3. The Lawyer’s Question—Jesus Parable of Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25–37)

At one place a lawyer put what he meant to be a testing question, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus referred him to the great commandments of love to God and one’s neighbor, eliciting the further query, "And who is my neighbor?" In reply Jesus spoke to him the immortal parable of the Good Samaritan, and asked who proved neighbor to him who fell among the robbers. The lawyer could give but one answer, "He that showed mercy on him." "Go," said Jesus, "and do thou likewise."

The incident of Martha and Mary, which Luke inserts here (vs 38–42), comes in better later, when Jesus was nearer Bethany.

At this place Luke brings together a variety of discourses, warnings and exhortations, great parts of which have already been noticed in earlier contexts. It does not follow that Lk has not,
in many cases, preserved the original connection. This is probably the case with the Lord's Prayer (11 1-4), and with portions of what Mt includes in the Sermon on the Mt (e.g. 22:29-34; 5:21-26; 7:21-23).

1. Discourses, Parables, and Miracles = Mt 23 23-36; 12 2-12 = Mt 10 26-33; 12 42-48 = Mt 24 45-51; 13 18-21, parallels of Mt 28 1-7; and in other discourses (e.g. 11 42-52; 14 21-23).

Of matter original to Lk in these chs may be noted such passages as that on the Friend at Midnight (11 5-8), the incident of the man who wished Jesus to bid his brother divide his inheritance with him, to whom Jesus spoke the parable of the Rich Fool (12 13-21), the parable of the Barren Fig Tree, called forth by the disposition to regard certain Gallileans whom Jesus had slain in a tumult at the temple, and eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam had fallen, as sinners above others (13 1-9: “Nay,” said Jesus, “but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish”), and most of the teaching in ch 14, referred to by parables.

In ch 18, we have the mention of a Pharisee inviting Jesus to dine, and of his astonishment at the Lord's neglect of the customary ablutions before eating. Ver 53 gives a glimpse of the fury to which the scribes and Pharisees were aroused by the teachings and denunciations. They “began to press upon him vehemently . . . laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth.” In 13 31 ff it is told how the Pharisees sought to frighten Jesus from the district by telling him that Herod would fain kill Him. Jesus bade them tell that “fox” that His work would go on uninterrupted in the brief space that remained (“day” used etymologically) till He was “perfected” (ver 32). The woe on Jesus (vs 34-38) is given by Mt in the discourse in ch 23.

Of the miracles in this section, the casting out of the demon that was dumb (11 14 ff) is evidently the incident oldest. It is already noted in Mt 12 22 ff. Two other miracles are connected with the old accusation of Sabbath breaking. One was the healing in a synagogue on the Sabbath day, a woman bowed down for 18 years with “a spirit of infirmity” (13 10-17); the other was the cure on the Sabbath of a man afflicted with dropcy at a feast in the house of a ruler of the Pharisees to which Jesus had been invited (14 1-6). The motive of the Pharisee’s invita-

b) The Infirn Woman—of Sabbath breaking. One was the healing in a synagogue on the Sabbath day, a woman bowed down for 18 years with “a spirit of infirmity” (13 10-17); the other was the cure on the Sabbath of a man afflicted with dropcy at a feast in the house of a ruler of the Pharisees to which Jesus had been in-

5. Martha and Mary place for the introduction of the epi-

6. Feast of the Dedica-

II. From the Abode at Bethabara till the Raising of Lazarus.—After leaving Jesus Jesus went beyond Jordan again to the place where John at first bap-

1. Parables cast a deep spell over Jesus. He did not repel them, as the Pharisees did, but ate and drank with them. Publicans and sinners gathered to His teaching, and He associated with them. The murmuring was great: “This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.” The defence of Jesus was in parables, and the Pharisees’ reproach may be thanked for three of the most beautiful parables Jesus ever spoke—the Lost Sheep (cf Mt 18 12-14), the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son (ch 15). Why does the shepherd rejoice more over the one lost sheep brought back than over the ninety-nine that have not gone astray? Why does the woman rejoice more over the recovery of a coin than over all the coins safe in her keeping? Why does the father rejoice more over the prodigal son come back.
in rags and penitence from the far country than over the credit, but a stern brother that had never left the home? The unattractiveness of the ‘exhortory’ character of the rich man’s heart. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-nine just persons that need no repentance (ver. 7).

Two other parables, interpolated by discourses (in part again met with in other connections, of 16 13 with Mt 6 24; ver 16 with Mt 11 12; ver 18 with Mt 5 32; 19 9, etc), were spoken at this time—that of the Unjust Steward (10 1-9) and that of the Rich Man and Lazarus (vs 19-31).

2. Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16)

The dishonest steward, about to be dismissed, utilized his opportunities still dishonestly, to make friends of his master’s creditors; let the ‘children of light’ better his example by righteously using mammon to make friends for themselves, who shall receive them into everlasting habitations. The rich man, pampered in luxury, let the afflicted Lazarus starve at his gate. At death—in Hades—the positions are reversed: the rich man is in torment, stripped of all he had enjoyed; the poor man is at rest in Abraham’s bosom, compensated for all he suffered. It is character, not outward estate, that determines destiny. The unmerciful are damned (Lk 17).

Even a sinner from one world will not save men, if they hear not Moses and the prophets (ver 31).

In this connection Lk (17 1-10) places exhortations to the disciples on occasions of stumbling, forgiveness, the power of the One whom ‘We are unprofitable servants’, some of which are found elsewhere (cf Mt 18 6.7.15.21, etc).

While Jesus was in the trans-Jordanic Bethabara, or Bethany, or in its neighborhood, a message came to Him from the house of Martha and Mary in the Judean Bethany (on the Mount of Olives, about 2 miles E. from Jesus), that His friend Lazarus (‘he whom thou lovest’) was sick.

3. The Summons to Bethany—Raising of Lazarus

(Jn 11)

For He abode still two days where He was (Jn 11 6). As the sequel showed, this was only for the end of a yet more wonderful manifestation of His power and love, to the glory of God. Meanwhile He was busy with His disciples and other classes, and His fame was going ahead of Him. He performed miracles, and had the reception of His ministry as the Son of God; but His power and His glory were not yet manifested. When Jesus announced His intention of going into Judaea, the disciples sought hard to dissuade Him (ver 8); but Jesus was not moved by the fears they suggested. He reached Bethany (a distance of between 20 and 30 miles) on the fourth day after the burial of Lazarus (ver 17), and was met on the outskirts by Martha, and afterward by Mary, both plunged in deepest sorrow. Both breathed the same plaint: ‘Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died’ (vs 21.32).

To Martha Jesus gave the pledge, ‘Thy brother shall rise again,’ strengthening the faith she already had expressed in Him (ver 22) by announcing Himself as ‘the resurrection, and the life’ (vs 25.26); at Mary’s words He bade be taken to the tomb. Here, it is recorded, ‘Jesus wept’ (ver 35), the only other instance of His weeping in the Gospels being as He looked on lost Jesus (Lk 19 41). The proof of love was manifest, but some, as usual, suggested blame that this miracle-worker had not prevented His friend’s death (ver 37).

Arrived at the rock-tomb, Jesus, still groaning in Himself, caused the stone at its mouth to be removed, and, after prayer, spoke with a loud voice, ‘Lazarus, come forth!’ (ver 40). This, the judge, who had been dead came forth bound with his grave-clothes. He was released and restored to his sisters.

Even this mighty deed did not alter the mind of the Pharisees, who held a council, and decided, on the advice of Caiphas (ver 50), that for the safety of the nation it was necessary to get Jesus out of the way.

The circumstances of this beautiful narrative speaks irresistibly for its historical truth, and the objections raised by critical writers center really in their aversion to the miraculous as such.

III. From the Retirement to Ephraim till the Arrival at Bethany.—The hostility of the ruling classes was now so pronounced that, in the few weeks that remained till Jesus should go up to the Passover, He seemed to be driven to take refuge in private at a city called Ephraim (situation uncertain). That He was in secrecy during this period is implied in the statement (ver 57) that if anyone knew where He was, he was to inform the chief priests and Pharisees. The retirement would be for Jesus a period of preparation for the ordeal before Resumed, Him, as the wilderness had been for the commencement of His ministry.

On His leaving this retreat to resume His advance to Jerusalem the narratives again become rich in incident and teaching.

It is not easy to define the route which brought Jesus again to the border line between Samaria and Judaea, and where Jesus was parted from His disciples. As this region, He was met by ten lepers, who besought Him for a cure. Jesus bade them go, and showed themselves to the priests, and on the way they were healed, except one. He, a Samaritan, returned to give thanks and glorify God. Gratitude appeared in the unlikely quarter.

At some point in this journey the Pharisees sought to entrap Jesus on the question of divorce. Was it lawful to divorce a woman for every cause? (Mt 19 3). Jesus in reply admitted the permission to divorce given by Moses (Mk 10 3-8), but declared that this was for the hardness of their hearts, and went back to the original institution of marriage in which the two so joined were declared to be ‘one flesh.” Only one cause is admissible as a ground of separation and remarriage (Mt 19 9-10, 12; Mk 10 1-12). Mk has not even the exception, which is probably, however, implied. Comments follow to the disciples in Mt on the subject of continence (vs 10-12). See Divorce.

Another question asked by the Pharisees of Jesus was as to when the kingdom of God should come. The expectation excited by His own ministry and claims was that it was near; when should it appear? Rebounding their worldly ideas, Jesus warned them that the kingdom did not come “with observation”—was not “a Lo, there! Lo, here!”; it was “within” them, or “in their midst,” though they did not perceive it. In the last decisive coming of the Son of Man there would be no doubiety as to His presence (vs 24.25). He adds exhortations as to the suddenness of His coming, and the separations that would ensue (vs 20-37), which Mt gives as part of the great discourse on the Last Things in ch. 24.

In close connection with the foregoing, as furnishing the ground for the certainty that this day of the Son of Man would come, Jesus spoke the parable of the Unjust Judge. He exhorted His people to the claims of right, yet yielded to the widow’s importunity, and granted her justice against her adversary. How much more surely will the righteous, long-suffering...
God avenge His own elect, who cry unto Him day and night (vs 7.8)? Yet men, in that supreme hour, will almost have lost faith in His coming (ver 8).

A series of sayings and incidents at this time throw light upon the spirit of the kingdom.

5. The Spirit of the Kingdom

a) Parable of Pharisee and Publican (Lk 18:9-14)

A similar lesson is inculcated in the beautiful incident of the blessing of the babes. The disciples rebuked the mothers for bringing their children to be blessed; but this, according to St Luke, Jesus approved, "Even the little children are for the kingdom of heaven's sake." (Matthew 19:14)

b) Blessing of the Young Ruler (Mt 19:13-15; Mk 10:12-15; Lk 18:18-19)

This amiable, blameless young man ("Jesus looking upon him loved him," Mk 10 21) knelt, and addressing Jesus as "Good Teacher," asked what good deed he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus first declined the term "good," in the conventional sense of what he might do to inherit eternal life. He would have called him "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew 5:3)

Jesus told him to sell all he had and follow Him. The young man was unwilling to part with his possessions, and after expressing surprise at what was required, he went away sorrowing, for he was unwilling to give up the comforts of his life. This is not only the most touching incident in the Gospels, but a parable of supreme value.

6. Third Announcement to the disciples, so hard to be persuaded that the kingdom was not immediately to be set up in glory, of His approaching sufferings and death, followed by resurrection. The disciples had been "amazed and indignant" (Mt) after the statement of St James and John regarding the honor of the kingdom. (Matthew 16:21-23)

a) The Curse of Bartimaeus (Mt 20:19-28; Mk 10:45-52; Lk 18:38-43)

Bartimaeus, the blind beggar of Jericho, came to Jesus, crying, "Have mercy on me, Lord, Jesus of Nazareth." (Luke 18:38)

b) The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Mt 20:1-16; Mk 10:1-15; Lk 20:1-8)

The laborers were hired at different wages, yet all at the end received the same wage. The murmurings at the laborers generated by the grace at work in the vineyard, who had worked longest betrayed a jealously of spirit which may explain why they were not more highly rewarded. In strictness, the kingdom is a gift of grace, for the sum total of its blessings one and the same to all.

8. Jesus at Jericho

Held two notable incidents marked His progress.

a) The Call of Zacchaeus (Lk 19:1-10)

Jesus entered Jericho, and as He went along, Zacchaeus, the chief collector of the city, was a wealthy man. Seeing Jesus coming, he ran to meet Him, and climbed a sycamore tree to see Jesus as He passed. To his amazement, and that of the crowd, Jesus stopped

b) The Hospitable Feast (Lk 14:15-24)

As the guests of the feast were the "rich and honorable" of the city, he was asked to be his guest. He was not only welcome, but he was asked to be the guest of honor. Thus, it was that Jesus came to the city of Jericho, where He was asked to be the guest of honor and was so received.
on His way, and called Zacchaeus by name to hasten to come down, for that day He must abide at his house. Zacchaeus joyfully received Him, and, moved to a complete change in his views of duty, declared his purpose of giving half his goods to the poor, and of repaying the rest, which he might have taken by false accusation. It was a revolution in that wretched soul, wrought by love. "Today," Jesus testified, "is salvation come to this house. . . . For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost."

The expectations of the multitude that the kingdom of God should immediately come, made Jesus to speak the parable of the Pounds, forewarning them that the consummation of the days they looked for might be delayed than they thought, and impressing on them the need of loyalty, faithfulness and diligence, if that day when it came, was not to prove disastrous to them. The nobleman went into a "far country" to receive a kingdom, and his ten servants were to trade with as many pounds (each = 100 drachmas) in his absence. On his return the faithful servants were rewarded in proportion to their diligence; the faithless one lost what he had; the rebellious citizens were destroyed. Thus Jesus fore-shadowed the coming of Jesus as the servant of the Father, and His followers as His servants who were plotting against Him, and checked hopes that disregarded the moral conditions of honor in His kingdom.

Arrival at Bethany.—From Jericho Jesus moved on to Bethany, where He abode with Lazarus and his sisters. To His halt here before His public entrance into Jerusalem the next events belong.

B. THE PASSION WEEK—BETRAYAL, TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION

We reach now the closing week and last solemn events of the earthly life of Jesus. The importance attached to this part of their narratives is seen by the space the evangelists devote to it. Of the Gospels, Mt. and Mk. fully one-third is devoted to the events of the Passion Week and their sequel in the resurrection; Luke has several chapters; John gives half his Gospel to the same period. It is obvious that in the minds of the evangelists the crucifixion of Jesus is the pivot of their whole narrative—the dénouement to which everything tends from the first.

1. The Events Preceding the Last Supper.—The arrival in Bethany is placed after "He took leave of the Passover over" (Lk 21:31). Assuming that the public entry into Jerusalem took place on the Sunday, and that the 14th of Nisan fell on the following Thursday, this would lead to the conclusion that the arrival being placed on the Friday or Saturday preceding, according to the mode of reckoning, it is in the highest degree unlikely that Jesus would journey from Jericho on the Jewish Sabbath; hence He may be supposed to have arrived on the Friday evening. The supper at which the anointing by Mary took place would have been the Saturday (Sabbath) evening. Mt and Mk connect it with events two days before the Passover (Mt 26:2; Mk 14:11), parenthetically, in a way which leaves the other order open.

This beautiful deed occurred at a supper given in honor of Jesus at the house of one Simon, a leper (Mt and Mk)—probably cured by Jesus—at which Martha, Mary and Lazarus were guests. Martha aided Mary in anointing Jesus at serving (Jn 12:2). In the course of the meal, or at its close, Mary brought a costly box of ointment (valued by Judas at "300 shillings," about $650, or at of ARVm on Jn 6:7), and with the perfume anointed the head (Mt, Mk) and feet (Jn) of Jesus, wiping His feet with her hair (Mt and Mk, though not mentioning the "feet," speak of the "body" of Jesus). Indignation, instigated by Judas (Jn), was at once awakened at what was deemed wanton waste. How much better had the money been given to the poor! Jesus vindicated Mary in her loving act—a prophetic anointing for His burial—and declared that wherever His gospel went, it would be spoken of for a memorial of her. It is the hearts from which such acts come, that are the true friends of the poor. The chief priests were only the further exasperated at what was happening, and at the interest shown in Lazarus, and plotted to put Lazarus also to death (Jn 12:10).

2. The Anointing at Bethany.—Another account of the anointing at Bethany is given in Mk 14:6-9. This is a longer narrative, and is the more faithful, inasmuch as it includes the saying of Jesus on the evening of the last Passover, "He that receiveth you receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me." The expression, "even Joseph," may have been dropped in Mk. Mt contains no account of the anointing at Bethany.

3. The Entry into Jerusalem.—The Mount of Olives had to be crossed by the way from Bethany to Jerusalem. The disciples were to be sent to the adjacent villages—probably Bethphage (this seems to have been also a name of a district)—where an ass and its colt would be found tied. These they were to bring to Jesus, assuring them of the permission of the owners. Garments were to be borrowed over the colt, and Jesus seated Himself on it. In this humble fashion (Mt and Jn note, in fulfillment of prophecy, Zec 9:9), He proceeded to Jerusalem, bearing palm branches, who had already come out to meet Him (Jn). Throng accompanying Him, going before and after; these, spreading their garments, and strewing branches in the way, hailed Him with hosannas, "Son of David, King of Israel," who came in the name of the Lord. Very different were the feelings in the breasts of the Pharisees. "Behold," they said, "how ye prevail nothing: lo, the world is gone after him" (Jn 12:19). They doubt Jesus' divine mission, but that if they were silent, the very stones would cry out (Lk 19:40).

Jesus weeping over Jerusalem—return to Bethany.—One incident in this progress to Jerusalem is related only by Lk (19:41-44). As a bent in the road Jesus became suddenly visible, Jesus paused and wept over the city, so blind to its day of visitation, and so near to its awful doom. Not His own sufferings, but the thought of Jerusalem's guilt and woes, filled Him with anguish. On reaching Jericho, Mark's testimony is explicit that He did no more than enter the temple, and 'look round on all things' (11:11). Then eventide having come, He returned to Bethany with the Twelve.

The morning before the Passover Jesus found Jesus and His disciples again on their way to the city. Possibly the early hours had been spent by Jesus in solitary prayer, and, as they went, it is recorded that "he hungered." Tree—A fig tree from which, from its foliage, Second fruit might have been expected, stood invitingly by the wayside, but when Jesus approached it, it was found to have nothing but leaves—a striking symbol of the outerly religious, but spiritually barren Jewish community.

4. Cursing of the Fig Tree—Cleansing of Temple

21:12-22; Mk 11:11-22; Lk 19:45-48

Tree—A fig tree from which, from its foliage, Second fruit might have been expected, stood invitingly by the wayside, but when Jesus approached it, it was found to have nothing but leaves—a striking symbol of the outerly religious, but spiritually barren Jewish community.

And in this sense Jesus used it in pronouncing on it the word of doom, "No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever" (Mk). Next morning (Tuesday), as the disciples passed, the tree was found withered from the roots. Mt combines the events of the cursing and the withering, placing both on the second day, but Mk more accurately distinguishes them. Jesus used the surprise of the disciples as the occasion of a lesson in the omnipotence of faith, with added counsels of prayer.

Were there two cleancisings?—Pursuing His journey on the first morning, Jesus reached the temple, and there, as His first act, is stated by Mt and Mk to
have cleansed the temple of the traders. It is a difficult question whether this is a second cleansing, or the same act as that recorded by John at the beginning of his ministry (Jn 2:13-17) and here narrated out of its chronological order. The acts are at least quite similar in character and significance. In favor of a second cleansing is the anger of the priests and scribes (Mt 21:13), and the decision of the next day for His authority.

On other incidents are recorded of this visit to the temple, except the healing of certain blind and lame, and the praises of the children, "Hosanna to the son of David"—an echo of the previous day's proceedings (Mt 21:14-16). In the evening He went back to Bethany.

Far different is it with the third day of these visits of Jesus to the temple—the Tuesday of the Passion Week. This is crowded with parables, discourses, incidents, so numerous, that the mind in seeking to grasp how one short day could embrace them all. It was the last day of the appearance of Jesus in the temple (Mt 21:36), and marks His final break with the authorities of the nation, on whom His words of denunciation (Mt 23) fell with overwhelming force. The thread of the day's proceedings may thus be briefly traced.

On His first appearance in the temple on the Tuesday morning Jesus was met by a demand from the chief priests, scribes and elders (representatives of the Sanhedrin), for the authority by which He acted as He did. Jesus met them by a counter-Parable question, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" The 23–22:14; dilemma was obvious. If John was Mk 11:27 Divinely accredited, why did they not accept his testimony to Jesus? Yet —12:19; Lk 20:1-18 they feared to say his mission was of men, for John was universally esteemed a prophet. They could therefore only lamely reply: "We cannot tell:" (AV). Matters had now come to an issue, and Jesus, reverting to the method of the previous day, set forth plainly their sin and its results to themselves and others.

The Two Sons—the Wicked Husbandmen—the Marriage of the King's Son. The parables spoken on this occasion: that they were but a few, one might say "I go not," but afterward repented and went, the other who said, "I, go Sir," but went not—pointing the moral that the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of God before the self-righteous leaders who rejected the preaching of John (Mt 21:28–32); that of the Wicked Husbandmen, who slew the servants, and finally the son, sent to them, and were at length themselves destroyed, the vineyard being given to others—a prophecy of the transferring of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Mt, Mk, Lk); and that of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mt 22 2–14), akin to that of the Great Supper in Lk 14:16–24 in its gathering in of the outcasts to take the place of those who had been hidden, but distinguished from it by the feature of the wedding garment, the lack of which meant being thrust into the outer darkness. The Pharisees easily perceived that these parables were spoken of them (Mt 21:45; Mk 12:12; Lk 20:19), and were correspondingly enraged, yet dared not touch Jesus for fear of the people.

The attempt was next made on the part of the Pharisees, Herodians and Sadducees—now joined in a common cause—to ensnare Jesus by captious and compromising questions. These attempts He rebuked with a wisdom and dignity which foiled His adversaries, while He showed a ready appreciation of a candid spirit when it presented itself, and turned the point against His opponents by putting a question on the Davidic sonship of the Messiah. b) Ensnaring Questions—the Resurrection—The Great Commandment. First things, etc the Pharisees with the Herodians sought (Mt 22:1–46; Mk 12:14) to entrap Him by raising the question of the lawfulness of tribute to Caesar. 13–37; Lk 20:19–44 bearing Caesar's image and superscription, Jesus obtained from them a recognition of their acceptance of Caesar's authority, and bade them render Caesar's things to Caesar, and God's to God. The Son of man with the puzzle of the wife who had seven husbands, leading up to denial of the resurrection; but Jesus met them by showing that marriage relations have no place in the resurrection life, and by pointing to the implication of a future life in God's word to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. God "is not the God of the dead, but of the living," a fact which carried with it all the weight of resurrection, as needed for the completion of the personal life. The candid scribe who came last with His question as to which commandment was first of all, had a different reception. Jesus met Him kindly, satisfied him with His answer, and pronounced him "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mk 12:34).

(2) David's Son and Lord. Jesus had silenced, but Jesus now put to them His own question. If David in Ps 110 could say "Jeh saith unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand," etc, how was this reconcilable with the Christ being David's son? The question was to bring the implication of the oracle as spoken by David, or one of his house, of the Messiah, and was intended to suggest the higher nature of Christ as one with God in a Divine sovereignty. David's son was also David's Lord.

At this point, in audience of the multitudes and of His disciples in the temple, Jesus delivered that tremendous indictment of the scribes and Pharisees, with denunciations of woes upon them for their hypocrisy and iniquity, bearing on them the curses of the old covenant. He begins by saying, "Ye have taken away the plowshare out of the handful, let them also go down to the slaughter." (Mt 23:14) and adds of the scribes and Pharisees: "These hypocrites make broad their phylacteries, and increase the breadth of their prayer-essential, in the temple, and were at length themselves destroyed, the vineyard being given to others—a prophecy of the transferring of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Mt, Mk, Lk); and that of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mt 22:2–14), akin to that of the Great Supper in Lk 14:16–24 in its gathering in of the outcasts to take the place of those who had been hidden, but distinguished from it by the feature of the wedding garment, the lack of which meant being thrust into the outer darkness. The Pharisees easily perceived that these parables were spoken of them (Mt 21:45; Mk 12:12; Lk 20:19), and were correspondingly enraged, yet dared not touch Jesus for fear of the people. The attempt was next made on the part of the Pharisees, Herodians and Sadducees—now joined in a common cause—to ensnare Jesus by captious and compromising questions. These attempts He rebuked with a wisdom and dignity which foiled His adversaries, while He showed a ready appreciation of a candid spirit when it presented itself, and turned the point against His opponents by putting a question on the Davidic sonship of the Messiah.
course found earlier, cf Lk 11:39-52. All seems to have been gathered up afresh in this final accusation. It can be imagined that the anger of the Pharisees was fierce at such words, yet they did not venture on at to being it out.

Before finally leaving the temple, Jesus seems to have passed from the outer court into the women's court, and there to have sat down near the receptacles provided for the gifts of the worshippers. Many who were wealthy cast of their gold and silver into the treasury, but the eye of Jesus singled out one poor widow, creeping up, cast in two mites (Gr lepē̂s, the smallest of coins), which were but a farthing. It was little, but it was her all, and Jesus immortalized her poor offering by declaring that, out of her want, she had given more than the wealthiest there. Gifts were measured in His sight by the willingness that prompted them, and by the sacrifice they entailed.

It is perhaps to this crowded day, though some place it earlier in the week (on Sunday or Monday), that the incident should be referred of the death would be best to strengthen the words of Jesus, as related in Jn 12:20 ff. Who these Greeks were, or whence they came, is unknown, but they were evidently proselytes to the Jewish faith, and men of some note. The meeting was made through Philip of Bethsaida, and Philip and Andrew conveyed it to Jesus. It is not said whether their wish was granted, but we can hardly doubt that it was. Jesus evidently saw in the incident a prelude of that glory that should accrue to Himself through all men being drawn to Him (vs 23-32). But His saw as clearly that this "glorifying" could only be through His death (vs 24-25), and He universalized it into a law of His kingdom that, as a grain of wheat must fall into the earth and die if it is to be multiplied, so only through sacrifice can any life be made truly fruitful (vs 24-25). The thought of death, however, always brought trouble to the soul of Jesus (ver 27), and a voice from the Father was given to comfort Him. The multitude thought it thundered, and failed to apprehend the meaning of the voice, or His own words about being "lifted up" (vs 29-34).

Jesus had now bidden farewell to the temple. As He was going out, His disciples—or one of them (Mt 26:5)—called His attention to the magnificence of the buildings of the temple, eliciting from Him the startling reply that not one stone should be left (Mt 24; Mk upon another that should not be thrown 13; Lk 21: down. Later in the evening, when seated on the Mount of Olives on their return journey, in view of the temple, Andrew, James and John (Mk) asked Him privately when these things should be, and what would be the signs of their fulfillment. In Mt the question is thought more politely. "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming (parousia), and of the end of the world?" (or "consummation of the age"). It is in answer to these complex questions that Jesus spoke His great discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem and its final coming, some of the strands in which it is difficult now to disentangle. In the extended report in Mt 24 certain passages appear which are given elsewhere by Luke (cf Lk 17 20-37). It may tend to clearness if a distinction be made of the nearer event of the destruction of Jerusalem—also in its way a coming of the Son of Man—and the more remote event of the final parousia. The former, to which vs 15-28 more specially belong, seems referred to by the "these things" in ver 34, which, it is declared, shall be ful-

filled in that generation. Of the final parousia, on the other hand, it is declared in ver 36 that "of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only" (cf Mk 13:32). The difficulty of the phrase "immediately" of ver 29 is relieved by recalling the absence of perspective and grouping of future events in all apocalyptic prophecy—the consummation ever rising as the background of the immediate experience which is its prelude. The discourse then divides itself into a general part (vs 4-14), delineating the character of the entire period till the consummation (false Christs and prophets, wars, tribulations, apostasies, preaching of the gospel to all nations, etc); a special part relating to the impending destruction of the city, with appropriate warnings (vs 15-28); and a closing part (vs 29-51) relating mainly to the final parousia, but not without reference to preceding events in the extension of Christ's kingdom, and ingathering of His elect (vs 30-31). Warning is given of the suddenness of the coming of the Son of Man, and the need of being prepared for it (vs 37-51). The whole is a massive prophecy, resting on Christ's consciousness that His death would be the great event of the world's history, but the opening up of the way to His final glorification and triumph.

To this great discourse on the solemnities of the end, Jesus, still addressing His disciples, added three memorable parables (and g) Parables warning (Mt 26)—the first, that of the Ten Virgins, picturing, under the Virgins, a figure of virgins who went to meet the Bridegroom with insufficient provision and of last Judgment, showing how the last division will be made according as discipleship is evinced by loving deeds done to those in need on earth—such deeds being owned by Christ, the King as done to Himself. Love is thus declared to be the ultimate law in Christ's kingdom (cf 1 Cor 13); the loveless spirit is reproached. "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (ver 46).

Lk 21:37-38 might suggest that Jesus taught in the temple every day till the Thursday of the Passover; if, however, the denunciation took place, as nearly all agree, on Tuesday, an exception must be made of the Wednesday, which Jesus probably spent in retirement in Bethany in preparation of spirit for His last great conflict (others arrange differently, and put some of the preceding events in this day). The summary in Jn 12:26-33 connects that of the Pharisees with Isaiah's vision (6:10), and with the prophecy of the rejected Servant (53:1).

The plot for the destruction of Jesus was meanwhile maturing. Two days before the Passover (Tuesday evening), Jesus forewarned the disciples of His approaching be-

7. An Atmosphere of tral and crucifixion (Mt 26:2); and Plotting—probably at that very hour a secret meeting of the chief priests and elders of the people was being held in the court of the house of Caiphas (Mt 26), to consult as to the means of putting Him to death. Their resolve was that it should not be done on the feast day, lest there should be a tumult; the appearance of Judas, who since the anointing had seemingly mediated this step, speed-
ily changed their plans. For the pultry sum of 30 pieces of silver (abekels of the sanctuary, less than £20 or £4; the price of a slave, Ex 21 32; cf Zec 11 12), the recreant disciple, perhaps persuading himself that he was really forcing Jesus to an exercise of His Messianic power, agreed to betray His Lord. The presentment of infidelity to the traitor now only waited his opportunity to carry out his project.

II. From the Last Supper till the Cross. — A question of admitted difficulty arises in the comparison of the Synop- tic and Jn. details of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion. The Synoptics seem clearly to place the Last Supper on the 13th, and the crucifixion on the 14th, when the Passover had not yet been eaten (13 28; 19 14). Many, on this ground, affirm an irreconcilable discrepancy between Jn and the Synoptics, some (e.g. Meyer, Farrar, less decisively, Sanday) preferring Jn; others (Stegen, Baur, Schmiedel, et al. making the fact), discredit Jn. By those who accept both accounts, various speculations are proposed: ite. its opinion (early church writers; many moderns, as Goeck, Westcott, Farrar) is that Jesus, in view of His death, anticipated the Passover and, ate His paschal meal with His disciples on the evening of the 13th; others, in protest, “Lord, Lorraine, Andrew, D. Smith), adhering to the Synoptics, here shared, that the apparent discrepancy is accounted for by a somewhat loose usage of terms in Jn. Details of the discussion must be sought in the works on the subject. A preparatory view is best given by Westcott, *Intro to the Study of the Gospels*, 339 ff; and in Farnace, *Life of Christ*, Evron. X. A good statement of that for the Synoptics may be seen in Andrews, *Life of Our Lord*; cf Tholuck, *Comm. on Js*, on 13 1; Luthardt, *Comm. on Mt*, ch 18 28; D. Smith, *Days of His Flesh*, App. II. The language of the Synoptists (“the first day of unleavened bread, when that sacrifice was passed,” Mk 14 12) leaves no doubt that they intended to identify the Last Supper with the regular Jewish Passover. It is hardly conceivable that the reference could be mistaken on so vital a point of the apostolic tradition. This also explains the view of the church of Austria Minor, where John himself latterly resided. On the other hand, the phrase to “eat the passover” in Jn 13 28 may very well in John’s usage, refer to participation in the special sacrifices which formed a chief feature of the proceedings on the 15th. The allusion in Jn 13:1 I need mean no more than that, the Passover now impending, Jesus, loving His disciples to the end, gave them a special meal during the period that ended with the evening of the 14th of Nisan. The “preparation of the passover” in Jn 19 14.31 most naturally indicates another meal, another type of the Sabbath, the Passover week, alluded to also by the Synoptists (Mt 27 62; Mk 15 42; Lk 23 54). The objections based on the literary regulations about the Sabbath are, in fact, convincingly met by Tholuck (see also Andrews). We accept, then, our Lord ate the Passover with His disciples at the usual time—the evening of the 14th of Nisan (i.e. the beginning of the 15th).

In the scene in the upper chamber, at the observance of the Last Supper, we enter the holy of holies of this part of the Lord’s history. It was performed with great solemnity in token of the near departure of the Second Person of the Trinity. The setting apart of the Lord’s Supper, the act of consecration, the washing of the feet, symbolized the act of humiliation before the poor, the fascinating grace, the rôle of the Master that rises up. It is a direct parallel to the services of the high priest, the Nazarite, and the members of the Levitical order. The Lord Himself, who is about to be forsaken, assumes the rôle of a priest, an offering, for the redemption of His people.

2. The Last Supper (Mt; Mk 14:12–26; Lk 22:7–30; Jn 13:21–30) On the “first day of unleavened bread”—the Thursday, 14th of Nisan of the Hebrew calendar—the peculiar significance of the Passover meal. Jesus bade two of His disciples (Lk names Peter and John) make the necessary preparations for the observance of the Passover. This included the sacrifice of the lamb at the temple, the securing of a guest-chamber. Jesus bade the disciples follow a man whom they would meet bearing a pitcher, and at the house where he resided, then the house, doublets a disciple, at once gave them “a large upper room furnished and ready” (Mk); there they made ready.

Evening being come, Jesus and the Twelve assembled, and took their places for the meal. We gather from Jn 13 23 that John reclined next to Jesus (on the right), and the sequel shows that Judas and Peter were near on the other side. It was probably this arrangement that gave rise to the unseemly strife for prece- dence among the disciples narrated in Mk 14 9–10. The account of the Dis- ciples’ feet than once had occasion to do (cf Mk 9 33–37); then (for here may be inserted the beautiful incident in Jn 13 1 ff), Jesus, rising from the table, He gave them an amazing illustration of His own precept, “He that is chief [let him become] as he that doth serve. . . . I am in the midst of you as he that serveth” (Lk 22 26,27), in divesting Himself of His garments, girding Himself with a towel, and per- forming the act of a servant in washing His disciples’ feet. Peter’s exclamation must have expressed the feelings of all: “Lord, dost thou wash my feet?”

The act of the Divine Master was a wonderful lesson in humility, but Jesus used it also as a parable of something higher. “If I wash thee not [i.e. if thou art not cleansed by the receiving of my word and spirit, which this washing symbolizes], thou hast no part with me”; then on Peter’s further impulsive protest, “Not so, Lord; I will not wash the feet of him that is a sinner,” Jesus, seizing His napkin at the table, He bade them imitate the example He had just given them.

Is it I? — An ominous word had accompanied the reply to Peter, “Ye are not all clean” (Jn 13 10,11). As the supper proceeded, the question, “Is this made plain, Judas, who had already sold his Master, was at the table with the rest. He had permitted Jesus to wash his feet, and remained un- moved by that surpassing act of condescending love. Jesus was “troubled in spirit,” and now openly declared, “One of you shall betray me” (the Gr word means lit. “deliver up”): cf Lk 22 4, and RVm throughout). It was an astounding announcement to the disciples, and from one and another came the deep protest, “Who is it?” “Jn. Jesus answered that it was one of those dipping his hand with Him in the dish (Mk), and spoke of the woe that would overtake the betrayer (“Good were it for that man if he had not been born”). But, at a sign from Peter, asked, “Who is it?” (Jn. Jesus said, but to John only, to mark his treachery by the words, “Is it I, Rabbi?” and Jesus replied, though still not aloud, “Thou hast said” (Mk); then, as Satanic passion stirred the breast of Judas, He added, “What thou doest, do quickly” (Jn). Judas at once rose and went out — into the night (13 30). The disciples, not comprehending his abrupt departure, though on some occasion had been given him for the feast or for the work. Jesus was relieved by his departure and spoke of the glory coming to Himself and to His Father, and of love as the mark of true discipleship (13 31–35). The form of the observance of the Passover by the Jews are given elsewhere (see Passover). Luke alone of the NT writers speaks of 2 cups (22 17.20); in Jewish practice 4 cups were used. The “Western” text of the Lord’s Supper 13 omits the cup, from which some (of Sanday, BD) infer deliberately, but this is not necessary. Lk’s lat cup (ver 17) may be that with which the paschal supper opened; the 2d cup—that mentioned by all the writers—was probably the 3d Jewish cup, known as “the cup
of blessing" (cf 1 Cor 10:16). Some, however, as Meyer, make it the 4th cup. It is implied in Mt, Mk, Jn, that by this time Judas had gone. Left then, was His final, the essential, the paschal meal being complete, Jn proceeded, by taking and distributing bread and wine, associating them with His body and blood, soon to be offered in death upon the cross, to institute that sacred rite in which, through all ages since (though its simplicity has often been sadly obscured) His love and sacrifice have been commemorated by His church. There are variations of phrase in the different accounts, but in the essentials of the sacramental institution there is entire agreement. Taking bread, after thanks to the character of a real institution, and gave it to the disciples with the words, "This is my body": the cup, in like manner, after thanksgiving, He gave them with the words, "This is my blood of the covenant [in Lk and Paul, "the new covenant in my blood"] which is poured out for many" (Mt add, "unto remission of sins"). Lk and Paul add what is implied in the others: "This do in remembrance of me" (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24). Nothing could more plainly designate the bread and wine as holy symbols of His body and blood, offered as death for man's redemption, and sealing in His blood a new covenant with God; nor, so long as the rite is observed in its Divine simplicity, as Jesus instituted it, will it be possible to expunge from His death the character of a real institution. The touching words Jesus intimated that He would no more drink of the fruit of the vine till He drank it new with them in their Father's Kingdom (on the doctrinal aspects, see EUCHARIST; SACRAMENT; LORD'S SUPPER). The Supper was over, and parting was imminent, but Jesus did not leave the holy chamber till He had poured out His inmost heart in those tender, consolatory, profoundly spiritual Discourses, addresses which the beloved disciple has preserved for us in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chs of His Gospel, followed by the wonderful closing intercessory prayer of ch 17. He was leaving them, but their hearts needed not be troubled, for they would see Him again (14:18; 16:16 ff), and if, ere long, He would part with them again in visible form, it was only outwardly He would be separated from them, for He would send them the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who would lead His body and blood into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance that He had said to them (14:16.17; 15:26; 16:7–14). If He went away, it was to prepare a place for them, and He would come again to receive them to Himself in His Father's house (14:1–3); let them meanwhile show their love to Him by keeping His commandments (14:15.23.24). In the Spirit He Himself and the Father would dwell in the souls that loved Him (14:21–23). The intimacy of their union with Him would be like that of branches in the vine; only by abiding in Him could they bring forth fruit (15:1 ff). They would have tribulations (15:18 ff; 16:1.2), but as His dying bequest He left them His own peace (14:27); that would sustain their hearts in all trial (16:33). With many such promises did He comfort them in view of the terrible ordeal through which they were soon to pass; then, addressing His Father, He prayed for their holy keeping, and their final admission to His glory (17:9–24.5). These solemn discourses finished, Jesus and His disciples sang a hymn (the "Hallel") and departed to go to the Mount of Olives. Comparing the evangelists, one would infer that the conversation in which Jesus foretold the denial of Peter at least commenced before they left it (Lk 22:31; Jn 13:31). Jn connects it, probably through relation of subject, with the exposure of Judas, 13:36–38; but it seems to have continued on the way (Mt, Mk). Jesus had spoken of their being "offended" in His exaltation of spirit, Peter declared that though all should be offended in Him, He would never be offended. Jesus, who had already warned Peter that Satan sought to have him, that he might sift him as wheat (Lk 22:31); but, "I made supplication for thee," etc, now told him that before the cock should crow, he would thrice deny Him. Peter stoutly maintained that he would die rather than be guilty of so base an act, did he or the others (Mt 26:33; Mk 14:29) know themselves! The enigmatic words in Lk 22:36 about taking scrip and sword point metaphorically to the need, in the times that were coming upon them, of every lawful means of provision and self-defense; the succeeding words show that "sword" is not intended to be taken literally (ver 38).

Descending to the valley, Jesus and His disciples, crossing the brook Kidron ("of the cedars"), entered the "garden" (Jn, known as Gethsemane ("oil-press")) at the foot of Mount of Olives. Here took the Betrayal place the agony, which is the proper beginning of the Passion, the arrest of Jesus, and the arrest and trial of those who had betrayed Him. That night concerning Him should have fulfills (Lk 22:37: "your hour, and the power of darkness," ver 53), it was inevitable that mind and spirit should concentrate on the awful body in the Garden of Gethsemane, and mental suffering that way. The Garden Him. It was not the thought of physical suffering alone—from that also the pure and sensitive humanity of Jesus shrank with natural horror—but death to Him, the Holy One and Prince of Life, had an incomprehensible hateful swell over humanity, due to the judgment of God on sin, and now descending upon Him through the workings of the vileness of human passions in the religious heads of His nation. What anguish to such an One, filled with love, and desiring to comfort them, in the darkness and desert, to a malefactor's cross—alone, yet not alone, for the Father was with Him! Jn 16:32). The burden on His spirit when He reached Gethsemane was already, as the language shows, all but unendurable—"amaz'd," "sore troubled," "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death" (Mk). There, bidding the other disciples wait, He took with Him Peter, James, and John, and withdrew into the recesses of the garden. Leave there a little behind, He sank on the ground in solitary "agony" (Lk), and with strong crying and tears" (He 5:7), poured out His soul in earnest supplication to His Father. "Let this cup pass away from me"—it could not be, but the revulsion of His nature was expressed—"howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt." The passage in Lk 22:44), "His sweat became as it were great drops of blood," etc, though omitted in certain MSS, doubtless preserves a genuine tris. Returning to the three, He found them asleep with sleep: even the support of their wakeful sympathy was denied Him! "Watch and pray," He gently admonished them, "that ye enter not into temptation. A second and third time the same thing happened—wrestling with God on their knees, till, with Divine strengthening (Lk 22:41), victory was attained, and calm restored.
"Sleep on now," He said to His disciples (the crisis is past; your help can avail no more): "Arise, let us be going" (the future has to be faced; the betrayer is at hand. See the remarkable sermon of F. W. Robertson, II, sermon 22).

The crisis had indeed arrived. Through the darkness, even as Jesus spoke, He saw the light from lamps, revealing a b) Betrayal mingled company of armed men—by Judas—Rom soldiers, temple officers (Jn), Jesus others—sent by the chief priests, traitors, and elders, to apprehend Jesus. Their guide was Judas. It had been found impracticable to lay hands on Jesus in public, but Judas knew this retreat (Jn 18 2), and had arranged, by an act of dastardly treachery, to enable them to effect the capture in privacy. The sign was to be a kiss. With the expectation of friendship, only possible to one into whose heart the devil had truly entered (Lk 22 3; Jn 13 27), Judas advanced, and hailing Jesus as "Master," effusively kissed Him (Mt 26 45; Mk 14 45m). He had asked, "Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" (Lk); now He said, "Friend, do that for which thou art come" (Mt). The soldiers essayed to take Jesus, but on their first approach, driven back as by a supernatural power, fell to the ground (Jn). A proof thus given of the voluntariness of His surrender (of Mt 26 53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father," etc), Jesus, remarking only on the iniquity of secret violence when every day they had opportunity to take Him in the temple, submitted to be seized and bound. At this point, Peter, with characteristic impetuosity, remembering, perhaps, his pledge to die, if need be, with Jesus, drew a sword, and cut off the right ear of the high priest's servant (Jn gives the name). Having heard His deed justified by what Jesus had earlier said about "swordsmen" (Lk 22 38,38), he was speedily undeceived by Jesus' rebuke (Mt 26 52; Jn 18 11), and by His healing of the ear (Lk; the last miracle of Jesus before His death). How little this flicker of impulsive boldness meant is shown by the general panic that immediately followed. "All the disciples," it is related, "left him, and fled" (Mt, Mk). Mk tells of a young man who had come upon the scene in a linen cloth as he fled the house, now seen as an act of the disciples to save Jesus. He may be the "young man" of Jn 18 27, who fled without his naked body, and who fled, leaving the cloth behind (14 51.52). Not improbably the young man was Mark himself.

It would be about midnight when Jesus was arrested, and He was at once hurried to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, where in expectation of the capture, a company of chief priests, scribes and elders—members of the Sanhedrin—were already assembled. Here the first instance in the trial of Jesus took place.


The legal and constitutional questions connected with the trial of Jesus are considered in the art. on JESUS CHRIST, ABRAHAM; see also Dr. Taylor Jones, The Trial of Jesus Christ; on the powers of the Sanhedrin, see SANEDRIN, and of Caiaphas, JESUS CHRIST, PEOPLE, etc., II, pp. 163 ff. There seems little doubt that, while certain questions of a technical nature were involved, the trial was illegal in nearly every particular. The arrest itself was arbitrary, as not founded on any formal accusation (the Sanhedrin, however, seems to have arrogated to itself powers of this kind; cf Acts 4 1ff); but also of definite purpose, seeking not testimony, interrogation of accused, haste in condemnation, were unquestionably in flagrant violation of the established law, and had in both cases. It is to be remembered that the death of Jesus had already been foreseen by the heads of the Sanhedrin, so that the trial was wholly a means to a foregone conclusion. On the historical side, certain difficulties arise. Jn seems to record the first conviction of Jesus take place before Annas, father-in-law to Caiaphas (on Annas, see below; though deposed 15 years before, he retained, in reality, all the dignity and influence of the high-priesthood; cf Lk 3 2; Acts 4 6); after which He is sent to Caiaphas (Jn 18 13.14.19–24). The narratives in Lk vs 19–23 are regarded as a preliminary interrogatory by Annas till matters were prepared for the arraignment before Caiaphas; or (2) ver 24 is taken over by Matt as hear, in the sense of "had sent," as in AV), and the interrogation is included in the trial by Caiaphas (Jn 18 19–23). Annas and Caiaphas may be presumed from the account of Peter's denials to have occupied the same official residence; else Annas would not have been in readiness for the trial. The frequently occurring term "chief priests" denotes the high priests, with those who had formerly held this rank, and members of their families (cf Schürer, op. cit., 203 ff). They formed, with the scribes, the most important element in the Sanhedrin.

First Jesus was led before Annas, then by him, after a brief interview, was transferred, still bound, to Caiaphas. Annas had been deposed, as above noticed, much earlier Annas and Caiaphas— and through his sons and relations, as the Unjust long as he lived exercised much of the authority of high priest. Like all those holding this high office, he and Caiaphas were Sadducees. Annas—if he is the questioner in Jn 18 19–23—asked Jesus concerning His disciples and His teaching. Such examination was unlawful, the duty of the accuser, in Jewish law, being to produce witnesses; properly, therefore, Jesus referred him to His public teaching in the temple, and bade him ask those who heard Him there. An officer standing next Jesus with his hand for so speaking: Indignity which Jesus endured with meek remonstrance (vs 22.23).

1) An illegal session. Meanwhile a company of the Sanhedrin had assembled (23 sufficed for a quorum), and Jesus was brought before this tribunal, which was presided over by Annas. A hurried search had been made for witnesses (this, like the night session, was illegal), but even the suborned testimony thus obtained ("false witnesses") was found useless for the purpose of establishing, constructively or directly, a charge of blasphemy against Jesus. At length two witnesses were produced who gave a garbled version of the early saying of Jesus (Jn 2 19) about destroying the temple and rebuilding it in three days. To speak against the temple might be construed as a blasphemy against God (cf Mt 23 16.21; Acts 6 13.14), but here too the witnesses broke down through lack of agreement. In all cases, however, must Jesus be condemned: the unprecedented course therefore was taken of seeking a conviction from the accuser himself, who accused Himself. Rising from his seat, the high priest adjured Jesus by the living God to tell them whether He was the Christ, the Son of God (in Mk, "Son of the Blessed"). In using this title, Caiaphas had evidently in view, as in Jn 5 18; 10 33, a claim to equality with God. The supreme moment had come, and Jesus did not falter in His reply: "Thou hast said." Then, identifying Himself with the Son of Man in Daniel's vision (7 13.14), He solemnly added, "Henceforth from this resurrection on ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." It was enough. Without even the pretense of inquiry into the truth or falsehood of the claim, the high priest rent his garments, exclaiming, "The hath spoken blasphemy," and by assent of all Jesus was adjudged worthy of death. Abuse and insult followed. The members of the Sanhedrin were permitted to spit on the condemned One, smite Him, blindfold and mock Him, saying, "Prophecy into us, thou Christ: who is he that smiteth thee?" Then, with further blows, He was led away (Mt 26 68).

2) A morning confirmation. To give color of judicial sanction to these tumultuous and wholly irregular night proceedings, a more formal meeting of the Sanhedrin was convened as soon as day
had dawned (Mt 27:1; Mk 15:1; Lk 22:66-71). Probably the irregularities were held to be excused by the urgency of the occasion and the solemnities of the feast. Jesus was again brought forward; new questions were put which He declined to answer. Possibly a new appeal of His Messiahship was made (more probably Luke includes in this scene, the only one he records, some of the particulars of the earlier proceedings). The judgment of the past night was confirmed.

While this great moral tragedy of the trial and condemnation of Jesus was in process, a lesser, but still awful, tragedy in the history of a soul was being enacted in the court of the threefold denial of his Master by the apostle Peter. Peter, who had followed “afar off” (Lk), had gained access to the court through an unnamed disciple, whom it is easy to identify with John (Jn 18:15). As he stood warming himself at a fire which had been kindled, the maid who had admitted them (Jn), gazing attentively at Peter, said boldly, “Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean” (Mt 26:69). Unnerved, and affrighted by his surroundings, Peter took the readiest mode of escape in denial. “I know him not.”

His heart must have sunk within him as he framed the words, and the crowing of a cock at the moment (Mk—perhaps an hour after midnight), reminding him of his Master’s warning, deepened his discomfiture. Guiltily he withdrew to the porch, only a little after to be accosted by another (the maid had spoken to her neighbors, Mk), with the same charge. More afraid than ever, he declared again, “I know not this man,” and, seeing he was not believed, strengthened the denial with an oath. Yet a third time, an hour later, a bystander (or several, Mk), this time founding on his Galilean speech, pronounced, “Of a truth thou art one of them.” Peter, to clear himself, cursed and swore, snow-disclaiming knowledge of his Lord. To this depth had the boastful apostle fallen—as low, it might seem, as Judas! But there was a difference. As Peter spoke the cock again crowed—the cockcrow which gives its form to three of the narratives (Mk alone ignores the doubling). At the same instant, either from within, or as He was being led forth, Jesus turned and looked on His erring disciple. That look—so full of pity, sorrow, reproach—could never be forgotten! Its impression remained, “Petri heartf felt repentance its counterpart in the remorse of Judas, which, bitter as it also was, cannot receive the nobler name. First, c) Remorse Judas sought to return the 30 shekels and Suicide paid him as the price of blood (“I betrayed innocent blood”); then, when callously rebuffed by the priests and elders, he flung down the accursed money in the sanctuary, and went and hanged himself. Mt and Acts seem to follow slightly divergent traditions to his end and the purchase of the potter’s field. The underlying facts probably are that the priests applied the money, which they could not put into the treasury (Ml), to the purchase of the field, where, either before or after the purchase, Judas deceived himself (Jn 18:15). His actions (falling and bursting asunder), assigning it as a place to bury strangers in. His connection with Judas is attested by its name, “Akeldama,” “the field of blood.”

The Jews might condemn, but they had no power to pronounce sentence of death (Jn 18:31). This power had been taken from them by the Romans, and was now vested in the Rom governor. The procurator of Judaea was Pontius Pilate, a man hated by the Jews for his ruthless tyranny (see Pilate), yet, as the Gospels show him, not without a sense of right, but vacillating and weak-willed in face of mob clamor, and risk to his own interests. His residence in Jerusalem (“Praetorium,” ERV “palace”) was a matter of some controversy (Mt 27:2-11;—G. A. Smith, etc., on the tesselated pavement (Jn 19:13) in the semicircular front of which was placed the tribunal (bêmma) from which judgments were delivered. It was to this place the events took place when it was “early” (Jn 18:28), probably between 6 and 7 AM (of 19:14, Rom computation).

Jesus was taken within the Praetorium, but His accusers were too scrupulous about defilement at the Passover festival (Jn 18:28) to enter the building. Pilate therefore came out to hear their accusation. a) Attitude of the Accusers They would fain have had an endorse their condemnation without further inquiry, but this he would not do. They would not have it that it was a simple question of their law, yet had to justify their demand for a death sentence (ver 31). They alleged that Jesus was a revolutionary character of Christ’s teaching, His forbidding to pay tribute to Caesar (a false charge), His claim to be a king (Lk 23:2). to all which charges Jesus answered not a word (Mk 15:5). At a later stage, after Pilate, who knew very well that no mere sedition against the Rom power had called forth all this passion (witness the choice of Barabbas), had repeatedly declared that he found no crime in Jesus (Mk 15:14; Lk 23:4.14.22; Jn 18:38; 19:4). his pronouncement, it was .laid bare: “We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God” (Jn 19:7). When it was seen how this declaration made Pilate only the more unwilling to yield to their rage, return was made to the political motive, now in the form of personal threat: “If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar’s friend” (ver 12). This was Pilate’s weak point, and the Jews knew it. The clamoim grew louder, “Cru-cify him! crucify him!” Pilate, appalled by the idea of the degradation could no go farther than in the cry, “We have no king but Caesar” (ver 15).

Pilate was from the first impressed with the imno-cence of Jesus, and was sincerely anxious, as his action showed, to save the terrible and ignominious death His.Pilate by his act of grace. His was the noblest of the Roman emperors, he was the monarch of the Roman world; he was not, like earthly kings, supported by violence; he was founded on the truth, and gathered its subjects from those that received the truth (Jn 18:36.37). The indifference to the name of truth which the jaded mind of Pilate confessed (“What is truth?”) could not hide from him the nobility of the soul of the Holy One who stood before him. He declared publicly, “I find no fault in this man,” and thereafter sought means of saving Him, at least of shifting the responsibility of His condemnation from himself to others.

(1) Jesus sent to Herod.—Hearing in the clamor
round the judgment seat that Jesus was a Galilean, and remembering that Herod Antipas, who had judged him in Galilee, asked Pilate, when he had first expounded to send Jesus to Herod, to be examined by him (Lk 23:6–11). This act of courtesy had the effect of making Herod and Pilate, who had been at enmity, again friends (ver 12); otherwise it failed of its object. Herod was pleased enough to see one he had so often heard about—
even thought in his flippancy that a miracle might be done by him—but when Jesus, in presence of
“that fox” (Lk 13:32), refused to open his mouth in answer to the accusations levelled against him by Herod, his soldiers turned the matter into jest, by clothing Jesus in gorgeous apparel, and sending him back as a mock-king to Pilate.

(2) “Not this man, but Barabbas.”—Pilate's next thought was to release Jesus in pursuance of a Jewish custom of setting free a prisoner at the feast, and to this end, having again protested that no fault had been found in him, offered the people the choice between Jesus and a notorious robber and murderer called Barabbas. Jesus, then, was bound. Just then, as he sat on the judgment seat, a message from his wife regarding a dream she had ( "Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man," Mt 27:19) must strongly have influenced his superstitious mind. Pilate may have supposed that the attitude of his wife would prefer a murderer to one so good and pure; but, instigated by the priests, they perpetrated even this infamy, shouting for the release of Barabbas and the crucifixion of Jesus.

Pilate:—"Pilate's face now began to reveal itself. He proposed to "chastise" (scourge) Jesus—why "chastise," if he was innocent?—then release him. But this compromise, as was to be anticipated, only whetted the eagerness for blood, and the cries grew ever louder, "Crucify him, Crucify him!" Pilate, however, as if yielding to the storm, did deliver Jesus to be scourged (scourging—a fearful infliction—preceded crucifixion), the cruelty being aggravated by the maltreatment of the soldiers, who, outstripping former mockeries, put on his head a crown of thorns, arrayed him in a purple robe, and raised blows upon his bleeding face and form. It seems to have been a design of Pilate to awake pity, since again he brought Jesus forth, and then ejected him, new with attestation of his innocence, presented him to the people in the words, "Behold, the man!" (Jn 19:5). How hideous the mockery, at once to declare of such an one, "I find no ground to execute him to the cross... thus shamefully abused! No pity dwelt in these hearts, however, and the shouts became still angrier, "Crucify him."

(4) A last appeal—Pilate yields.—The words of the leadess, "He made himself the Son of God," spoken as a reason for putting Jesus to death (Jn 19:7), struck a new fear into the heart of Pilate. It led him again to enter the Praetorium, and inquire of this strange prisoner, unlike any he had ever seen, "Who is this man?" Jesus asked, "I know thee not," asked Pilate, "that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?" Jesus answered only that he, Pilate, had no power over him at all save what was given him of God; the greater therefore was the crime of those who had subjected him to this abuse of Divinely given power. Again Pilate went out and sought to release Jesus, but was met by the fierce cries that foreboded complaint to Caesar (Jn 19:12). A tumult seemed imminent, and Pilate succumbed. Here probably (though not necessarily) he had the washing of his hands by Pilate—a vain declaring of his responsibility—recorded in Mt 27:24, and the awful answer of the people, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (ver 25). Pilate now ascends the judgment seat, and, fully conscious of the iniquity of his procedure, proceeds to the cross. The trial over, Jesus is led again into the Praetorium, where the cruel mockery of the soldiers is resumed in intensified form. The Holy One, throned, crowned, clad in purple, a reed thrust into his hand, is placed at the mercy of the whole band of soldiers, who bow the knee in ridicule before Him ("Hail, King of the Jews"), spit upon him in contempt, smite him on the head with the reed (Mt, Mk). Then, stripped of the robe, his own garments are put on him, and the crown of thorns is fixed on his brow.

In all this hideous scene of cruelty, injustice, and undeserved suffering, the conspicuous feature in the bearing of Jesus is the absolute calmness, dignity and meekness with which he endures the highest wrongs and temptations. He undertakes no vengeance; but he has in view the vindication of his Father's name, the carrying out of his Father's will, and the revelation of his Father's love, patience, and compassion. He has no aim, as his words and actions show, other than to make known the Father’s love, patience, and compassion. He knows the Father’s will, and the revelation of his Father’s love, patience, and compassion. He has no aim, as his words and actions show, other than to make known the Father’s will, and the revealed nature of the Father, that all who hear may know the truth, believe in God, and have eternal life (Jn 14:6). The love of God so displayed in Jesus's death for man’s sins—so compassionate, just, and forgiving—means for us the forgiveness of sin, the assurance of eternal life, and the hope of heaven.

**III. The Crucifixion and Burial.**—Crucifixion was the form of punishment reserved for the Romans for slaves, foreigners, and the vilest criminals, and could not be inflicted on a Roman citizen. With its prolonged and excruciating torture, it was one of the most agonizing and ignominious death-penalties. The victim, while being strapped to the cross, was subjected to a variety of torture and mockery, including whipping, being spat on, etc. This cruel punishment was designed to inflict the heaviest physical exhaustion, mental strain, agony of scourging, suffering from wounds and blows, of that terrible night and morning, with unbroken fortitude and unembittered spirit. Not a word of complaint passes from him; He makes no reply to accusations; when reviled, He reviles not again; He takes all with submission, as part of the cup the Father has given Him to drink. It is a spectacle to move the stoniest heart. Well to remember that it is the world’s sin, in which all share, that mingled the bitter draught!

1. The Crucifixion

(Mt 27:31—56; Mk 15:21–41; Lk 23:26–49; Jn 19:16–37)

"In the end, it was a sight of Golgotha, the 'place of a skull' (in Lk ‘Calvary,’ the Latinized form), is quite uncertain. It may have been a slant mound resembling a skull (thus Meyer, Luthardt, Godet, etc), but this is not known. It is only plain that it was outside the wall, in the immediate vicinity of the city (see note below on sepulcher). The time of the crucifixion was about 9 AM (Mk 15:25). The day (Friday) was the Sabbath of the Passover week (Mt, Mk, Lk; cf Jn 19:14.31). It was part of the torment of the victim of this horrible sentence that he had to bear his own cross (according to some only the pathibulum, or transverse beam) to the place of execution. As Jesus, staggering, possibly fainting, under this burden, passed out of the gate, a stranger coming from the country, Simon, a man of Cyrene, was laid hold of, and compelled to carry the cross (such an one would not be permitted to do so), to Jerusalem and the temple. Simon, however, was not wholly unipitted. In the crowd following him were some women of Jesus, who bewailed and lamented him. The Lord, turning,
bade these weep, not for Him, but for themselves and for their children. "If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" (Lk 23:27–31).

When Jesus was crucified, the crucifixion at once took place under the care of a centurion and a quaternion of soldiers. With ruthless blows, hands and feet were nailed to the wood, then the cross was reared—two perpendicular part may, as some think, have first been placed in position. As to emphasise, from Pilate's point of view, the irony of the proceedings, two robbers were crucified with Jesus, on right and left, an undisguised fulfilment of prophecy (Isa 53:12). It was doubtless when being raised upon the cross that Jesus uttered the touching prayer—His 1st word on the cross (its genuineness need not be questioned, though some ancient MSS omit)—"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Lk). Above His head, according to custom, was placed a tablet with His accusation, written in three languages, Heb, Gr and Lat. The chief priests took offence at the form, "This is the King of the Jews," and wished it changed to "He said, Lord, King," etc., but Pilate curtly dismissed their complaint: "What I have written I have written" (Jn). Whether Jesus still wore the crown of thorns is doubtful. The garments of the Crucified were divided among the soldiers, but for His inner garment, woven without seam, they cast lots (cf Ps 22:18). A draught of wine mingled with an opiate (gall or myrrh), intended to dull the senses, was offered, but refused.

The triumph of Christ's enemies now seemed complete, and their gloe was correspondingly unrestrained. Their victim's helplessness was to them a disproof of His claims. Railing, and wagging their heads, they taunted Him, "If thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross!" "He saved others; himself he cannot save." At first the robbers who were crucified with Him (possibly only one) joined in this reproach, but ere long there was a change. The breast of one of the malefactors opened to the impression of the holiness and meekness of Jesus, and faith took the place of scorn. He rebuked his neighbor for reviling One who had "done nothing against me, address: "Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." The reply of Jesus—His 2d word on the cross—surpassed what even the penitent in these strange circumstances could have anticipated, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Lk). A not less touching incident followed—perhaps preceded—this rescue of a soul in its last extremity. Standing near the cross was a group of holy women, one of them the mother of Jesus Himself (Jn 19:25). Mary the mother of Jesus, Mary's sister, Mary the wife of Cleopas—identity the two latter—Mary Magdalene. Mary, whose anguish of spirit may be imagined, was supported by the disciple John. Beholding them—His 3d word from the cross—Jesus tenderly commended His mother to the care of John; to Mary, "Woman, behold, thy son"; to John, "Behold, thy mother." From that time Mary dwelt with John.

Three hours passed, and at noon mocking was hushed in presence of a startling natural change. The sky, and a deep darkness, lasting for 3 hours, settled over the land. The darkness was preternatural in its time and occasion, whatever natural agencies may have been concerned in it. The earthquake a little later (Mt) would be due to the same causes. It was as if Nature veiled itself, and shuddered at the enormity of the crime which was being perpetrated. But the outer gloom was only the symbol of a yet more awful darkness that, toward the close period, overspread the whole of this world. d) The Great Darkness—of Jesus Himself. Who shall fathom the cry of the depths of agony that lay in that awful cry—the 4th from the cross—that burst loudly from the lips of Jesus, "Eli, Eli, lamad sabachthani?" —"My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (or, "Why didst thou forsake me?")—words borrowed from Ps 22:1! It was before remarked that death was not a natural event to Jesus, but ever had in it to His mind its significance as a judgment of God on sin. Here it was not simply death that He experienced in his most cruel form, but death bereft of the sensible comforts of the Father's presence. What explanation of that mystery can be found which does not take into account with Isa 53 (cf Jn 1:29) His character as Sin-Bearer, even as the unbroken trivial with which in His loneliness He clings to God ("My God") may be felt to have in it the element of atonement? On this, however, the present is not the place to dwell.

The end was now very near. The victim of crucifixion sometimes, on his deathbed, spoke of his days; but the unexampled strain of body and mind which Jesus had undergone since the preceding day brought with it an earlier termination to His sufferings. Light was returned with it; peace; and in the consciousness that all things were now finished (Jn 19:28), Jesus spoke again—the 5th word—"I thirst" (Jn). A sponge filled with vinegar was raised on a reed to His lips, while some who had heard His earlier words ("Eli, Eli," etc), and thought He called for Elijah, said, "Let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him" (Mt). With a last effort, Jesus cried aloud—"It" and memorable word—"It is finished," then, in a final utterance—the 7th—"commended His spirit to God: "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Lk). Following on this word, bowing His head, He surrendered Himself to death. It will be seen that of the 7 words spoken from the cross, 3 are preserved by Lk alone (1st, 2d, 7th), 3 by Jn alone (3d, 5th, 6th), while the 4th cry ("Eli, Eli," etc) occurs only in the first 2 evangelists (Mt and Mk, however, speak of Jesus "crying with a loud voice" at the close).

Jesus had died; the malefactors still lived. It was now 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and it was desirable that the bodies should not remain upon the cross in the approaching Sabbath. Permission was therefore obtained from Pilate for the soldiers Earthquake to break the legs of the crucified (crulpfragium), and so hasten death. When it was discovered that Jesus was already dead, a soldier, possibly to make sure, pierced His side with a spear, and John, who was present, notices as a special fact that "there came out blood and water" (19:34). Whether this means, as Stroud and others have contended, that Jesus literally died of rupture of the heart, or what other physiological explanation may be given of the phenomenon, to which the apostle elsewhere attaches a symbolical significance (1 Jn 5:6), need not here be discussed (see Brown). This, however, was not the only startling and symbolically significant fact attending the death of Jesus. A great darkness had precluded the death; now, at the hour of His expiry, the veil of the temple (i.e. of the inner shrine) was rent from top to bottom—surely a sign that the way into the holiest of all was now opened for mankind.
(He 9:8.12)—and a great earthquake shook the city and rent the rocks. Mt connects with this the statement that the tombs thus opened “many, the graves of the saints . . . were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many” (27:52ff). There is nothing in itself improbable, though none of the other evangelists mention it, in such an early demonstration being given of what the Lord’s death and resurrection meant for believers. In other ways the power of the cross was revealed. A dying robber had been won to repentance; now the centurion who commanded the soldiers was brought to the avowal, “Truly this was the Son of God” (Mt, Mk; in Lk, “a righteous man”). The mood of the crowd, too, was changed since the morning; they “returned, smiting their breasts” (Lk 23:48). “Afar off,” speechless with wonder, stood the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, with other friends and disciples. The evangelists name Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome (Mk) and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward (Lk).

Jesus had conquered hearts on His cross; now His death reveals friends from the wealthier classes, hitherto kept back by fear (Jn 19:38), who charge themselves with His honorable burial. One was Joseph which of Arimathea, a just man, “looking for the kingdom of God, of whom the Holy Spirit foretold” (Jn 19:38). In fact it is recorded that, through a member of the Sanhedrin, he was not consented to their counsel and deed (Lk); the other was Nicodemus, he who came to Jesus by night (Jn 3:1-2; 19:39), mentioned again only in Jn (50-52), who, also as a member of the Sanhedrin, puts a word in for Jesus.

Joseph of Arimathea takes the lead. “Having dared,” as Mk says (16:43, Gr), he begged the body of Jesus from Pilate, and having obtained it, bought linen cloth wherein to wrap it, and reverently buried it in a new rock-tomb of his own (Mt, Mk), “where never man had yet lain” (Lk). Jn furnishes the further particulars that the tomb was in the vicinity, not far from where Jesus was crucified (11:31, 41-42). He tells also of the munificence of Nicodemus, who brought as much as 100 pounds (about 75 lbs. avoirdupois) of spices—“a mixture of myrrh and aloes” (ver 39), with which to embalm the body of Jesus. This thought of as an “arming” is rather, the spices formed a powder strewn between the folds of the linen bandages (cf Luthardt, Comm. on Jn 19:40). The body, thus prepared, was then placed in the tomb, and a great stone rolled to the entrance. The burial was of necessity a very hurried one, which the holy women who witnessed it—Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses are specially mentioned (Mt, Mk)—purposed to supplement by an anointing when the Sabbath was past (cf Lk 23:56).

Though Jesus was dead, the chief priests and Pharisees were far from easy in their minds about Him. Mysterious words of Had been quoted about His building of the temple in three days; possibly Judas had told something about His sayings regarding His death and rising again on the 3d day; in any case, His body was in the hands of His disciples, and they might reasonably suppose that He had risen. With this plea they went to Pilate, and asked from him a watch of soldiers to guard the tomb. To make assurance doubly sure, they sealed the tomb with the official seal. The result of their efforts was only, under Providence, to provide new evidence of the reality of the resurrection.

The uncertainty attaching to the site of Golgotha attaches also to the site of Joseph’s rock-tomb. Opinion is about equally divided in favor of, and against, the traditional site, where the Church of the Sepulchre now stands. A principal ground of uncertainty is whether that site originally lay within the second wall of the city of Jerusalem (cf. Stanley, Sinai and Pal. 457 ff.; G. A. Smith, Jesus, II, 576; a good conspectus of the different opinions, with the authorities, is given in Andrews, Part VII).

P. THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

The resurrection of Jesus, with its completion in the ascension, setting the seal of the Father’s acceptance on His finished work on earth, The Resurrection and marking the decisive change from His state of humiliation to that of Fundamental Fact sense the corner stone of Christianity (cf. 1 Cor 15:14, 17). It was on the preaching of Christ crucified and risen that the Christian church was founded (e.g. Acts 2:32-39; 1 Cor 15:3-4). Professor Harnack would distinguish between the “Easter faith” (that Jesus lives with God) and “the Easter message,” but the church never had any Easter faith apart from the Easter message. The conception of the resurrection is therefore a first task to which unbelief addresses itself. The modern spirit rules it out a priori as miraculous. The historical fact is denied, and innumerable theories (imposture, theories of swoon, of hallucination, mythical theories, spiritualistic theories, etc) are invented to explain the belief. None of these theories can stand calm examination (see the writer’s work, The Resurrection of Jesus). The objections are but small dust of the balance compared with the strength of the evidence for the fact. From the standpoint of faith, the resurrection of Jesus is the most credible of events.

If Jesus was indeed such an One as the gospel history declares Him to be, it was impossible that death could hold Him (Acts 2:24). The resurrection, in turn, confirms His claim to be the Son of God (Rom 1:4).

With the narratives of the resurrection are here included, as inseparably connected, those of the appearances of the Lord after His resurrection and ascension and Galilee. The accounts will show that while the body of Jesus was a true body, identical with that which suffered on the Cross (it could be touched, ver 25); it was also attested, it escaped the restrictions of a mortal being, its life was not the life of the animal (Lk 20:21; 1 Cor 15:3-8) bodily, on a new phase of existence, in which at some least of the ordinary limitations of body were transcended. Its condition in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension was an intermediate one—no longer simply natural, yet not fully entered into the state of glorification. “I am not yet ascended . . . I ascend” (Jn 20:17); in these two parts of the one saying the mystery of the resurrection body is comprised.

The main facts in the resurrection narratives stand out clearly. “According to all the Gospels,” the arch-skeptical Strauss concedes, “the Easter ‘story’ is a true story, and the resurrection morning at the tomb appears to be a historical fact.” The morning—The Open Tomb—was restored to life at daybreak on Sunday (New Life of Jesus, I, 397, ET).

Discrepancies are alleged in detail as to the time, names and number of the women, number of angels, etc.; but most of these vanish on careful examination. The Synoptics group their material, while Jn gives a more detailed account of particular events.
(1) The angel and the keepers.—No eye beheld the actual resurrection, which took place in the early morning, while it was still dark. Mk records that there was "no man in the place where the Lord lay," and sat upon it. Before his dazzling aspect the keepers became as dead men, and afterward fled. The chief priests bribed them to conceal the facts, and say the body had been stolen (Mt 28:4-11:15).

(2) Visit of the women.—The first intimation of the resurrection to the disciples was the discovery of the empty tomb by the women who had come at early dawn (Mt 28:1; Mk 16:2; Lk 24:1; Jn 20:1), with spices, prepared to anoint the body of Jesus (Mk 16:1; cf Lk 23:56). Apparently ignorant of the guard, the women were concerned on their way as to who should roll away the stone from the door of the tomb (Mk 16:3), and were much surprised to find the stone rolled away, and the tomb open. There is no need for supposing that the women mentioned all came together. It is much more probable that they came in different groups or companies—perhaps Mary Magdalene and another Mary, or Mary Salome, first (Mt, Mk; cf of the "we" of Jn 20:2); then Joanna and other members of the Galilean band (Lk).

(3) The angelic message.—As the women stood, peeping in, and talking about the tomb, they received a vision of angels (Mt and Mk speak only of one angel; Lk and Jn mention two; all allude to the dazzling brightness), who announced to them that Jesus had risen ("He is not here; for he is risen;—he is not in the place where the Lord lay"), and bade them tell His disciples that He went before them to Galilee, where they should see Him (Mt, Mk; Lk, who does not record the Galilean appearances, omits this part, and recalls the words spoken by Jesus in Galilee, concerning His death and resurrection; cf Mt 16:21). The women departed with "trembling and astonishment" (Mk), yet "with great joy" (Mt). Here the original Mk breaks off (ver 8), the remaining vs being an appendix. But it is granted that Mk must originally have contained an account of the report to the disciples, and of an appearance of Jesus in Galilee.

The narrative in Jn enlarges in important respects those of the Synoptics. From it we learn that Mary Magdalene (at any rate, but one at least is implied in the "we" of Mk 16:2), concluding from the empty tomb that the body of Jesus had been removed, at once ran to carry the news to Peter and John ("They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him"). These apostles lost no time in hastening to the spot. John, who arrived first, saw the linen cloths lying, while Peter, entering, beheld also the napkin for the head rolled up in a place by itself. After John likewise had entered ("He saw, and believed"), they returned to their home. Meanwhile Mary had come back disconsolate to the tomb, where, looking in, she, like the other women, had a vision of two angels. It was then that Jesus addressed her, "Why weepest thou?" At first she thought it was the gardener, but on Jesus tenderly naming her, "Mary," she recognized who it was, and the other exclamation, "Rabbi!" ("Teacher"), would have clasped Him, but He forbade: "Touch me not," etc (ver 17, Mk "Take not hold on me"), i.e. "Do not wait, but hasten to tell my disciples that I am risen, and ascend to my Father" (the assumption-life had already begun, altering earlier relations).

Report to the disciples—incresility.—The appearance of Jesus to the other women (Mt 28:9.10) is referred to below. It is probable that, on the way back, Mary Magdalene rejoined her sisters, and that the errand to the disciples—or such as could be found—was undertaken together. Their report was received with incredulity (Lk 24:11; cf Mk 16:11). The visit of Peter referred to in Lk 24:12 is doublets that recorded more precisely in Jn.

Ten appearances of Jesus altogether after His resurrection are recorded, or are referred to; of these five were on the day of resurrection. They are the following:

b) Other Easter-Day appearances

(1) The first is the appearance to Mary Magdalene above described.

(2) The second is an appearance to (Emmaus, the women as they returned from Jerusalem, tomb, recorded in Mt 28:9.10. Jesus met them, saying, "All hail," and as they took hold of His feet and worshipped Him, He renewed the commission they had received for the disciples. Some regard this as only a generalization of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, but it seems distinct from Mk.

(3) An appearance to Peter, attested by both Lk (24:34) and Paul (1 Cor 15:5). This must have been early in the day, probably soon after Peter's visit to the tomb. No particulars are given of this interview, but an and an angel came to the risen Lord to His repentant apostle. The news of it occasioned much excitement among the disciples (Lk 24:34).

(4) The fourth was an appearance to two disciples on their way from Jesus to Emmaus—a village about two hours distant (Mt 28:12-35; Mk 16:12.13). They were conversing on the sad events of the last few days, and on the strange tidings of the women's vision of angels, when Jesus overtook them, and entered into conversation with them. At first they did not recognize Him—a token, as in Mary's case, of change in His appearance—though their hearts burned within them as He opened to them the Scriptures about Christ's sufferings and glory. As the day was closing, Jesus abode with them to the evening meal; then, as He blessed and brake the bread, "Their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight" (Lk 24:30.31). They hastily rose, and returned to the company of disciples at Jerusalem. According to Mk 16:13, their testimony, like that of the women, was not at first believed.

(5) The fifth appearance was that to the "eleven," with others, in the evening—an appearance recorded by Luke (24:36.50), and John (20:19-23), and alluded to by Paul (1 Cor 15:5). The disciples from Emmaus had just come in, and found the company thronging with excitement at the news that the Lord had appeared to Simon (Lk). The doors were closed for fear of them, who supposed they had appeared in their midst with the salutation, "Peace be unto you" (Lk, Jn; doubt is unnecessarily cast on Lk 24:36.40, by their absence from some Western texts). The disciples were affrighted; they thought they had seen a spirit (Lk); "disbelieved for joy" (Lk 24:41). To remove their fears, Jesus showed them His hands and His feet (in Jn, His side), and ate before them (Lk). He then breathed on them, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit," and removed the commission formerly given to repent and retain sins (Jn; cf Mt 18:17.18). The breathing was anticipatory of the later affusion of the Spirit at Pentecost (cf Jn 7:39; Acts 2); the authority delegated depends for its validity on the possession of that Spirit, and its exercise according to the mind of Christ (cf e.g. 1 Cor 5:3). The incident strikingly illustrates at once the reality of
Christ’s risen body, and the changed conditions under which that body now existed.

Eight days after this first appearance—i.e. the next Sunday evening—a second appearance of Jesus to the apostles took place in the same chamber and in the same way as the first (cf. Jn 20:19). The peculiar feature of this second meeting was the removal of the doubt of Thomas, who, it is related, had not been present at the Eleven’s meeting, and who, according to the Gospel of Thomas, devoted (cf Jn 11:16), but of naturally questioning temperament (14:5), refused to believe on the mere report of others that the Lord had risen, and demanded indubitable sensible evidence for himself. Jesus, at the second appearance, after sauration, gave the doubting apostle the evidence he asked: “Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands;” etc. (Jn 20:27), though, as the event proved, the sign was not needed. The faith and love of the erstwhile doubter to earliest one of all the apostles is recorded for at least an admiring profession: “My Lord and my God.” It was well; but Jesus reminded him that the highest faith is not that which walks on the evidence of “sensuous” that have not seen, and yet have believed” (ver 29).

The scene now shifts for the time to Galilee. Jesus had decided to meet with His disciples in Galilee (Mt 26:32; Mk 16:7; cf Acts 1:9, 11). The apostles, however, to this Galilean meeting—that recorded in Mt 28:16–20, probably to identified with the appearance “to above five hundred brethren at once,” mentioned by Paul (1 Cor 15:6)—there is another appearance of Jesus to seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee, of which the story is preserved in Jn 21:1-23.

(1) At the Sea of Tiberias—the draught of fishes—Peter’s restoration.—The chapter which narrates this appearance after sauration is before the Twelve’s meeting (Sea of Tiberias) is a supplement to the Gospel, but is so evidently Johannine in character that it may safely be accepted as from the pen of the beloved disciple (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Gedt, Alford, etc.). The appearance is recorded in Jn’s account, and the word “appearances” (ver 14), i.e. the third to the apostles collectively, and in Jn’s record seven disciples are stated to have been present, of whom five are named—Peter, Thomas, Nathanael (probably to be identified with Bartholomew), James, John, and Zebedee. The disciples had spent the night in fishing without result. In the morning Jesus—yet unrecognized—appeared on the beach, and bade them cast down their net on the right side of the boat. The draught of fishes which they took revealed to John the presence of the Master. “It is the Lord,” he said to Peter, who at once flung himself into the lake to go to Jesus. On landing, the disciples found a fire of coals, with fish placed on it, and bread; and Jesus Himself, after more fish had been brought, distributed the food, and, it seems implied, Himself shared in the meal. Still a certain awe—another indication of a mysterious change in Christ’s appearance—restrained the disciples from asking openly, “Who art thou?” (ver 12). It was not long, however (“when they had broken their fast”), before Jesus sufficiently disclosed Himself in the touching episode of the restoration of Peter (the three-fold question, “Loest thou me?” answering to the death, not by Peter’s heartfelt, “Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee,” with the words of reinstatement, “Feed my lambs,” “Feed my sheep”).

In another way, Jesus foretold that Peter would have the opportunity of taking back his denial in the death by which he should glorify God (vs 18-19; tradition says he was crucified head-downward). Curious inquiries were set aside, and attention recalled to duty, “Follow thou me” (ver 22).

(2) On the mountain—the Great Commission—baptism.—Though only the eleven apostles are named in Matthew’s account (Mt 10:1-40), there was an “appointment” for a definite time and place (“the mountain”), and in the terms which the message was given to the “disciples,” suggests a collective gathering such as is implied in Paul’s above mentioned “five hundred brethren” occasion. The company being assembled, Jesus appeared; still, at first, with that element of mystery in His appearance, which led some to doubt (ver 17). Such doubt would speedily vanish when the Lord, announcing Himself as clothed with all authority in heaven and earth, gave to the apostles the supreme commission to “make disciples of all the nations” (vs 18-20; cf Mk 16:15, “Go ye into all the world,” etc). Discipleship was to be shown by baptism “into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (one name, not threefold), and was to be followed by instruction in Christ’s commands. Behind the commission, world-wide in its scope, and binding on every age, stands the word of never-failing encouragement, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” Doubts of the genuineness of these august utterances go as a rule with doubt of the resurrection itself.

It will be noticed that the Lord’s Supper and Baptism are the only sacraments instituted by Jesus in His Church.

Paul records, as subsequent to the above, an appearance of Jesus to James, known as “the Lord’s brother” (1 Cor 15:7; cf Gal 1:19). No particulars are given of an appearance of Jesus to James, which may have occurred either in Galilee or Jerusalem. James, so far as known, was not a believer in Jesus before the crucifixion (cf Jn 7:3); after the ascension he and the Galilean Jesus (Acts 1:14), and he became afterward a chief “pillar” of the church at Jerusalem (Gal 1:19; 2:9). This appearance may have marked the turning-point.

The final appearance of Jesus to the apostles (1 Cor 15:7) is that which Luke in the closing verses of his Gospel (44-53), and in Acts 1:3–12, brings into direct relation with the ascension. In the Gospel the evidence recorded with the company of the disciples (Acts 1:14), and he became afterward a chief “pillar” of the church at Jerusalem (Gal 1:19; 2:9). This appearance may have marked the turning-point.

The last meeting of Jesus with His apostles was mainly occupied with the Lord’s exposition of the prophetic Scriptures (Lk 24:44–46), with renewed commands to preach repentance and remission of sins in His name (beginning from Jerusalem” (ver 47-48; cf Acts 1:8), and with the injunction to tarry in Jerusalem till the Spirit should be given (ver 49; cf Acts 1:5). Then He led them forth to Olivet, “over against Bethany,” and, while blessing them, “was carried up into heaven” (vs 50-51; cf Acts 1:10).

Jesus had declared, “I ascend unto my Father” (Jn 20:17), and Luke in Acts 1 narrates the circumstances of that departure. Jesus might simply have vanished: from the three-fold question, “Loest thou me?” answering to the death, not by Peter’s heartfelt, “Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee,” with the words of reinstatement, “Feed my lambs,” “Feed my sheep.” In another way, Jesus foretold that Peter would have the opportunity of taking back his denial in the death by which he should glorify God (vs 18-19; tradition

2. The Ascension (Lk 24:50–51; Acts 1:6–14; cf Mk 16:19)
Then the scene insensibly changes to Olivet, where the ascension is located (Acts 1 12). The disciples inquire regarding the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (even yet their minds are held back in these temporal conceptions), but Jesus tells them that it is not for them to know the times and seasons, which the Father had set within His own authority (ver 7). Far more important was it for them to know that within the next days they should receive power from the Holy Spirit to be witnesses for Him to the uttermost part of the earth (ver 8). Even as He spake, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight (ver 9). Then, as the apostles stood gazing upward, two heavenly messengers appeared, who comforted them with the assurance that in like manner as they had seen Jesus ascend into heaven, so also would He come again. For that return the church still prays and waits (cf Rev 22 20). See, further, ASCENSION.

Retracing their steps to Jerusalem, the apostles joined the larger company of disciples in the "upper room" where their meetings seem to have been habitually held, and there, with one accord, to the number of about 120 (Acts 1 15), they all continued steadfastly in prayer till "the promise of the Father" (Luke 24 48; Acts 1 4) was, at Pentecost, bestowed upon them.

PART IV. EPILOGUE: THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING

The earthly life of Jesus is finished. With His resurrection and ascension a new age begins. Yet the work of Christ continues. As Luke 1. After the expressively phrases it in Acts 1 1 2. Ascension the Gospels are but the records of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach," until the day in which He was received up." It is beyond the scope of this art. to trace the succeeding developments of Christ's activity through His church and by His Spirit; in order, however, to bring the subject to a proper close, it is necessary to glance, even if briefly, at the light thrown back by the Spirit's teachings, after the ascension, on the significance of the earthly life itself, and at the enlargement of the apostles' conceptions about Christ, consequent on this, as seen in the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

It was the promise of Jesus that, after His departure, the Spirit would be given to His disciples, to teach them all things, and bring to their remembrance all that He had spoken or done. (John 16 15). It was not the Spirit a new revelation they were to receive, but illumination and guidance of their minds into the meaning of what they had received already (John 16 13 15). This promise of the Spirit was fulfilled at Pentecost (Acts 2) Only a few personal manifestations of Jesus (Acts 7 55 56; 22 17 18; 23 11) are recorded after that event—the two chief being the appearance to Paul on the way to Damascus (1 Cor 15 8; cf Acts 9 3 8, etc) and the appearance in vision to John at Patmos (Rev 1 10). The rest was internal revelation (cf Gal 1 12 16; Eph 1 17; 3 3 5). The immense advance in enlargement and clearness of view aided, no doubt, by Christ's parting instructions (Lk 24 44 48; Acts 1 2) is already apparent in Peter's discourses at Pentecost; but it is not to be supposed that much room was not left for after-growth in knowledge, and deepened insight into the connection of truths. Peter, e.g., had to be instructed as to the admission of the Gentiles (Acts 10 11), the apostles mentioned much of the relations of the law (cf Acts 15; 21 20 ff; Gal 2, etc); Paul received revelations vastly widening the doctrinal horizon; both John and Paul show progressive apprehension in the truth about Christ.

It is therefore a question of much interest how the apostolic conceptions thus gained stand related to the picture of Jesus we have been forming in the Gospels. It is the conceptions of the Gospels (the "historical" discourses and sayings) which, through the next day that the two pictures do not correspond. The transcendental Christ of Paul and John has little in common, it is affirmed, with the Man of Nazareth of the Synoptic Gospels. Theories of the "origins of Christianity" (the "apostolic movement" cf Plücker, Weisszäcker, Bousset, Wernle, etc) such speculations ignore the first conditions of the problem in not accepting the self-testimony of Jesus as to who He was, and the ends of His mission into the world. When Jesus is taken at His own valuation, and the great fact of His resurrection is admitted, the alleged contradictions between the "Jesus of history" and the "Christ of faith" largely disappear.

It is forgotten how great a change in the center of gravity in the conception of Christ's person and work was necessarily involved in the facts of Christ's death, resurrection and Lordship. The life is not finished yet. Its influence breathes in every page, e.g. of Paul's epistles. But the weakness, the limitations, the self-suppression—what Paul in Phil 2 7 calls the "emptying"—of that earthly life have now been left behind. The rejected and crucified One, who has now been vindicated, exalted, has entered into His glory. This is the burden of Peter's first address at Pentecost: "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts 2 36). Could anything look quite the same after that? The change is seen in the growing substitution of the name "Christ" for "Jesus" (see at beginning of art.), and in the habitual speaking of Jesus as "Lord".

With belief in the lordship of Jesus went necessarily an enlarged conception of the significance of His person. The elements were all there in what the disciples had seen and known of Jesus while on earth. There is not such a thing as historical Godhead. In this is already contained in substance everything taught about Jesus in the epistles: His preexistence (the Lord's own words had suggested this, Jn 8 58; 17 5, etc); His share in Divine attributes (eternity, etc), in Divine works (creation, etc, 1 Cor 8 6; Col 1 16 17; He 1 2; Rev 1 5; 3 14, etc), in Divine worship (Phil 2 9 11; Rev 5 11 12, etc), in Divine names and titles (He 1 8, etc). It is an extension of the same conception when Jesus is represented as the end of creation—the "Head" in whom all things are finally to be summed up (Eph 1 10; cf He 2 6 9). These high views of the person of Christ in the Epistles are everywhere assumed to be the possession of the readers. Jesus had furnished His disciples with the means of understanding His death as a necessity of His Messianic vocation, endured for the salvation of the world; but it was the resurrection and exaltation which shed light on the utmost meaning of this also. Jesus died, but He was for sins. He was a propitiation for the sin of the world (Rom 3 20;
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This subject is of special interest, not only on account of its inherent importance, but more particularly on account of its immediately preceding, and leading directly up to what is the greatest tragedy in human history, the crucifixion of Our Lord. It has also the added interest of being the only proceeding on record in which the two great legal systems of antiquity, the Jewish and the Roman, which have most largely influenced modern legislation and jurisprudence, each played a most important part.

The coexistence of these two systems in Judaea, and their joint action in bringing about the tremendous results in question, were made possible by the Jewish and Roman client law, institutions and usages, in so far as they were compatible with Roman sovereignty and supremacy. Not only not, but, in a large degree, they permitted these laws to be administered by the officials of the subject peoples. This overshadowed all—indeed, the latter was the law which but was permitted only so long as it was not abused. It might be withdrawn at any time, and the instances in which this was done were by no means rare.

Of the matters considered in this article, the arrest of Jesus and the proceedings before Annas, Caiphas and the Sanhedrin took place professedly under Jewish law; the proceedings before Pilate and the reference to Herod, under Rom law.

It is very difficult to construct from the materials in the four Gospels a satisfactory continuous record of the arrest, and of what may be called the twofold trial of Jesus. The Gospels were written from different subject viewpoints, and for different purposes, each of the writers selecting such particulars as seemed to him to be of special importance for the particular object he had in view. Their reports are all very brief, and the proper chronological order of the various events recorded in different Gospels is in many cases, largely a matter of conjecture. The difficulty is increased by the great irregularities and the tumultuous character of the proceedings; by our imperfect knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem at this time (29 AD); also by the fact that the reports are given mainly in popular, and not in technical language; and when the latter form is used, the technical terms have had to be transcribed into Greek, either from the Heb or from the Lat.
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For instance, opinions are divided as to where Pilate resided when in Jerusalem, whether in the magnificent palace occupied by Herod Antipas during the Passover, or in the castle of Antonia; as to where was the palace occupied by Herod the Great, or in the castle of Caiaphas; and whether Anas or Caiaphas occupied the palace during the Passover week. The examination of Jesus, recorded by John, was before Anas or Caiaphas, and no one knows the particular matter. It is very satisfactory, however, to know that, although it is sometimes difficult to see the best way of harmonizing the different accounts, yet there is nothing irreconcilable or contradictory in them, and that there is no material point in matters of this kind. The argument is the same throughout the whole of this article, which is seriously affected by any of these debatable matters.

For a clear historical statement of the events of the concluding day in the life of Our Lord before His crucifixion, see the article on Jesus' Death. The present article will endeavor to consider the matters relating to His arrest and trial from a legal and constitutional point of view.

1. The Arrest. — During the last year of the ministry of Jesus, the hostility of the Jews to Him had greatly increased, and some six months before they finally succeeded in accomplishing their purpose, they had definitely resolved to make away with Him. At the Feast of Tabernacles they sent officers (the temple-guards) to take Him while He was teaching in the temple (Jn 7:32); but these, after listening to His words, returned without having made the attempt, giving as a reason that "never was man so spoken" (ver 46).

After His raising of Lazarus, their determination to kill Him was greatly intensified. A special meeting of the council was held to consider the matter. There Caiaphas, the high priest, strongly advocated such a step on national grounds, and on the ground of expediency, quoting in support of his advice, in a cold-blooded and cynical manner, the Jewish adage that it was expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. Their plans to this end were frustrated, for the time being, by Jesus withdrawing Himself to the border of the wilderness, where He remained with His disciples (Jn 11:47-54).

On His return to Bethany and Jerusalem, six days before the Passover, they were deterred from carrying out their design on account of His manifest popularity, as evidenced by His triumphal entry into Jerusalem on the first day of the Passover week (Palm Sunday), and by the crowds who thronged around Him, and listened to His teachings in the temple, and who enjoyed the divisions which Pharsees, Sadducees and Herodians, as successively sought to entangle Him in His talk.

Two days before the Passover, at a council meeting held in the palace of Caiaphas, they planned to accomplish their purpose by subtlety, but "not during the feast, lest a tumult arise among the people" (Mt 26:3-5; Mk 14:1-10). While they were in this state of perplexity, to their great relief Judas came to them and agreed to betray His Master for money (Mt 26:14-16; Mk 14:10,11).

This time they determined not to rely solely upon their own temple-guards or officers to execute their warrant or order of arrest, fearing that these officials, being Jews, might again be fascinated by the strange influence which Jesus exercised over His countrymen, or that His followers might offer resistance. They therefore applied to Pilate, the Roman procurator (governor), for the assistance of a band of Roman soldiers. He granted them a cohort (Gr. sqvph, 400 to 600 men) from the legion then quartered in the castle of Antonia, which adjoined and overlooked the temple-area. The final arrangements as to these would probably be completed while Judas was at the supper room. It has been suggested that the whole cohort would not go, but only a selection from them. However, it is said that Judas "received the band [cohort] of soldiers" (Jn 18:3), and that they were under the command of a chief captain (Gr. chiliarh, Lat. tribune, ver 12). If there had not been more than one, they would not have been under the command of a captain, but the chief officer would have been a centurion. The amazing popularity of Jesus, as shown by His triumphal entry into the city, may have led the authorities to make such ample provision against any possible attempt at rescue.

The Garden of Gethsemane, in which Judas knew that Jesus would be found that night, was well known to him (Jn 18:2); and he also knew the time he would be likely to find his Master there. Thither at the proper hour he led the band of soldiers, the temple officers and others, and also some of the chief priests and elders themselves; the whole being described as "a great multitude with swords and staves" (Mt 26:47). Although the Easter full moon would bring them, they also carried "lanterns and torches" (Jn 18:3), in order to make certain that Jesus should not escape or fail to be recognized in the deep shade of the olive trees in the garden.

On their arrival at the garden, Jesus came forward to meet them, and the traitor Judas gave them the appointed signal by kissing Him. As the order or warrant was a Jewish one, the temple officers would probably be in front, the soldiers supporting them as reserves. On Jesus announcing to the leaders that He was the one they sought, what the chief priests had feared actually occurred. There was something in the words or bearing of Jesus which awed them, and they were panic-stricken, went backward, and fell to the ground. On their rallying, the impetuous Peter drew his sword, and cut off the ear of one of them, Malchus, the servant of the high priest (Jn 18:10).

On this evidence of resistance the Roman captain and soldiers came forward, and with the assistance of the Jewish officers bound Jesus. Under the Jewish law this was not lawful before condemnation, but they were permitted to do so in exceptional cases where resistance was either offered or apprehended.

Even in this trying hour the concern of Jesus was more for others than for Himself, as witness His miracle in healing the ear of Malchus, and His request that His disciples should not resist liberty (Jn 18:8). Notwithstanding His efforts, His followers were panic-stricken, probably on account of the vigorous action of the officers and soldiers after the assault by Peter, "and they all left him and fled" (Mk 14:50).

It is worthy of note that Jesus had no word of blame or censure for the Roman officers or soldiers who were only doing their sworn duty in supporting the civil authorities; but His pungent words of rebuke were for their approach for not having attempted His arrest while He was teaching openly in the temple were reserved for "the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders" (Lk 22:52), who had shown their inordinate zeal and hostility by taking the unusual, and for those who were to sit as judges on the case, the improper and illegal course of accompanying the officers, and themselves taking part in the arrest.

The whole body departed with their prisoner for the city. From the first three Gospels we might infer that they went directly to the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest.

3. Taken to the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest.
Why they did so we are not informed, the only statement made being that he was delivered to Caiaphas (ver 13). He had been the high priest from 7 AD to 15 AD, when he was deposed by Valerius Gratus, the Roman procurator. He was still the most influential member of the Sanhedrin, and, being of an aggressive disposition, made no objections as to the trial. It was he who had given the instructions as to the arrest, and that they thought it their duty to report first to him.

Annas, however, sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas (ver 24). Having delivered over their prisoner, the Roman soldiers would proceed to their quarters in the castle, the temple officials retaining Jesus in their charge.

Meanwhile, the members of the Sanhedrin were assembling at the palace of the high priest, and the preliminary steps toward the first or Jewish trial were being taken.

II. The Jewish Trial. — It is the just boast of those countries whose jurisprudence has had its origin in the common law of England, that their Jewish Law system of criminal law is founded upon the Jewish Law the humane maxims that everyone is presumed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty, and that no one is bound to criminate himself. But the Jewish law went even farther in the safeguards which it placed around an accused person. In the first place, it was prescribed that one witness shall not be sufficient to convict man of even a minor offence. “One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established” (Dt 19 15).

These principles of the Mosaic law were elaborated and extended in the system which grew up after the return from Babylon. It was begun by the men of the Great Synagogue, and was afterward completed by the Sanhedrin. Up to the time of Our Lord, and for the first two centuries of the Christian era, their rules remained largely in an oral or unwritten form, until they were compiled or codified in the Mish by Rabbi Judah and his associates and successors in the early part of the 2d cent. It is generally conceded by both Jewish and Christian writers that the main provisions, wherein found for the protection of accused persons, had been long incorporated in the oral law and were recognized as a part of it in the time of Jesus.

The provisions relating to criminal trials, and esp. to those in which the offence was punishable by death, were very stringent. They were all framed in the interest of the accused. Among these were the following: The trial must be begun by day, and if not completed at night must be adjourned and resumed by day; the quorum of Judges in capital cases was 23, that being the quorum of the Grand Council; a verdict required only a majority of one, might be rendered on the same day as the trial was completed; any other verdict could only be rendered on a subsequent day and required a majority of at least two; no prisoner could be convicted on his own evidence; it was the duty of a judge to see that the interests of the accused were fully protected.

The modern practice of an information or complaint and a preliminary investigation before a magistrate was wholly unknown to the Jewish law and foreign to its general practice of the witnesses in open court, was in reality the beginning of a Jewish trial, and the crime for which the accused was tried, and the sole charge he had to meet, was that which was disclosed by the evidence of the witnesses.

Let us see how far the foregoing principles and rules were followed and observed in the proceedings before the high priest in the present instance. The first step taken in the Trial of Jesus by the high priest, which is recorded only in Jn 18 19-23. Opinions differ as to whether this examination was conducted by Annas at his residence before he sent Jesus to Caiaphas (ver 24), or by the latter after Jesus had been delivered up to him.

Caiaphas was actually the high priest at the time, and had been for some years. Annas had been deposed from the office about 14 years previously by the Roman procurators, but had held the high-priestly title (cf Mt 26 3). Many of the Jews did not concede the right of the procurator to depose him, and looked upon him as still the rightful high priest, and at this time the vice-president of the Sanhedrin. The trial in which he took part was conducted by John in this passage are based largely upon two different renderings of Jn 18 24. In AV the verse reads, "Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest," a reading based upon the TR which implies that Jesus had been sent to Caiaphas before the examination. On the other hand, RV, following the Gr text adopted by Nestle and others, reads, "Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest." (Jn 18 19).

However, it is not material which of these two leading members of the Sanhedrin conducted the examination. The same may also be said as to the controversy regarding the residence of Annas at the time, whether it was in some part of the official palace of the high priest or elsewhere. The important matters are the fact, the time, and the manner of the examination by one or other of these leading members of the council, not the precise place where, or the particular person by whom, it was conducted.

The high priest (whether Annas or Caiaphas) proceeded to interrogate Jesus concerning His disciples and His teaching (Jn 18 20-24). 5. The Preliminary Examination — Such a proceeding formed no part of a regular Jewish trial, and was, moreover, not taken in good faith; but had, with a view to entrapping Jesus into arguments that might be used against Him at the approaching trial before the council. It appears to have been in the nature of a private examination, conducted probably while the members of the council were assembling. The dignified and appropriate answer of Jesus pointedly brought before the judges the irrevelance of the charge, and was a reminder that His trial should begin with the examination of the witnesses: “I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whether the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said” (vs 20-21 AV). The reply to this was a blow from one of the officers, an outrageous proceeding which appears to have damaged the reputation of the judge, and it was left to Jesus Himself to make the appropriate protest.

The next proceeding was the trial before the council in the palace of Caiaphas, attended at least by the procurator of Judea. This was an illegal meeting, since a capital trial, as we have seen, could not either be begun or proceeded with at night. Some of the chief priests and elders, as previously stated, had been guilty of the highly improper act for judges, of taking part in and directing the arrest of Jesus. Now, "the chief priests and the whole council" spent the time intervening between the arrest and the commencement of the trial in something even worse: they "sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death" (Mt 26 59). This, no doubt, only means that they then collected their false witnesses and instructed them as to the testimony they should give. For weeks, ever since the raising of Lazarus, they had been preparing for this trial, as we read: "So from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death" (Jn 11 53).

Caiaphas, as high priest and president of the Sanhedrin, presided at the meeting of the council. The oath administered to witnesses in a Jewish court was an extremely solemn invocation, and it makes
one shudder to think of the high priest pronouncing these words to perjured witnesses, known by him to have been procured by the judges before him in the manner stated.

But even this did not avail. Although "many bare false witness against him," yet on account of their having been imperfectly tutored by their instructors, or for other cause, their witnesses "agreed not together" (Mk 14:56), and even these prejudiced and partial judges could not find the concurring testimony of two witnesses required by their law (Dt 19:15).

The nearest approach to the necessary concurrence came at last from two witnesses, who gave a distorted report of a figurative and enigmatic statement made by Jesus in the temple during His early ministry: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn 2:19). The explanation is given: "He spake of the temple of his body" (ver 21).

The testimony of the two witnesses is reported with but slight variations in the two first Gospels as follows: "This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Mt 21:46) and "We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands" (Mk 12:40). Whether these slightly different statements represent the discrepancies in their testimony, or on account of some other variations or contradictions, the judges reluctantly decided that "not even so did their witness agree together" (ver 59).

Caiphas, having exhausted his list of witnesses, and seeing that the prosecution on which he had set his heart in danger of breaking down for the lack of legal evidence, adopted a blustering tone, and said to Jesus, "Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace" (Mt 26:62,63), relying on the fact that the prosecution had utterly failed on account of the lack of agreement of two witnesses on any of the charges. As a final and desperate resort, Caiphas had recourse to a bold strategem: to draw from Jesus an admission or confession on which he might base a condemnation, similar to the attempt which failed at the preliminary examination; but this time fortifying his appeal by a solemn adjuration in the name of the Son of God. He said to Jesus: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" (vs 63,64). Caiphas, although knowing that under the law Jesus could not be convicted on His own answers or admissions, thereupon in a tragic manner "rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? They answered and said, He is worthy of death" (vs 63,66).

The night session then broke up to meet again after daybreak in order to ratify the decision just come to, and to give a semblance of legality to the trial and verdict. The closing scene was one of disorder, in which they spat in their prisoner's face and buffet him (vs 67,68; Lk 22:65-67): "witnesses."

The following morning, "as soon as it was day," the council reassembled in the same place, and Jesus was led into their presence (Lk 22:66). There were probably a number of the council present who had not attended the night session. For the benefit of these, and perhaps to give an appearance of legality to the proceeding, the high priest began the trial anew, but not with the examination of witnesses which had proved such a failure at the night session. He proceeded at once to ask the same questions as had finally brought out from Jesus the night before the answer which he had declared to be blasphemy, and upon which the council had "condemned him to be worthy of death" (Mk 14:64). The question was mentioned in all the Gospels, the details of the examination are related by Luke alone. When asked whether He was the Christ, He replied, "If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of no man be set at the right hand of the power of God" (Lk 22:67-69). This answer not being sufficient to found a verdict of blasphemy upon, they all cried out, "Art thou then the Son of God?" To this He gave an affirmative answer, "Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth" (vs 70,71).

It will be observed that neither at the night nor at the morning session was there any sentence pronounced upon Jesus by the high priest.

10. Powers There was on each occasion only what of the San- of the San- ishredin would be equivalent to a verdict of the San- hedin guilty found by a jury under our criminal law, but no sentence passed upon the prisoner by the presiding judge. When Judaea lost the last vestige of its independence and became a Roman province (AD 6), the Sanhedrin ceased to have the right to inflict capital punishment or to administer the law of life and death. This jurisdiction was thenceforth transferred to the Roman procurator. The Sanhedrin submitted very reluctantly to this curtailment of its powers. A few years later it exercised it illegally and in a very riotous manner in the case of Stephen (Acts 7:58). Annas, however, of all men, had good reason not to violate this law, as his having done so during the absence of the procurator was the cause of his being deposed from the office of high priest by Valerius Gratus (15 AD).

The proceedings may have been taken before the high priest in the hope that Pilate might be induced to accept the verdict of the Sanhedrin as conclusive, but that Jesus had the Deity. The council then passed on to the procurator. If so, the trial was not concluded but was carried over into the office of high priest by Caiaphas (15 AD).

The proceedings may have been taken before the high priest in the hope that Pilate might be induced to accept the verdict of the Sanhedrin as conclusive, but that Jesus had the Deity. The council then passed on to the procurator. If so, the trial was not concluded but was carried over into the office of high priest by Caiaphas (15 AD).

The proceedings may have been taken before the high priest in the hope that Pilate might be induced to accept the verdict of the Sanhedrin as conclusive, but that Jesus had the Deity. The council then passed on to the procurator. If so, the trial was not concluded but was carried over into the office of high priest by Caiaphas (15 AD).
which blasphemy was under the Jewish law. Even if there had been jurisdiction, it would have been irregular, as the judges had rendered themselves incompetent to try the case, having been guilty of the violation of the law that required judges to be unprejudiced and impartial, and carefully to guard the interests of the accused. Even the letter of the law had been violated in a number of important respects. Among these may be mentioned: (1) some of the judges taking part in the arrest are not named; (2) the examination before the trial and the attempt to obtain admissions; (3) endeavors of the judges to procure the testimony of false witnesses; (4) commencing and continuing the trial at night; (5) examining and adjourning the accused in order to extort admissions from him; (5) rendering a verdict of guilty at the close of the night session, without allowing a day to intervene; (7) holding the morning session on a feast day, and rendering a verdict at its close; and (8) rendering both verdicts without any legal evidence.

III. The Roman Trial.—Early on the morning of Friday of the Passover week, as we have already seen, "the chief priests with the elders and scribes of both ethnic and the whole council (Mk), in the palace of the high priest; and after the examination of Jesus and their verdict that He was guilty of blasphemy, they took counsel against Him "to put him to death" (Mt), this being, in their judgment, the proper punishment for the offence of which they had pronounced Him guilty.

For the reasons already mentioned, they came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to invoke the aid of the Rom power in carrying out this sentence. They therefore bound Jesus, and led Him away and delivered Him up to Pilate, who at this time probably occupied, while in Jesus, the magnificent palace built by Herod the Great. Jesus was taken into the judgment hall of the palace or Praetorium; His accusers, unwilling to defile themselves by entering into a heathen house and thereby rendering themselves unfit to eat the Passover, remained outside upon the marble pavement.

The proceedings thus begun were conducted under a system entirely different from that which we have thus far been considering, both in its nature and its administration. The Jewish law was a part of the religion, and in its growth and development was administered in important cases by a large body of trained men, who were obliged to follow strictly a well-defined procedure. The Roman law, on the other hand, had its origin and growth under the stern and manly virtues and the love of justice which characterized republican Rome, and it still jealously guarded the rights and privileges of Roman citizens, even in a conquered province. Striking illustrations of this truth are to be found in the life of St. Paul (see Acts 18 35-39; 22 24-29; 25 10-12.). The lives and fortunes of the natives in an imperial province like Judea may be said to have been almost completely at the mercy of the Rom procurator or governor, who was responsible to his imperial master alone, and not even to the Senate. Pilate therefore was well within the mark when, at a later stage of the trial, being irritated at Jesus remaining silent when questioned by him, he petulantly exclaimed: "Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to release thee?" (Jn 19 10). While, however, the procurator was not compelled in such cases to adhere strictly to the prescribed procedure, there was at the same time a wide discretion, he was not allowed to violate or depart from the established principles of the law.

On this occasion, Pilate, respecting the scruples of the chief priests about entering the palace, went outside of their request, apparently leaving Jesus in the Praetorium. He asked them the usual for-

mal question, put at the opening of a Rom trial: "What accusation bring ye against this man? They answered and said unto him, If he were not an evil-doer, we should not have delivered him up unto thee." Pilate could see at once that this was a mere attempt to evade the direct question he had asked, and was not such an accusation as disclosed any offence known to the Rom law. Affecting to treat it with the greatest care and sincerity, he asked the accused, in the direction of the law, he said, "Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law. The Jews said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death" (ver 31).

Perceiving that Pilate would not gratify their desire to have Jesus condemned on the verdict which they had rendered, or for an offense against their own law only, the Accusation "they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man persuading our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king." (Lk 23 2). This was an accusation containing three charges, much like a modern indictment containing three counts. Pilate appears to have been satisfied that there was nothing in the first two of these charges; but the third was too serious to be ignored, esp. as it was a direct charge of majestas or treason, the greatest crime known to the Rom law, and as to which the reigning emperor, Tiberius, and his then favorite, Sejanus, were particularly sensitive and jealous. The charges in this case were merely oral, but it would appear to have been in the discretion of the procurator to receive them in this form in the case of one who was not a Rom citizen.

The accusers having been heard, Pilate returned to the Praetorium to examine Jesus regarding the last and serious accusation. The Four Gospels give in the same words the explanation, Defence and thereupon to him by Pilate, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" The Acquittal first three record only the final affirmative answer, "Thou sayest," which if it stood alone might have been taken as a plea of guilty; but John gives the interview which explains the matter fully. He tells us that Jesus did not answer the question directly, but asked Pilate, "Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me?" (Jn 18 34) (apparently not having been outside, when the charges were made). On being told that it came from the chief priests, He went on to explain that His kingdom was not of this world, but was a spiritual kingdom. Being again asked if He was a king, He replied in effect, that He was a king in that sense, and that His subjects were those who were of the truth and heard His voice (vs 35-37). Pilate, being satisfied with His explanation, "went out again unto the Jews, and apparently having taken Jesus with him, he mounted his judgment seat or movable tribunal, which had been placed upon the tessellated pavement, and pronounced his verdict, "I find in him no fault at all" (ver 38 AV, RV 'I find no crime in him').

According to the Rom law, this verdict of acquittal should have ended the trial and at once enrolled the discharge of Jesus; but instead it brought two fresh Accusations which Jesus made no reply. Pilate hesitated, and hearing a charge that Jesus had begun His treasuruable teaching in Galilee, the thought occurred to him that he might escape from his dilemma by sending Jesus for trial to Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of...
Galilee, who was then in Jesus for the feast, which he accordingly did (Lk 23:7).

Herod had long been desirous to see Jesus—"...he answered him nothing." The chief priests and scribes, who had followed him from the Praetorium to the Maccabean palace, which Herod was then occupying, "stood, vehemently accusing" Jesus (vs 8-10). "That fox," however, as Jesus had called him (Lk 13:32), was too astute to intermeddle in a trial for treason, which was a dangerous proceeding, and possibly he was aware that Pilate had already acquitted Him; in which case a retrial by him would be illegal. He and his soldiers, probably irritated at the refusal of Jesus to give him any answer, mocked Him, and arraying Him in a gorgeous robe, no doubt in ridicule of His claim to be a king, sent Him back to Pilate. This reference to Herod in reality formed no effective part of the trial of Jesus, as Herod declined the jurisdiction, although Pilate sought to make use of it in his subsequent discussion with the chief priests. The only result was that Herod was flattered by the courtesy of Pilate, the eminity between them ceased, and they were made friends (Lk 23:11.12.15).

On their return, Pilate resumed his place on the judgment seat outside. What followed, however, properly formed no part of the legal trial, as it was a mere travesty upon law, as well as upon justice. Pilate resolved to make another attempt to secure the consent of the Jews to the release of Jesus. To this end he summoned not only the chief priests and the rulers, but the people as well (Lk 23:13), and after mentioning the failure to prove any of the charges made against Jesus, he reminded them of the custom of releasing at the feast a prisoner selected by them, and offering as a compromise to chastise or scourge Jesus before releasing Him. At this point Pilate's anxiety to release Jesus was still further increased by the message he received from his wife concerning her disturbing dream about Jesus and warning him to have "nothing to do with that righteous man" (Mt 27:19). Meanwhile, the chief priests and elders were busily engaged in canvassing the multitude to ask for the release of Barabbas, the notorious robber, and destroy Jesus (ver 20). When Pilate urged them to release Jesus, they cried out all together, "Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas"; and upon a further appeal on behalf of Jesus they cried, "Crucify, crucify him." A third attempt on his part met with no better result (Lk 23:18-23).

The Fourth Gospel alone records a final attempt on the part of Pilate to save Jesus. He scourged Him, it has been suggested, with a view to satisfying their desire for His punishment, and afterward appealing to their pity. He allowed his soldiers to repeat what they had seen done at Herod's palace, and place a crown of thorns upon His head, array Him in a purple robe, and render mock homage to Him as king of the Jews. Pilate went out to the Jews with Jesus thus arrayed and bleeding. Again declaring that he found no fault in Him, he presented Him, saying, "Behold, the man!" This was met by the former cry, "Crucify him, crucify him." Pilate replied, "Take him yourselves . . . I find no crime in him." The Jews referred him to their ruler. He declared that he had made Himself the Son of God. This alarmed Pilate's superstitious fears, who by this time appears to have wholly lost control of himself. He took Jesus into the palace and said to Him, "Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer." Irritated at His silence, Pilate reminded him of his absolute power over Him. The mysterious answer of Jesus as to the source of power still further alarmed him, and he made new efforts to secure His discharge (Jn 19:1-9).

The Jews were well aware that Pilate was arbitrary and cruel, but they had also found that he was very sensitive as to anything that might injuriously affect his official position or his standing with his masters to threats, the emperor. As a last resort they shouted to him, "If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar's friend: every one that maketh himself a king speakest against Caesar" (ver 12). The prospect of a charge of his aiding and abetting such a crime as treason, in addition to the other charges that a guilty conscience told him might be brought against him, proved too much for the vacillating procurator. He brought Jesus out, and sat down again upon the judgment seat placed upon the pavement. He made one more appeal, "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests gave the hypocritical answer, "We have no king but Caesar" (ver 15). Pilate finally succumbed to their threats and clamor; but took his revenge by placing upon the cross the superscription that was so galling to them, "The King of the Jews."

Then occurred the closing scene of the tragedy, recorded only in the First Gospel, when Pilate washed his hands before the multitude (a Jewish custom), saying to them, "I wash not the guilt of this Hands [of Jesus] righteous man; see ye to it." The reply was that dreadful imprecation, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Mt 27 24-25).

Pilate resumes his place upon the judgment seat, the fatal sentence at last falls from his lips, and Jesus is delivered up to be crucified.

12. The Sentence

Now, how far were these proceedings in accordance with the Roman law under which they purported to have been taken and conducted? Was orderly, Pilate, as procurator, was the proper officer to try the charges brought against Jesus.

13. Review

In the next place he acted quite properly in declining to entertain a charge which disclosed no offence known to the Roman law, or to pass a sentence based on the verdict of the Sanhedrin for an alleged violation of the Jewish law. He appears to have acted in accordance with the law, and indeed in a judicial and praiseworthy manner in the trial and disposition of the threefold indictment for treason (unless it be a fact that Jesus was not present when these accusations were brought against Him outside the Praetorium, which would be merely an irregularity, as they were made known to Him later inside). Pilate's initial mistake, which led to all the others, was in not discharging Jesus at once, when he had pronounced the verdict of acquittal.

All the subsequent proceedings were contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the law. Although Pilate took his place in such a manner that the seat, his acts, properly speaking, were not those of a judge, and had no legal force or value; but were rather the futile attempts of a weak and vacillating politician to appease an angry mob thirsting for the blood of an innocent countryman. The carrying out of a sentence imposed in such a cause and under such conditions, may not inaptly be described as a judicial murder.

John James Maclaren
JESUS, GENEALOGY OF. See Genealogy of Jesus.

JESUS JUSTUS, iευσος υστους (Ἰερώνος ὁ ἀγέ-
μονος Ἰούστος, Ἰερώνος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούστος, “Jesus that is called Justus”) Col 4:11.

1. A Jew
   One of three friends of Paul—the
   other two being Aristarchus and Mark—
   whom he associates with himself in
   sending salutations (Rom 16:23, “He
called by name”). He is not mentioned
   in the NT, and there is nothing more known
   about him than is given in this passage in Col,
   viz. that he was by birth a Jew of the circumcision,
   that he had been converted to Christ, and that he
   was one of the inner circle of intimate friends
   and associates of the apostle during his first Rom-
   2. He Remains True to Paul
   In giving the address of Paul’s imprisonment,
   the writer extends to him the Christians in Rome on
   his arrival there to lose its first warmth, and
   remains true to Paul.

   The words also contain the information that at a stage
   in Paul’s imprisonment, when the welcome extended to
   him by the Christians in Rome on his
   arrival there had lost its first warmth, and
   he went

   “Reuel” David

   (11. untrue 51),
   mean
   should
   1
   Ch
   ii,
   “Ithran”
   “feared, yet he was a youth.”
   The narrative there (8 4 ff) should
   be connected with that of 6 34, where Gideon is
   followed by his clan, and not with that of ch 7, where he has
   300 picked men. The captives would be taken to Orpah,
   Gideon’s home, and slain there.

   (3) Father of Amasa (1 K 2 5.32); he was an
   Ishmaelite according to 1 Ch 2 17 = “Ithra, the
   Israeliite” of 2 S 17 25, where “the Ishmaelites”
   should be read for “the Israelites”.

   (4) A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2 32 bis).

   (5) A Judahite (1 Ch 4 17).

   (6) A man of Asher (1 Ch 7 38) = “Ithram” of
   ver 37.

   JOHN RUTHERFORD

   JETHRO, jethrō (жение), yithro, “abundance”:
   (1) Ex 4 18 RvM, AvM. See Jethro.

   (2) Gideon’s eldest son (Jgs 8 20), who was
   captured by his father to slay Zebah and Zal-
   munnah, but “fearful, because he was yet a youth.”
   The narrative there (8 4 ff) should be
   connected with that of 6 34, where Gideon is
   followed by his clan, and not with that of ch 7, where he has
   300 picked men. The captives would be taken to Orpah,
   Gideon’s home, and slain there.

   (3) Father of Amasa (1 K 2 5.32); he was an
   Ishmaelite according to 1 Ch 2 17 = “Ithra, the
   Israeliite” of 2 S 17 25, where “the Ishmaelites”
   should be read for “the Israelites”.

   (4) A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2 32 bis).

   (5) A Judahite (1 Ch 4 17).

   (6) A man of Asher (1 Ch 7 38) = “Ithram” of
   ver 37.

   DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

   JETHETH, jethēth (지תק), yitheth, meaning un-
   known: A chief (or clan) of Edom (Gen 36 40 ||
   1 Ch 1 51), but probably a mistake for “Jetheth”
   = “Idram” (Gen 36 26).

   JETHLAIH, jethlaih (지תק), yithlah. See Ithlah.

   JETHRO, jethrō, jethrō (지תק), yithrō, “excell-
   ence,” Ex 3 1; 4 18b; 18 1–12 [in 4 18a, probably a
   textual error, “yithrō”], yithro, “Jeth,” AvM, RvM;

   LXX always “Ιούδηρος, Iotthôrō”: The priest of Midian
   and father-in-law (βαλαθήν) of Moses.

   It is not easy to determine the relation of J. to
   Reuel and Hobab. If we identify J. with Reuel as
   Ex 18 1b (and VS 18, V. II. 3), we must connect “Moses’ father-
   in-law” in Nu 10 30 and Ex 18 with “Reuel” (AV “Raguel”), and make Hobab
   the brother-in-law of Moses. But while it is possible that Jethro may be
   in the wider sense of a wife’s relative, it is
   the word “brother” (Heb “brother”) in the
   AVm. If we substitute, as Ewald suggests (II, II. 25, “Jethro son of
   Reuel”, Ex 2 18 (and of the name “Jethro” is given), we would then identify J. with
   Hobab, the son of Reuel in Nu 10 29, taking “Moseh”
   “father-in-law” to refer back to Hobab. Against this
   identification, however, it is stated that J. went away
   from his own country (Nu 10 32), but any effort on the part of
   Moses to detain him (Ex 18 27), whereas Hobah, though
   at first refused to remain with the Israelites, seems to
   have yielded to the pleadings of Moses to become their
guide to Canaan (Nu 10 29–32; Jgs 11 16, where Kittel
   reads “Hobab the Kenite”): 4 11. It may be noted
   that while the father-in-law of Moses is spoken of as a
   Midianite “in Ex, he is called” AVm.

   When Moses fled from Egypt he found refuge in
   Midian, where he received a hearty welcome into
   the household of J. on account of the
courtly kindness he had shown
   the priests’ 7 daughters in helping
   them to water their father’s flocks,
   and that friendship resulted in J. giving Moses
   his daughter, Zipporah, to wife (Ex
   4 25–21). After Moses had been for about 40
   years in the service of his father-in-law, the angel of
   the Lord appeared to him as he was keeping the flock at Horeb,
   commanding him to return to Egypt and deliver his enslaved
   brethren out of the hands of Pharaoh (3 1 ff). With J.’s consent Moses left Midian to carry out
   the Divine commission (4 18).

   When tidings reached Midian of “all that God
done for Moses, and for Israel” in delivering
   them from Egypt bondage, J. with a
   natural pride in the achievements of his
   relative set out to visit Moses at
   Jethro in the Wilderness
   (Ex 18 1–12). On learning of
   his father-in-law’s arrival at the
   “mount of God,” Moses went out
to meet him, and after a cordial exchange of greetings they
   retired to Moses’ tent, where a pleasant interview
   took place between them. We are told of the
   interest J. felt in all the particulars of the
great deliverance, how he “rejoiced for all the goodness
   which Jeth had done to Israel,” and how the con-
viction was wrought within him that Jeth
   was “greater than all gods; yea, in the thing wherein
   they dealt proudly against them” (ver 11). In this
   condition so expressed there is evidently a reference to
   the element by which they feared the gods, though
   in their high-handed pursuit they would be able to
   bring back Israel into bondage, but by which they
   were themselves overthrown.

   It is worth noting that in the religious service
   in which J. and Moses after their return from
   Egypt as priest, offered a burnt offering, and Aaron with
   all the elders of Israel partook of the sacrificial
   feast, prominence was given to J. over Aaron, and
   thus a priesthood was recognized beyond the limits of
   Israel.

   This visit of J. to Moses had important conse-
   quences for the future government of Israel (Ex
   18 21–27). The priest of Midian
   became concerned about his son-in-
   law when he saw him occupied from
   morning to night in deciding the dis-
   putes that had arisen among the people. The labor
this entailed, J. said, was far too heavy a burden for one man to bear. Moses himself, would soon be worn out, and the people, too, would become weary and dissatisfied, owing to the inability of one judge to overtake all the cases that were brought before him. J., therefore, urged Moses to make use of the talents of others and adopt a plan of gradual promotion of judges who would dispose of all cases of minor importance, leaving only the most difficult for him to settle by a direct appeal to the will of God. Moses, recognizing the wisdom of his father-in-law’s advice, readily acted upon his suggestion and appointed 12 or 24 judicial men, and made these heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. Thereafter, J. returned to his own country.

The story of J. reveals him as a man of singular attractiveness and strength, in whom a kind, considerate disposition, a deeply religious spirit, and a wise judgment all met in happy combination. And this anointed priest of Midian made Israel and nations his devout admirers when he taught the distinction between the legislative and the judicial function, and the importance of securing that all law be the expression of the Divine will, and that its application be entrusted only to men of ability, piety, integrity, and truth (Ex 18:21).

JAMES Crichton

JETHUR, je'thor (יְחות), yitha', meaning uncertain:
A “son” of Ishmael (Gen 25:15; 1 Ch 1:31),
against the clan two and a half tribes warred (1 Ch 18:1); they are the Ituraeans of NT times. See ITURAEA.

JEUEL, je'ool (יהוּל), yow'del, meaning unknown:
(1) A man of Judah (1 Ch 9:6); the name is not found in the list of Neh 11:24.
(2) A Levite, AV “Jeelil” (2 Ch 29:13).
(3) A companion of Ezra, AV “Jeiel” (Ezr 8:13).
(4) The name occurs also as K'thith in 1 Ch 9:35; 2 Ch 26:11. See Jeiel, (2), (6).

JEUSH, je'ush (יהוּשׁ), yowash, probably “he protects,” “he comes to help”; see HPN, 109; K'thith is Yow'sh, yow'sh, in Gen 36:5:14; 1 Ch 7:10.
(1) A “son” of Essau (Gen 36:5:14:18, 1 Ch 1:35). The name is thought by some to be identical with that of a biblical Jezon, i.e., meaning ‘helper,’ whose antiquity is vouched for by inscriptions of Thamud (Skinner, Gen. 432).
(2) A Benjamite. See Curtis, Ch. 145 ff.
(3) A descendant of King Saul, AV “Jeeshu” (1 Ch 8:90).
(4) A Gershonite Levite (1 Ch 23:10:11).
(5) A son of King Rehoboam (2 Ch 11:19).

David Francis Roberts

JEZUB, je'uz (יהוזב), yow'sug, “he counsels”: the eponym of a Benjamite family (1 Ch 8:10).

JEW, jō, jōo; JEWESS, JEWISH, jō'ish, jōo'ish (יִשָׁה, yow'daḥ, pl. יִשָּה, yow'dhaḥim; LXXd Tet., LXXd Tet.; adj. יִשָּה, yow'daḥis; LXXd Tet., LXXd Tet.; adj. f. יִשָּה, yow'daḥith; LXXd Tet., LXXd Tet.): “Jew” denotes originally an inhabitant of Judah (2 K 16:6 tends to the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom), but later the meaning was extended to embrace all descendants of Abraham. In the OT the word occurs a few times in the sing. (Est 2:5; 3:4, etc; Jer 34:9; Zec 8:23); very frequently in the pl. in Ezr and Neh, Est, and in Jer and the prophets. The adj. in the OT applies only to the “Jews’ language” or speech (2 K 18:26:28; Neh 13:24; Isa 36:11:13). “Jews” (always pl. in familiar terms for Israelites in the Gospels (esp. in Jn), Acts, Eph., etc.): “Jewess” occurs in 1 Ch 6:18; Acts 16:1; 24:24. In Tit 1:14 a warning is given against “Jewish fables” (in Gr. the adj. is found also in Gal 2:14). The “Jews’ religion” (Ioudatămos) is referred to in Gal 1:13:14. On the “Jews’ language,” see LANGUAGES OF THE OT; on the “Jews’ religion,” see INDIAN RELIGIONS.

James Orr

JEWEL, je'ool (יִזְבּל), yowzul, an ornament of gold, silver or of precious stones in the form of armlet, bracelet, anklet, nose-ornament, etc. Oriental dress yields itself freely to such adornment, and many words are employed in the OT to describe them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. Thereafter, J. returned to his own country.

The story of J. reveals him as a man of singular attractiveness and strength, in whom a kind, considerate disposition, a deeply religious spirit, and a wise judgment all met in happy combination. And this anointed priest of Midian made Israel and nations his devout admirers when he taught the distinction between the legislative and the judicial function, and the importance of securing that all law be the expression of the Divine will, and that its application be entrusted only to men of ability, piety, integrity, and truth (Ex 18:21).

JAMES CRICHTON

JETHUR, je'thor (יְחות), yitha', meaning uncertain:
A “son” of Ishmael (Gen 25:15; 1 Ch 1:31),
against the clan two and a half tribes warred (1 Ch 18:1); they are the Ituraeans of NT times. See ITURAEA.

JEUEL, je'ool (יהוּל), yow'del, meaning unknown:
(1) A man of Judah (1 Ch 9:6); the name is not found in the list of Neh 11:24.
(2) A Levite, AV “Jeelil” (2 Ch 29:13).
(3) A companion of Ezra, AV “Jeiel” (Ezr 8:13).
(4) The name occurs also as K'thith in 1 Ch 9:35; 2 Ch 26:11. See Jeiel, (2), (6).

JEUSH, je'ush (יהוּשׁ), yowash, probably “he protects,” “he comes to help”; see HPN, 109; K'thith is Yow'sh, yow'sh, in Gen 36:5:14; 1 Ch 7:10.
(1) A “son” of Essau (Gen 36:5:14:18; 1 Ch 1:35). The name is thought by some to be identical with that of a biblical Jezon, i.e., meaning ‘helper,’ whose antiquity is vouched for by inscriptions of Thamud (Skinner, Gen. 432).
(2) A Benjamite. See Curtis, Ch. 145 ff.
(3) A descendant of King Saul, AV “Jeeshu” (1 Ch 8:90).
(4) A Gershonite Levite (1 Ch 23:10:11).
(5) A son of King Rehoboam (2 Ch 11:19).

David Francis Roberts

JEZUB, je'uz (יהוזב), yow'sug, “he counsels”: the eponym of a Benjamite family (1 Ch 8:10).

JEW, jō, jōo; JEWESS, JEWISH, jō'ish, jōo'ish (יִשָּה, yow'daḥ, pl. יִשָּה, yow'dhaḥim; LXXd Tet., LXXd Tet.; adj. f. יִשָּה, yow'daḥith; LXXd Tet., LXXd Tet.): “Jew” denotes originally an inhabitant of Judah (2 K 16:6 tends to the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom), but later the meaning was extended to embrace all descendants of Abraham. In the OT the word occurs a few times in the sing. (Est 2:5; 3:4, etc; Jer 34:9; Zec 8:23); very frequently in the pl. in Ezr and Neh, Est, and in Jer and the prophets. The adj. in the OT applies only to the “Jews’ language” or speech (2 K 18:26:28; Neh 13:24; Isa 36:11:13). “Jews” (always pl. in
the unfavourable verdict of the Heb historians? That verdict is based on the results and effects of the marriage, on the life and character of J, and in the life of two main incidents demand attention. This is not described in 1 K 18 4, "when J cut off the prophets of Jeh"; and this shows the history of the time to be incompletely related. In 1 K 18 4 we are further told that "As for Jeh's prophets not at her table" (KJV).

Prophets (commentators regard the reference to "400 prophets of the Asherah" as an addition). In 1 K 19 1 Ahab tells J. of the slaughter of the prophets of Baal by Elijah, and then J. (19 2) sends a messenger to Elijah to threaten his life. This leads to the prophet's flight, an object which J. had in view, perhaps, for she would hardly dare to murder Elijah himself. 2 K 9 7 regards the massacre of Ahab's family as a punishment for the persecution of the prophet by J.

Ahab expresses a desire to possess the vineyard neighboring upon his palace in Jezreel, owned by Naboth, who refuses to part with it. The royal family is offered either its value or a better vineyard in exchange. Ahab accepts the exchange, and then, upon finding that he has purchased it at the cost of his melancholy feelings, asks him sarcastically if he is not king, suggesting that as king his wishes should be immediately granted by his subjects. She therefore, upon plots to murder Naboth. The vineyard, J. sends letters sealed in Ahab's name to the elders of Naboth's town, who have them changed to p一张 and Hameke Naboth "at the head of the people" (R.V), a phrase taken by some to mean that he is arranged, while it is explained by others as meaning that Naboth is to be given the chief place. Two witnesses—a sufficient number for that purpose—are to be brought to accuse Naboth of blasphemy and treason. That is done, and Naboth is found guilty, and stoned to death. The prophecy is confirmed, and Ahab, falling to the king (vs 1), feels that he needs his body (ver 19). But in vs 30–23 this prophecy is made, concerning Ahab but against Jezebel, and ver 25 attributes the sins of Ahab to her influence over him.

The prophecy is fulfilled in 2 K 9 30–37. Ahab and Jezebar had succeeded their father Ahab; the one reigned for 2 years (1 K 22 41), the other 12 years (2 K 3 1). Jehu heads a revolt against the house of Ahab, and the two days following Jehu by Joash (49) had "painted her eyes, and attired her head," and sees Jehu coming. She greets him sarcastically as his master's murderer. According to MT, Jehu asks, "Who is on my side? who?" but the text is emended by Klostermann, following LXX in "who is on your side? Who shouldst thou find familiar with me?" i.e. thou art but a murderer's wife. She is killed along with the horses that drew the chariot (reading "thou trid" for "be trid""): 23 33. When search is afterward made for her remains, they are found cached in the vault, which was the prophecy fulfilled. (Some commts hold that Naboth's vineyard and Ahab's garden, and Naboth a Jezreelite, of the words; which was in "Jezreel"; of LXX I 21 I am wanting in LXX, which has "And Naboth had a vineyard by the threshing-floor of Ahab king of Samaria." But of 1 K 18 45; 23: 2 K 8 29: 9 10.15.30.36.) See Ahab; JER.

The character of J. is seen in that of her daughter, Athalith of Judah (2 K 11); there is no doubt that J. was a powerful person.

3. Jezabel's ality. She brought the worship of Character the Phoen Baal and Astarte with her into Heb life, and indirectly introduced it into Judah as well as into the Northern Kingdom. In judging her connection with this propagation, we should bear in mind that she is not a queen of the 20th cent.; she must be judged in company with other queens famous in history. Her religious activity and zeal might profitably be compared with that of Mary, queen of Scots. It must also be remembered that the introduction of any religious change is often resented when it comes from a foreign queen, and is apt to be misunderstood, e.g. the attitude of Greece to the proposal of Queen Olga to have an authorized edition of the Bible in modern Gr.

On the other hand, although much may be said that would be favorable to J. from the religious standpoint, the balance is heavy against her when we remember her successful plot against Naboth. It is not perhaps blameworthy in her that she held the religion of her land, although the natural things would have been to follow that of her adopted land (cf. Ruth 1 16 f). The superiority of Jeh-worship was not as clear then as it is to us today. It may also be held that Baal-worship was not unknown in Heb life (cf Jgs 6 25 f.), that Baal of Canaan had become incorporated with Jeh of Sinai, and that there were pagan elements in the worship of the latter. But against all this it must be clear that the Baal whom J. attempted to introduce was the Phoen Baal, pure and simple; he was another god, or rather in him was presented an idea of God very different from Jeh. And further, "in Phoenicia, where wealth and luxury had been enjoyed on a scale unknown to either Israel or the Canaanites of the interior, there was a refinement, if one may so speak, and at the same time a prodigality of vicious indulgences, connected with the worship of Baal and Astarte to which Israel had hitherto been a stranger. . . . It was like a cancer eating into the vitals and heart sickness resulting in total decay (Isa 1 6). In Israel, moral deterioration meant political as well as spiritual death. The veil of the nation lay in fertility to Jeh alone, and in His pure worship" (H.P.M., §218).

The verdict of the historian is now substantiated. J. is an example—an extreme one no doubt—of the bad influence of a highly developed civilization forcing itself upon all its sins upon a community less highly civilized, but possessed of a nobler moral and religious capacity. She has parallels both in family and in national life. For a parallel to Elijah's attitude toward J. of the words of Carlyle about Knox in On Heroes and Hero Worship, IV. cap. the section, "We blame Knox for his intolerance," etc.

In Rev 2 20, we read of Jezabel, "the woman Jezabel, who calleth herself a prophetess"; not "thy wife" (i.e. the wife of the bishop) R.Vm, but as Moffat (Expos Gr Test.) aptly renders, "that Jezabel of a woman alleging herself a prophetess." Some members of the church at Thyatira "under the sway of an infatuated woman refused to separate from the local guilds where moral interests, though not ostensibly defied, were often seriously compromised. Her lax principles or tendencies made for a connection with foreign and compromising associations which evidently exerted a dangerous influence upon some weaker Christians in the city." Her followers "prided themselves upon their enlightened liberalism (ver 24)." Moffat rejects both the view of Schirer (Theol. Abhand- lungen, 39 f.), that is to be identified with the Chaldean Sibyl at Thyatira, and also that of Selwyn making her the wife of the local acharist. "It was not the culte but the trait of guilds that formed the problem at Thyatira." See also Zahn, Intro to the NT, § 73, n. 7; Ahab; Baal; Elijah.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

JEZELUS, je-zel'us, je'zē-lus (Ia'glos, le'tlos). (1) In 1 Esd 8 32; called "Jahaziel" in Ex 8 5. (2) In 1 Esd 8 35; called "Jehiel" in Ex 8 9.

JEZER, je'zēr ("vyeer"), ye'ger, "form" or "purpose": A "son" of Naphtali (Gen 46 24; Nu 26 49; 1 Ch 17 3).

JEZERITES, je'zērites (The, "ιαυες-τες, ha-yērite [collective with art."]): Descendants of "Jezzer" (Nu 26 49).

JEZIAH, je'zi'ah. See Iziah.
JEZEBEL, je'zi-el, je'zil (K'thûh is נְצַרְיָה, y'zî'ra, or נְצַרְיָ', y'rî'el; K-r thûth, jez'ril'). God gathers, perhaps): One of David's Benjamites recruits at Ziklag (1 Ch 12 9).

JEZELIAH, jez-Ál'ah. See ZELIAH.

JEZOAR, je-zo'ar. See ZOAR.

JEZRAHIAH, jez-rah-ÁH. See ZRHAHIAH.

JEZREEL, jez'rél-Ál, jez'rél (נְצַרְיָא לָע, y'zî'el), “God soweth”:
1. A city on the border of the territory of Issachar (Josh 19 18). It is named with Zebulun and Shunem (modern Iskâli and Sûlam). It remained loyal to the house of Saul, and is mentioned as part of the kingdom over which Abner set Ish-bosheth (2 S 2 9). From Jezreel came the tidings of Saul and Jonathan's death on Gilboa, which brought disaster to Mephibosheth (2 S 4 4). The city played no important part in the history till the time of Ahab. Attracted, doubtless, by the fine position and natural charms of the place, he made it one of his royal residences, building here a palace (1 K 21 1). This was evidently on the eastern wall, which was the gate by which Jehu entered and was succeeded by the quarters of Queen Jezebel (2 K 9 30 f). The royal favor naturally enhanced the dignity of the city, and “elders” and “nobles” of Jezreel are mentioned (1 K 21 8, etc.). Under the influence of Jezebel, an institution for the worship of Baal was founded here, from which, probably, the men were drawn who figured in the memorable contest with Elijah on Carmel (2 K 10 11). “The tower in Jezreel” was part of the defences of the city. It commanded a view of the approach up the valley from Beth-shan—the way followed by the hordes of the E., who, from time immemorial, came westward for the rich pasture of the plain (2 K 9 17). It was necessary also to keep constant watch, as the district E. of the Jordan was always more unsettled than that on the W.; and danger thence might appear at any moment. The garden of Naboth seems to have lain to the E. of the city (2 K 9 21), near the royal domain, to which Ahab desired to add it as a garden of herbs (1 K 21 6 f). See NABOTH. This was the scene of the tragic meetings between Elijah and Ahab (1 K 21 17 f), and between Jehu and Joram and Ahaziah (2 K 9 21). Joram had returned to Jezreel from Ramoth-gilead to be healed of his wounds (9 15). The highway the dogs devoured Jezebel's body (vs 31 f). Naboth had been stoned to death outside the city (1 K 21 13). Jos lays the scene by the fountain of Jezreel, and here, he says, the dogs licked the blood washed from the chariot of Ahab (Am. VIII, xv. 6). This accords with 1 K 21 19; but 22 38 points to the pool at Samaria. The site of Jezreel must be sought in a position where a tower would command a view of the road coming up the valley from Beth-shan. It has long been the custom to identify it with the modern village, Ezrin, on the northwestern spur of Gilboa. This meets the above condition; and it also agrees with the indications in Ophom as lying between the Lake Lizzia (Lejzrâ) and Sycamore (Beisân). Recently, however, Professor A. K. S. Macalister made a series of excavations here, and failed to find any remains of ancient Israelite occupation. This casts doubt upon the identification, and further excavation is necessary before a certain conclusion can be reached. For the “fountain which is in Jezreel,” see HADDON, WELL OR.
(2) An unidentified town in the uplands of Judah (Josh 15 59), the home of Ahioam (1 S 17 3, etc.)

JEZREEL, VALE OF. See ESDRAELON, PLAIN OF.

JEZREELITE, jez'rél-it, jez'rél-it (נְצַרְיָא לָע, ha-y'zî'rlth): Applied to Naboth, a native of Jezreel (1 K 21 1, etc).

JEZREELITES, jez-rél-Ál-es, jez'rél-it-es (נְצַרְיָא לָע, y'zî'rlth, “of Jezreel,” fem.): Applied to Ahinoam, one of David's first two wives, a native of Jezreel in Judah (1 S 27 3; 30 5; 2 S 2 2; 3 2; 1 Ch 3 1).

JEZRIELUS, jez-ri'el-us (Tôpêelos, tserêlos; AV Hierieles; 1 Esd 9 27): Corresponding to “Jehiel” in Ezr 10 26.

JBSAM, jib'sam. See ISBAM.

JIDLAPH, jîd'laf (יִדֹּלָפ, yôdôlaph, perhaps “he weeps”): A “son” of Nahor (Gen 22 22).

JIMNA, JIMNAH, jim'NA (יוֹמְנָה, yimnâh, perhaps “good fortune!”): A “son” of Asher (Gen 35 17, AV “Jimnah”), whereas RV has IMNAN (q.v.).

JIMNITES, jim'nîts, THE (same as “Jimna,” only collective with the def. art.; Nu 26 44, AV “Jimna”), whereas RV has “Imnites”: Descendants of Jimna or Jina.

JIPHTAH, jîp'th (יִפְטָה, yôphtha). See JIPHTAH.

JIPHTHAHEL, jîp'thâ-Ál, el. See JIPHTHAHEL.

JOAB, jô'ab (יוֹבָא, yô'âb), “Jeh is father”:
1. Taâd, Idôb (יִדָּב, yôdôb).
(a) Son of Zeruiah, David's sister. He was “captain of the host” (cf 2 S 19 13) under David.
(b) Joab is first introduced in the narrative of the war with Abner, who supported the claims of Ish-bosheth to the throne against those
1. Joab of David (2 S 3 8—3 11). The two and Abner armies met, and on Abner's suggestion a tournament took place between 12 men from each side; a general engagement follows, and in this J.'s army is victorious. Asahel, J.'s brother, is killed in his pursuit of Abner, but the latter's army is sorely pressed, and he appeals to J. for a cessation of hostilities. J. calls a halt, but declares that he would not cease had Abner not made his plea.
(b) 2 S 3 12—29. Abner visits David at Hebron, and makes an alliance with David. He then leaves the town, apparently under royal protection. J. is absent at the time, but returns immediately after Abner's departure, and exostulates with David for not avenging Asahel's death, and at the same time attributes a bad motive to Abner's visit. He sends a message, no doubt in the form of a royal command, for Abner to return; the chief does so, is taken aside “into the midst of the gate” (or as LXX and commentators read, “into the side of the gate,” 3 27), and slain there by J. David proclaims his own innocence in the matter, commands J. as well as the people to mourn publicly for the dead hero (3 31), composes a lament for Abner, and pronounces a curse upon J. and his descendants (ver 30 is regarded as an editorial note, and commentators change ver 39).
(a) 2 S 10 1—14; 1 Ch 19 15—17. David sends ambassadors with his good wishes to Hanun on his ascending the throne of the Ammonites; these are ill-treated, and war follows, David's troops being commanded by J. On finding himself placed between the Ammonites on the one hand, and their Syrian allies on the other, he divides his army, and himself leads one division against the Syrians,
leaving Abishai, his brother, to fight the Ammonites; the defeat of the Syrians is followed by the rout of the Ammonites.

(2) 2 S 10 15–19; 1 Ch 19 16–19 describes a second war between Hadarezer and David. J. is not mentioned here.

(c) 2 S 11 1 narrates the resumption of the war against the Ammonites; J. is in command, and the town of Rabbah is besieged. Here occurs the account of David's sin with Bathsheba, omitted by Ch. David sends J. to send Uriah, his husband, to Jerus, and when he refuses to break the soldier's vow (11 6–13), J. is to procure Uriah's death in the siege, and the general then sends news of it to David (11 14–27). After capturing the 'watercity' of Rabbah, J. takes the capital of Ammon, and Abdon, the captive, and leads the triumphs (12 26–29).

(a) The next scene depicts J. attempting and succeeding in his attempt to get Absalom restored to royal favor. He has noticed that the people's heart is 'vested in Abishai and Absalom' (14 1), and so arranges for "a wise woman" of Tekoa to bring a supposed complaint of her own before the king, and then rebuke him for his treatment of Absalom. The plan succeeds. David sees J. is in the right, and gives him permission to bring Absalom to Jerus. But the rebel has to remain in his own house, and is not allowed to see his father (14 1–24).

(b) Absalom attempts to secure J.'s intercession for his captive father, but his failure is due to his father's confidence. J. turns a deaf ear to the request until his field is put on fire by Absalom's command. He then sees Absalom, and gets David to receive his prodigal son back to the royal home (14 25–33).

(c) Absalom revolts, and makes Amasa, another nephew of David, general instead of J. (17 24 f). David flees to Mahanaim, followed by Absalom. J. is given a third of the army, the other divisions being led by Abishai and Joab. He is made sure that Absalom has been caught in a tree (or thickets), and expostulates with the informer for not having killed him. Although he is reminded of David's tender plea that Absalom be kindly dealt with, he dispatches J. to the rebel, with the blood of Absalom for a general halt of the army. When David gives vent to his feelings of grief, he is sternly rebuked by J., and the rebuke has its effect (17–19 8c).

2 S 19 8b–15. On David's return to Jerus, Amasa is made captain of the host instead of J. (19 13). Then Sheba revolts, Amasa dies by David to take the field (20 6). The Syr VS reads: "J." for "Abishai" in this verse, and some commentators follow it, but LXX supports MT. J. seems to have accompanied Abishai; and when Amasa meets them at Gibeon, J., on pretense of kissing his rival, kills him. He then assumes command by Amasa's men, and arranges with a woman of Abelbeth-maccaac to deliver to him Sheba's head. The revolt is then at an end.

J. subsequently opposed David's suggestion of a census, but eventually carried it out (2 S 24 1–9; 1 Ch 21 1–6), yet 1 Ch 21 6 and 27 6. J.'s 24 relate that he did not carry it out fully. He was one of Adonijah's supporters in his claim to the throne (1 K 1 7, 19, 41). For this he had to pay the penalty with his life, being slain at the altar in the "tent of Jeh" (1 K 2 28–34) by Benaiah, who acted upon Solomon's orders. His murder became his successor as head of the army. 1 K 2 5 makes David advise Solomon not to forget that J. slew Abner and Amasa, and 1 K 11 1–4 contains a reference to the deed of his name in Edom. 1 Ch 11 6 makes him win his spurs first at the capture of Jerus, but

2 S 2, 3 are previous in time to this event (cf 2 S 5 6–10), and 1 Ch 11 8 makes him repair the city, while 1 K 26 28 refers to a dedication of armor by him.

In summing up J.'s character, we must remember the stirring times in which he lived. That he was a most able general, there is no doubt.

6. Joab's He was, however, very jealous of his Character position, and this accounts for Amasa's murder, if not partially for that of Abner too: if he were afraid that Abner would support him, that fear may be held to be justified, for Amasa, who had not been too loyal to David did take J.'s place for a time. But blood revenge for Abner's death was perhaps the chief cause. Yet even when judged in the light of those rough times, and in the light of eastern life, the murder of Abner was a foul, treacherous deed (see Trumbull, Studies in Oriental Social Life, 129–31).

J. opposed the census probably because it was an innovation. His rebuke of David's great grief over Absalom's death can only be characterized as just; he is the stern warrior who, after being once merciful and forgiving, will not again spare a deceitful rebel; and yet David shows how a father's conduct toward J. is not regulated by stern justice. J.'s unwavering loyalty to David leads one to believe that no disloyalty was meant by his support of Adonijah, who was really the rightful heir to the throne. But their plans were foreseen by those of the harem, and J. had to pay the price with his life.

Taken as a whole, his life, as depicted in the very reliable narrative of 2 S and 1 K, may be said to be characteristic of the times that as that of David himself, with a truly Homeric ring about it. He was a great man, great in military prowess and also in personal revenge, in his loyalty to the king as well as in his stern rebuke of his royal master. He was the greatest of David's generals, and the latter's success and glory owed much to this noblest of that noble trio whom Jeruzael lived.

(2) A Jadhite, father or founder of Ge-harashim (1 Ch 4 14, "valley of craftsmen" RVm). See Ge-harashim.

(3) A family of returned exiles (Ezr 2 6 | Neh 7 11; Ezr 8 9; 1 Esd 8 35).

(4) See ATROTH-BETH-JOAB.

JOACHAZ, jō-a-kä'z, Jäh'ach, Te'chowías, Te'choniá: Son of Josiah (1 Esd 1 34). In Mt 11 "Jechoniah" is the reading.

JOACIM, jō-a-sim. See JOAKIM.

JOADANUS, jō-a-dän'ús (Ἰωάννα, Ioánnas): In 1 Esd 9 19, apparently, through some corruption; the same as Gedaliah, the son of Joshaun, the son of Joazadak, in Ezr 10 18.

JOAH, jō'a (יוֹאָה, jō'āh, "Jeh is brother"): (1) Son of Asaph and recorder under King Hese- kiah (2 K 18 18, 26; Isa 36 3.11.22); he was one of the 5 officers sent by the king to speak to the Assyrs envoys at the siege of Jerus (701 BC).

(2) In 1 Ch 26 6 (Heb 6); 2 Ch 29 12, a Levite (son of Zimmah) = "Ethan" of 1 Ch 6 42 (Heb 27).

(3) A son of Obad-edom (1 Ch 26 4).

(4) Son of Joshaun and recorder under King Josiah (2 Ch 34 8).

JOAHAZ, jō'a-há'z (יוֹהָז, jō'há'z, "Jeh has grasped" = "Jehovahs"): (1) Father of Joah (4) (2 Ch 34 8).

(2) RV and Heb in 2 Ch 14 1 for Jehoahaz, king of Israel. See JEHOAHAZ.
JOAKIM, jô-a'kim (יוֹאָכִים, יָוֹאכִים; AV Joasim):
(1) Jehoiakim, king of Judah and Jerus (1 Eed 1:15; Bar 1:5).
(2) Jehoiachin, son of (1) (1 Eed 1:43).
(3) Son of Jehuia (1 Eed 5:5), called by mistake son of Zerubbabel; in Neh 12:10.26 his name occurs as in 1 Eed, among the priests and Levites who returned to Jerus with Zerubbabel.
(4) High priest of Jerus in the time of Baruch (Bar 1:7).
(5) High priest in Jerus in the days of Judith who, along with “the ancients of the children of Israel,” welcomed the heroine back to the city after the death of Holofernes (Jdt 4). He cannot be identified with any of the high priests in the lists given in 1 Ch or in Jos, Ant. x, viii, 6. The word means “the Lord hath set up.” It is probably symbolical, and tends with other names occurring in the narrative to establish the supposition that the book was a work of imagination composed to support the faith of the Jews in times of stress and difficulty.

(6) The husband of Susanna (Sus vi 1 ff), perhaps here also a symbolic name. J. HUTCHISON

JOANAN, jô-an’nan (יוֹאָן, יואן; ‘Ioan'; ‘Ioanna, ‘Ioannya; AV Joanna):
(1) A grandson of Zerubbabel in the genealogy of Jesus according to St. Luke (3:27).
(2) The son of Eliasib (1 Eed 9:1 AV, RV “Jonas”).

JOANNA, jô-an’a (יוֹאָנה, יואנה, or ‘Ioanâ, ‘Ioânnâ; AV Johannes):
The wife of Chas; Herod’s steward. She was one of the “women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities” which “ministered unto him [AV, i.e. Jesus, or “them” RV, i.e. Jesus and His disciples of their substance,” on the occasion of Jesus’ tour through Galilee (Lk 8:23).
Along with other women she accompanied Jesus on his last journey from Galilee to Jerus, and was present when His body was laid in the sepulcher (Lk 23:55). She was thus among those who prepared spices and ointments, who found the grave empty, and who “told these things unto the apostles” (Lk 23:56—24:10).

JOANNES, jô-an’es, jô-an’ez (יוֹאָנֶה, יואנֶה; AV Johannes):
(1) Son of Acatan (1 Eed 8:38), called also “Johannes” in 23:8 ff.
(2) Son of Behai (1 Eed 9:29), called “Jehochanan” in Ezr 10:28.

JOARIB, jô-ar’ib (יוֹאָרִיב, יואריב; AV Jarib): Ancestor of Mattathias (1 Mace 14:29), given as “Joarib” in AV of 1 Mace 2:1; he was chief of the first of the 24 courses of priests in the reign of David. Varieties of the name are Jarib, Joarib, and Jehoiarib (1 Ch 24:7).

JOASH, jô’as (יוֹאָשׁ, yô’ash, “Jeh has strength” or “Jeh has bestowed”; AV, Iôâsh):
Gideon declares (6:15) that the family of the Abiezer in Manasseh, words similar to those of Saul (1 S 9:21), and not to be taken too literally. J. would be a man of standing and wealth, for Gideon was able to command 10 servants to destroy the altar and the Asherah (Jgs 6:27:34), and also to summon the whole clan to follow him. Further, the altar that J. had that was used by the community (6:28), so that he would be the priest, not only of his own family qdî paterfamilias, but also of the community in virtue of his position as chief. When Gideon destroyed the altar and the Asherah or sacred pillar by it, J. refused to deliver his son to death, declaring that Baal, if he was a god, should avenge himself (cf Elijah in 1 K 18).
(2) Called “the king’s son” (1 K 22:26; 2 Ch 18:25; cf Jer 36:26; 36:6), or, less probably, “the son of Hammolech,” RV; perhaps a son of Ahab. Micaiah the prophet was handed over to his custody and that of Amon by Ahab.
(3) A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (1 Ch 4:22).
(4) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag.
Commentators read here, “J. the son of Shemaiah [or Jehoshamai], the Gibeathite” (1 Ch 12:3).
(5) In 2 K 11:2, etc, = Joash, king of Judah.
(6) In 2 K 13:9, etc = Jehoash, king of Northern Israel.

JOATHAM, jô-a-thâm (יוֹעַתָם, יְוֹאָתָם; AV for RV “Jotham” (Mt 1:9)). See Jotham (the king).

JOB, jôb (јוֹב, יְיוֹב, meaning of name doubtful; some conjecturing “object of enmity,” others “he who turns,” etc, to God; both uncertain guesses; ‘Iqôb): The titular hero of the Book of Job, represented as a wealthy and pious landholder who lived in patriarchal times, or at least conditions, in the land of Uz, on the borders of Idumaea. Outside of the Book of Job he is mentioned by Ezekiel (Ezk 14:20) as one of 3 great personages whose representative righteousness would presumably avail, if that of any individuals could, to redeem the nation; the other two being Noah, an ancient patriarch, and Daniel, a contemporary of the prophet. It is difficult to determine whether J. was an actual personage or not. If known through legend, it must have been on account of some such experience as is narrated in the book, an experience unique enough to have become a potent household story; still, the power and influence of it is due to the mastery of vivid and pictorial projection of the story. It was the J. of literature, rather than the J. of legend, who lived in the hearts of men; a character so commanding that, albeit fictitious, it could be referred to as real, just as we refer to Hamlet or Othello. It is not the way of Heb writers, however, to evolve literary heroes from pure imagination; they crave an authentic basis of fact. It is probable that such a basis, in its essential outlines, existed under the story of Job. It is not necessary to suppose, however, that the legend or the name was known to Israel from ancient times. Job is introduced (Job 1:1) as if he had not been known before. The writer, who throughout the book shows a wide acquaintance with the world, doubtless found the legend somewhere, and drew its meanings together for an undying message to his and all times.
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LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

The greatest production of the Hebrew Wisdom literature, and one of the supreme literary creations of the world. Its
1. Place in the Canon

The Book of Job was not one of the books designated for public reading in the synagogues, as were the
2. Rank and Readers

It was rather a book for private reading, and one whose subject-matter would appeal esp. to the more cultivated and thoughtful classes.

II. The Literary Framework.

In view of the numerous critical questions by which the interpretation of the book has been clouded—questions of
3. Setting of the Story
4. Place and organization, existed. The Scene

Job, Book of

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

1808

ently among Scripture books it bears the matured literary stamp; both in style and structure it is a

work, not only of spiritual edification, but of
difined literary art. This may best be realized, perhaps, by taking it, as from the outset, if it purports to be, as a continuously maintained story, with the consistent elements of plot, character

scheme, and narrative movement which we naturally associate with a work of the narrator's art.

The story of the Book of Job is laid in the far-off patriarchal age, such a time as we find elsewhere represented only in the Book of Gen;
1. Setting of the Story

A time long before the Israelitish state, with its religious, social and political

The scene is in the free open country, among mountains, wadies, pasture-lands, and rural towns, where the

relations of man and man are more elemental and primitive, and where the things of God are more intimately apprehended than in the complex affairs of city and state. It is easy to see, therefore, how such gains by such a choice of setting. The patriarchal

conditions, wherein the family is the social and communal unit, enable him to portray worship and conduct in their primal elements; religious

rites of the simplest nature, with the unchallenged priest and intercessor (cf I 4:5; 42 8), and without the austere exactions of sanctuary or temple; to represent God, as in the old

folk-stories, as communicating with men in audible voice and in tempest; and to give the patriarch or sheikh a function of counsel and succor in the

community analogous to that of the later wise man or sage (cf ch 29). The place outside the bounds of Pal enables him to give an international or rather intercommunal tissue to his thought, as befits the

character of the wisdom with which he is dealing, a strain of truth which Israel could and did share with neighboring nations. This is made further evi-

dence by the fact that in the discourses of the book, the designation of God is not Jehovah (with one exception, 12:9), but Elohim or Eloah or Shaddai, appellatives rather than names, common to the Sem people. The whole archaic scene serves to detach the story from complex conditions of civilization, and enables the writer to deal with the inherent and

intrinsical elements of manhood.

All the characters of the story, J. included, are from non-Palestinian regions. The chief spokesman of the friends, Eliphaz, who is

character from Teman, is perhaps intended to represent a type of the standard and

orthodox wisdom of the day; Teman, and Edom in general being famed for wisdom (Jer 49:7; Ob vs 8.9). The characters of the friends, while representing several a remark-

able uniformity of tenet, are quite aptly individualized: Eliphaz as a venerable and devout sage who, with his eminent penetrateness of insight, combines a yearning compassion; Bildad more as a scholar versed in the derived lore of tradition; and Zophar more impetuous and dogmatic, with the
dogmatist's vein of intolerance. In Elihu, the young Aramaean who speaks after the others, the writer seems endeavoring to portray a young man's

possessiveness and the awkwardness of conviction, and with it a self-convict that quite outruns his quip. The Satan of the Prologue, who makes the wager

with Jehovah, is masterfully individualized, not as the malignant tempter and enemy of mankind, but as a

spirit composing, impudent skeptic, who can appreciate no motive beyond self-advantage. Even

the wife of J., with her peremptory disposition to
make his affliction a personal issue with God, is not without an authentic touch of the elemental feminine. But high above them all is the character of J. himself, with all its stormy alternations of mood, range of assertion and remonstrance and growth of new conviction, remains absolutely consistent with itself. Nor can we leave unmentioned what is perhaps the hardest achievement of all, the sublime venture of giving the very words of God, in such a way that He speaks no word out of character nor measures His thought according to the standards of man.

The Prologue, chs 1 and 2, a few verses at the beginning of ch 3 (ve 1-8a), and the Epilogue (42 7-17) are written in narrative prose. The rest of the book contains the short sentences introducing the speakers is in poetry: a poetical tissue conforming to the type of the later mishah (see under Proverbs), which in continuous series of couplets, is admirably adapted alike to imaginative sublimity and impassioned address. Beginning with J.'s curse of his day (ch 3), J. and his three friends answer each other back and forth in three rounds of speeches. To complete the subject, which is for reasons which the subject makes apparent, Zophar, the third friend, fails to join in time. After the friends are thus put to silence, J. speaks three times in succession (chs 26—31), and then "the words of J. are ended. At this point, for the first time, the speaker, Eliphaz, hitherto unmentioned, is introduced and speaks four times, when he answers J. at an approaching whirlwind (37, 44). J. speaks from the whirlwind, two speeches, each of which J. answers briefly (40 3-5; 42 1-6), or rather, he does not answer. Such, which we may now marize in Prologue (chs 1, 2), Body of Discussion (3-42), and Epilogue (42 7-17), is the literary framework of the book. The substance of the book is in a way dramatic; it cannot, however, be called so truly a drama as a kind of formless debate; its movement is too rigid for dramatic action, and it lacks besides the give-and-take of dialogue. In a hint of the dramatic, I would venture to call it "The Epic of the Inner Life," epic not so much in the technical sense, as in its effect. He is a work of fundamental significance may be compared to the story underlying the Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus. It will not be too much of either of these forms as designating the Book of Job; either term has to be accommodated almost out of recognition, because the Hebrew literary forms were not conceived according to the Gr categories from which our terms come. "Drama" and "dramatic" are derived. A great advantage on our appreciation of its form, I think, is imposed by those who regard it as a mixture of forms. It is too generally divided between narrative and didactic debate. To the Heb mind it was all a continuous narrative, in which the plot was a kind of frame. The cycle of visualized action, had nevertheless the movement and value which is in this light, rather than in the didactic, that we may most profitably regard it.

III. The Course of the Story. — To divide the story of J. into 42 parts, according to the 42 numbered chapters, is in the last degree arbitrary. Nothing comes of it except convenience in reading for those who wish to take their Job in little detached bits. The chapter division was no part of the original, and a very insignificant step in the later apprehension of the original. To divide according to the speeches of the interlocutors is better; it helps us realize how the conflict of views brings the various phases of the thought to expression; but this too, with its tempting three-times-three, turns out to be merely a framework; it corresponds only imperfectly with the true inwardsness of the story's movement; it is rather a scheme than a continuity. We are to bear in mind that this Book of Job is fundamentally the inner experience of one man, as he rises from the depths of spiritual gloom and doubt to a majestic table-land of new insight and faith; the other characters are but ancillary, helps and foils which are subordinate and relative. Hence, mindful of this inwardsness of Job's experience, I have ventured to trace the story in 5 main stages, naming them according to the landing-stage attained in each.

The story begins (1 1-5) with a brief description of J. as he was before his trial began; the elements of his life, outer and inner, on which is to be raised the question of motive. A prosperous landholder of the land of U, distinguished far and wide as the greatest (1:1). A blessing and a curse (1:5). To J.'s of the East, his inner character corresponds: to all appearance nothing lacking, a man "perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and turned away from evil." The typical Heb blessings of life were his to the full: wealth, honor, health, family. He is evidently set before us as the perfect example of the validity of the established Wisdom-tenet, that righteousness and Wisdom are identical (see under Proverbs, The Book), and this is manifest in its visible rewards. This period of his life J. describes afterward by retrospect as his "autumn days," when the friendship or intimacy (ad, g'dh) of God was over his tent (see 29 4, and the whole ch). Nor are we left without a glimpse into his heart: his constant attitude of worship, and his tender solicitude lest, in their enjoyment of the pleasures of life, his sons may have been disloyal to God (4-5). It is easy to see that not J. alone, but Wisdom as embodied in J., is postulated here for its supreme test.

Nor is the test delayed, or its ground ambiguous when it comes. Satan proposes it. Two scenes are given (1 6-12; 2 1-6) from the court of God, wherever that is; for although they are overheard by the reader, not seen, and of course neither J. nor any inhabitant of earth is aware of them. In these scenes the sons of God, the spirits who rejoiced over creation (38 7), are come together to render report, and Satan, uninvited, enters among them. He is a questioning spirit, unanchored to any allegiance, who roams through the earth, prying and criticizing. There is nothing, it would seem, in which he cannot find some flaw or discount. To J.'s question if he has considered J., the man perfect and upright, he makes no denial of the fact, but raises the issue of motive: "Doth J. fear God for nought?" and urges that J.'s integrity is after all only a transparent bargain, a paying investment with only reward in view. It is virtually an arrangement of power and status, of earthly relation. The essential human character: of God's order in connecting righteousness so intimately with gain; and of the essential human character, virtually denying that there is such a thing as disinterested, intrinsic human virtue. The answer perhaps does not the perfect embodiment of human virtue, is its designated victim. Satan proposes a wager, to the issue of which Jch commits Himself. The trial of J. is carried out in two stages: first against his property and family, with the stipulation that it is not to touch him; and then, this failing to detach him from his allegiance, against his person in sore disease, with the stipulation that his life is to be spared. Jeh acknowledges that for once He is consenting to an injustice (2 3), and Satan, liar that he is, uses instrumentalities that men have ascribed to God alone: the first time, tempest and lightning (as well as murderous foray), the second time, the black leprosy, a fell disease, loathsome and deadly, which in men's minds means the very stroke of God. The evil is as absolute as was the reward; a complete reversal of the order in which men's wisdom had come to trust. But in the immediate result, Jeh's in faith in His noblest creature is vindicated. Urged by his wife in his extremity to "curse God and die," J. remains true to his allegiance; and in his staunch utterance, "Jeh gave, and Jeh hath taken away; blessed be the name of Jeh," J., as the writer puts it, "sinned not, nor attributed to unrevealing [m'p, t'phlkh, lit. "tastless"]
1. The Veiled Impeachment

Imply that J.'s Turbulence of Mind precedes him from similar revelations, andJeopards his soul (5:12); advises him to commit his case to God, with the implication, however, that it is a case needing correction rather than justification, and that the result in view is a more passionate and detailed portrayal of his wrong, Bildad, following, abandoning the indirect impeachment and attributes the children's death to their sin (8:4), saying also that if J. were pure and upright he might supplicate and regain God's favor (8:6). He then goes on to draw a lesson from the traditional Wisdom lore, to the effect that sure destruction awaits the wicked and sure felicity the righteous (11:11-22). On J.'s following this with his most positive arraignment of God's order and claim for light, Zophar replies with impetuous heat, averring that J.'s punishment is less than he deserves (11:6), and reproving him for his presumption in trying to find the secret of God (11:7-12). All three of the friends, with increasing emphasis, end their admonitions in much the same way; promising J.'s reinstatement in God's favor, but always with the veiled implication that he must own to iniquity and treat as a sinner.

To the general maxims of Wisdom urged against him, with what vehemence and vehemence (of 13:2), J.'s objection is not that they are

2. Wisdom untrue, but that they are insipid.

Insipid, (6:7); they have lost their application to the case. Yet it is pain to him to think that the words of the Holy One should fail; he longs to die rather than deny them (6:9,10). One poignant element of his sorrow is that the intuitive sense (dāšīyāq; see under Fauvoralis, Tan 'Book of') is driven away from him; see 6:15. He raises the insinuating way in which the friends beg the question of his guilt; loan for forthright and sincere words (6:25). It is this quality of their speech, in fact, which adds the bitterness to his cup; his friends, on whom he had counted for support, are deceitful like a dried-up brook (6:15-20); he feels, in his sick sensibility, that they are not sympathizing with him but using him for their cold, calculating purposes (6:27). Thus is introduced one of the most potent motives of friendship; much will come of it when from the fallible friendships of earth he conquers his way by faith to a friendship in the unseen (6:19; 19:27).

With the sense that the old theories have become stale and pointless, though his discourses of the evil things is undulled by sin (6:30), J. arrives at an extremely poignant realization of the hardness and crookedness of the world-order, the result both of what the friends are saying and of what he has always held in common with them. It is the view that is forced upon him by the sense that he is unjustly dealt with by a God who renders no reasons, who on the score of justice vouchsafes to man neither insight nor recourse, and whose severity is out of all proportion to man's sense of worth (7:17) or right (9:17) or claim as a creature of His hand (10:8-14). Ch 9, which contains J.'s direct address to this arbitrary Being, is one of the most tremendous, not to say audacious conceptions in literature; in which a mortal on the threshold of death takes upon himself to read God a lesson in godliness. In this part of the story J. reaches his ultimatum of protest; a protest amusingly sincere, but not when we realize that it is made in the interest of the Godlike.

The great lack which J. feels in his arraignment of God is the lack of mediation between Creator and creature, the Oppressor and His victim.
is no umpire between them, who may lay his hand upon both, so that the wronged one might have a voice in the matter (9 32-35). The
4. No Mediation in Sight to remove God's afflicting hand, and to prevent God's terror from unmanning His victim (see 13 20-22, as compared with the passage just cited), are the great need to restore normal and reciprocal relations with Him whose demand of righteousness is so inexorable. This umpire or advocate idea, thus propounded negatively, will grow to a sublime positive conviction in the next stage of J.'s spiritual progress (16 19; 19 25-27).
4. The Inqviring, to the Theirs, what Detect- and a recur need pared for Mediation this.
and mendous which they false does favor him in the 19; 13-17), but returning to his reluctant negative, from the analogy of drying waters (14 11) and the slow wearing down of mountains (14 18.19). As yet he can treat the idea only as a fancy; not yet a hope or a grounded confidence.

and the conviction comes by a nobler way than fancy, by the way of his personal sense of the just and Godlike order. The friends in their second round of speeches have begun to use the grandeur of the human being as the base for the great problem, and to aim at the most far momentous matter. Discarding these for the present as an academic exercise composed in cold blood (18 4.5), and evincing a heart hid from understanding (17 4), he goes on to recount the most bitter terms he has yet used the flagrancy of his wrong as something that calls out for expiation like the blood of Cain (16 18), and breaks out with the conviction that his witness and voucher who will hear his prayer for mediation is on high (16 19-21). Then after Bildad in a spiteful retort has matched his complaint with a description of the calamities of the wicked (an augmented echo of Eliphaz), and his has pathetically explained the treachery of earthly friends (13.14.21-22) and mounts, as it were, at a bound to the sublime ultimatum of his faith in an utterance which he would fain see engraved on the rock forever (19 23-29).

"I know that my Redeemer liveth," he exclaims; lit. my Go'el ("p25, g044b), or next of kin, the person whose business in the old life idea was to maintain the rights of an innocent wronged one and avenge his blood. He does not recede from the idea that his wrong is from God (cf 19 6.21); but over his dust stands his next of kin, and as the result of this one's intercession J.'s, in his own integral person, shall see God no more a stranger. So confident is he that he solemnly warns the friends who have falsely impeached him that it is they, not he, who are in peril (19 28.29; cf 13 10.11).
That in this conviction of a living Redeemer J.'s faith has reached firm and final ground is evident from the fact that he does not recur to his old doubts at all. They are settled, and settled right. But now, leaving them, he can attend to the things as the friends have been brought to Zophar, the third speaker, following, presses to vehement extreme their iterated portrayal of the wicked man's terrific woes; it seems the design of the writer to make them outdo themselves in the transformation of their thesis. As Zophar ceases, and J. has thus, as it were, drawn all their fire, J. refutes them squarely, as we shall presently see. Meanwhile, in the course of his extended refutation, the friends begin a third round of speeches. Eliphaz, the Friends whose already taken alarm at the climax and sub- tenancy of J.'s words, as those of a degraded and ruinous to devotion (15 4-6), now in the interests of his orthodoxy brings in his bill of particulars. It is the kind of theoretical cant that has had large prevalence in dogmatic religion, but in J.'s case atrociously false. He accuses J. of the most heartless cruelties and frauds (22.5-11), and demands that J. should indulge in secret wickedness when God was not looking (22 12-14); to this it is that he attributes the spiritual darkness with which J. is encompassed.
Then in a beautiful exhortation—beautiful when we forget its unreal condition (22 29)—he ends by holding open to J. the way of the secret face. This is the last word of the friends that has any weight. Bildad follows J.'s next speech indeed very briefly (ch 25), giving a last feeble echo of their doctrine of total depravity; a reply which
J. ridicules and carries on in a kind of parody (ch 26). Zophar does not speak a third time at all. He has nothing to say. And this silence of his is the writer's way of making the friends' theory subside into impotence. The idea that J. has a defensible cause or sees farther than they is wholly lost on the friends; to them he is simply a wicked man tormented by the consciousness of guilt, and they attribute the tumult of his thoughts to a wrath, or vexation, which blinds and imperils his soul (cf 5 2; 18 4). That is not the cause of his dismay at all, nor is it merely that his personal fate is inscrutable (cf 23 17 m). He is confounded rather, even to horror, because the probable facts of the world-order prove the utter falsity of all that they allege. Leaving his case, the righteous man's, out of the account, he sees the wicked just as prosperous, just as secure, just as honored in life and death, as the righteous (21 5 15 29 35). The friends ought to see so plain a fact as well as he (31 29). To all outward appearance there is absolutely no diversity of fate between righteous and wicked (21 25 26). The friends' cut-and-dried Wisdom and their doctrine about God's purpose (cf 13 7 8) have landed them in a lie; the truth is that God has left His times mysterious to men (34 1). They may as well own to the full the baffling fact of the impunity of wickedness; the whole of ch 31, with its allusions to the same theme and its overwhelming calmness of tone, is an act of Wisdom, with its rigid law of reward and punishment, has failed to penetrate the secret. A hard regime of justice, work and wages, conduct and desert, does not sound the deep truth of God's dealings, either with righteous or wicked. Truth then, shall Wisdom go, or shall it rise to a higher level of outlook and insight? In some such dim inquiry as this, it would seem, J. goes on from where his friends sit silenced to figure some possible solution of things as they are. He begins with himself and his self-righteously held integrity, sealing his utterance by the solemn oath (37 2 6), and so solemnly do avowing all part or sympathy with the wicked (37 7; cf 21 16). He has already found a meaning in his own searching experience; he is being tried for a sublime assay, in which all that is permanent and precious in him shall come out as gold (33 10). But if the trial of man's integrity and the value of his; it may hold for all. What then of the wicked? In a passage which some have deemed the lost third speech of Zophar (37 8 23), and which, indeed, recounts what all the friends have seen (37 12), he sets forth the case of the wicked in its true light. The gist of it is that the wicked have not the joy of God (37 10), or the peace of a permanent hope. It is in much the same tone as the friends' diatribes, but with a distinct advance from outward disaster toward tendency and futility. The ore is not being purged for a noble assay; and this will work their woe. Then finally, in the celebrated ch 28, comes up the summary of wisdom itself. That remains, after all this testing of motive, a thing intact and elemental; and man's part in it is just what J.'s life has been, to fear God and shun evil (28 28).

As the crowning pronouncement on things as they are, J. in his final and longest speech, describes in his own words the contrasted life of Job and his friends. The typical life of a suffering man, youthin and pain, and the way in which this is brought to bear. The life of the typical friend, the friend who would be a friend and comforter, and the way in which this is brought to bear.

4. Job. From his "autumn days" when the Reads His friendship of God was over his tent Indictment and he was a counselor and benefactor among men (ch 29), through this contrasted time of his wretchedness and curse-betraying disease, when the most degraded disgrace him (ch 30), until now as he draws conscience near the grave, he recounts in solemn review the principles and virtues that have guided his conduct—a noble summary of the highest Heb ideals of character (ch 31). This he calls, in his indictment which his Adversary has written; and like a prince, bearing it upon his shoulder and binding it to him like a crown, he is ready to take it with him beyond the bourn to the presence of his Judge.

With this tremendous proposal, sanctified and fashioned by a final curse if it prove false, the words of the J. are ended.

The friends are silenced, not enlightened. They have clung to their hard thesis to the stubborn end; postulating enough overt crime on J.'s part to kill him (22 5 9), and clinching their hypothesis with their theory of 
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innate depravity (4 18 19; 16 14 15; 26 4 6) and spiritual hebetude (5 2; 15 26 27; 22 10 11); but toward J.'s higher level of honest integrity and exploring faith they have not advanced one inch; and here they lie, fossilised dogmatists, fixed and inveterate in their oedum theologum—a far cry from the friendship that came from afar to condole and console. J., His doctrine, his lofty conceptions of religious integrity, has held on his way in sturdy consistency (cf 17 9), and stood his ground before the enigma of things as they are. Both parties have said their say; the story is evidently ready for its dénouement. Taken up, with its rigid law of reward and punishment, has failed to penetrate the secret. A hard régime of justice, work and wages, conduct and desert, does not sound the deep truth of God's dealings, either with righteous or wicked. Truth then, shall Wisdom go, or shall it rise to a higher level of outlook and insight? In some such dim inquiry as this, it would seem, J. goes on from where his friends sit silenced to figure some possible solution of things as they are. He begins with himself and his stedfastly held integrity, sealing his utterance by the solemn oath (37 2 6), and so solemnly do avowing all part or sympathy with the wicked (37 7; cf 21 16). He has already found a meaning in his own searching experience; he is being tried for a sublime assay, in which all that is permanent and precious in him shall come out as gold (33 10). But if the trial of man's integrity and the value of his; it may hold for all. What then of the wicked? In a passage which some have deemed the lost third speech of Zophar (37 8 23), and which, indeed, recounts what all the friends have seen (37 12), he sets forth the case of the wicked in its true light. The gist of it is that the wicked have not the joy of God (37 10), or the peace of a permanent hope. It is in much the same tone as the friends' diatribes, but with a distinct advance from outward disaster toward tendency and futility. The ore is not being purged for a noble assay; and this will work their woe. Then finally, in the celebrated ch 28, comes up the summary of wisdom itself. That remains, after all this testing of motive, a thing intact and elemental; and man's part in it is just what J.'s life has been, to fear God and shun evil (28 28).

As the crowning pronouncement on things as they are, J. in his final and longest speech, describes in his own words the contrasted life of a suffering man, youthin and pain, and the way in which this is brought to bear. The life of the typical friend, the friend who would be a friend and comforter, and the way in which this is brought to bear.

For this determining pronouncement the writer has chosen to have both parties definitely represented, apparently at their best. So, instead of proceeding at once to the Self-consti-tuted Interpreter summons from the whirlwind, he introduces here a new character, Elihu, a young man, who, with growing impatience to the fruitless discussion, and now must set both parties right or burst (32 19). It is like the infusion of young blood into a thought (too arrogant in its antiquity of 8 8 10; 16 10 18; 19 11), that is, of passion. This character of Elihu is conceived in a spirit of satire, not without a dash of grim humor. His self-confidence, not to say conceit, is strongly accentuated (32 11 23); he assumes the umpire function for which J. has pleaded (33 6 7; cf 9 33 35; 13 20 22); and is sure he represents the perfect in knowledge (36 2 4; 37 16). He speaks four times, addressing himself alternately to J. and the friends. His words, though designedly diffuse, are not without wisdom and beauty; he makes less of J.'s deep-seated iniquity than do the friends, but blames him for speaking in the wicked man's idiom (34 7 9 36 37), and warns him against inclining more to iniquity than submission (36 21); but his positive contribution to the discussion is the view he holds of the chastening influence of dreams and visions (33 14 18; cf 7 13 15), and of the pains of disease (33 19 28), esp. if the sufferer has an angel [messenger] interpreter to reveal its meaning, such a one, he has impressed upon himself to be. As he proceeds in his speech, his words indicate that a storm is rising; and so long as it is distant he employs it to descend on the wondrous of God in Nature, wonders which to him mean little more than arbitrary marvels of power; but as it approaches near, and shows exceptional phenomena
as of a theophany, his words become incoherent, and he breaks off with an abrupt attack to disclaim his pretensions. Such is the effect, with him, of the near presence of God. It overpowers, paralyzes, stops the presumptuous current of life.

The writer of the book has not committed the literary fatuity of describing the whirlwind, except as Eliphaz has seen it on coming, first with concept of knowledge, then with wild access of terror—a description in which his essentially vapid personality is reflected. For the readers the sign of the thing that is wind is in the Voice. Voice it incloses, the thing it says. And here the writer has undertaken the most tremendous task ever attempted by the human imagination: to make the Almighty speak, and speak in character. And one faculty at least he has escaped; he has not made God bandy arguments with men, or piece together the shifting premises of logic. The whole of the two discourses from the whirlwind is descriptive; a recounting of observable phenomena of created nature from the great elemental things, earth and sea and light and star and storm, to the varied wonders of animal nature—all things in which the questing mind of man may share, laying hold in his degree on its meaning or mystery. Thus, as a poetic literary personation, it fails at no point of the Godlike. It begins with the dismission of Eliphaz: "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" (38:2). Then J. is hidden gird up his loins like a strong man, and listen and answer. The fact that J. alone, of all the company, can stand as it were, to terms with God is premonitory of the outcome. Of the two Divine discourses, the first (chs. 38, 39) emphasizes more especially the unsearchable wisdom of creation; and the lesson it brings home to J. is that a being who is great enough—or presumptuous enough—to criticize and censure is great enough to resolve his own criticism (40:2). To this, of course, J. has no answer; he has presented his plea, which he neither adds to nor takes back (40:3-5). Resuming, then, the Voice in the second discourse (40:6—41:34) goes on to describe two great beasts, as it were, elemental monsters of Nature: Behemoth—probably the hippopotamus—vast in resisting and overcoming power, yet aware of its inferiority and its presence and pain. To the other Leviathan—a wonder of beautiful adaptedness to its function in Nature, yet utterly malignant, unsubdueable, untamable. And the lesson brought home to J. by this strange distribution of creative power is that he, who has called in question God's right to work as He does, had better undertake to lower human pride and "tread down the wicked where they stand" (40:12), thus demonstrating his ability to save himself and manage mankind. For, as it were, J. thought J.'s trenchancy of demand is utterly melted away into contrition and penitence (42:1-6); but one inspiring effect is his, the thing indeed which he has persistently sought (cf. 33:9); God is no more a hearsey, such as the friends have defended and his Wisdom has speculated about; his eye sees Him here on earth, and in his still unremoved affliction, no stranger, but a wise and communable Friend, just as his confidant faith had pictured him, in some embodied sphere beyond the sphere of the parties in the story have met the august theophany, and it has wrought its effect on them according to the spirit of the man. The self-constituted interpreter, Eliphaz, finally stands as suddenly as he swelled up and exhibited himself. The man of integrity, J., has reached the beatific goal of his quest. What now of the friends who came from far to confirm their wisdom, and if he would return from iniquity and acquaint himself with God (23:30); J. is now the mediator, though he has held consistently to the terms they reproposed. And the Divine verdict on them is: "Ye have not spoken of me the way my servant J. hath spoken. These are the words of the Being who acknowledged that in permitting this whole trial He was 'swallowing Job up causelessly' (2:3). J.'s honest and immensely revelatory words, anger, remonstrance, bold arraignment of God's way and all, were 'the thing that is right.' There is no more tremendous Divine pronouncement in all Scripture than this.

Here certain myopic students of the Book of Job think the story should end. It offends them, apparently, to see Satan's work undone. The author, at least his final author, evidently did not think so: in the description of the theophany, one of the strangest kindnesses that prevailed in his age he knew better what he was about. It is not my business to cut the book to a modern pattern, but to note what is there. J. is restored to health, to double his former wealth, to family and home; and his old age. These were what the friends predicted for him on condition of his owning to guilt and calling injustice desert; but in no word of his has he intimated that worldly reinstatement was his wish or his object, the contrary rather. And what he sought he obtained, in richer measure than he sought; obtained it still in suffering, and on earth, "in the place where all may see" (cf. 34:26 m.). It is no discount to the value of this, nor on the other hand is it an essential addition, to express it not only in spiritual terms, but in terms current among men. And one fundamental thing this restored situation shows, or at least takes for granted, namely, that the quarral has not been with Wisdom, or its sanctions, but only with its encroaching false motive. Deepened, not invaded, its Newtonian law that it is well with the righteous, ill with the wicked, remains intact, an external sanction to live by, in spite of temporal exceptions. A spiritual principle of great significance, too, seems to be indicated, as it were, sputively, in the words, "And Jeh turned the captivity of J., when he prayed for his friends." He had stood on his integrity demanding his right, and became a self-asserting penitent; out of dust and ashes he prayed for others; so God, and became again such a power in health and wealth as he had been in his "autumn days."

IV. The Problem and the Purpose.—If the foregoing section has rightly shown the main thrust and interest of the Book of Job

1. Beyond its problem and its purpose. The sublime self-portrayal of a man who held fast his integrity, his God, and darkness tells its own story and teaches its own lesson, beyond the power of didactic propositions or deductions to compass. The Book is not a sermon but a vital, throbbing uprise of the human spirit. It is warm, wild, sudden. What is the inner life with its hopes, its doubts, its convictions, its supreme assurance; to impose on this any tether of didacticism is to chill its spirit and make it dog
matic and academic. The reading of its purpose which mainly holds the field today is expressed in the question, 'Why does God afflict the righteous?' and the book is used, like the book of Job in the old dispensation, as a justificaton of God's ways with man. Well, the friends of J. do their best to make their interpretation a theodicy, even outraging palpable fact to do it; they monopolize the didactic element of the poem, but the book is a poem. God does not afflict the righteous but the wicked, and that J. is a flagrant case in point who adds rebellion to his sin (cf. 34-37). J. does not know why God afflicts the righteous; he only knows that it is a grievous fact, which to him seems utterly un-Godlike, but J. knows, undoubtedly, but He does not tell. Yet all the while an answer to the question is shaping itself in personality, in intrinsic manhood, in the sturdy truth and loyalty of J.'s spirit. So, going beyond the didactic teth, we may say that in a deeper sense God is justified after all; if such a result of desperate trial is possible in man, it is worth all the rigor of the experiment. But it is as truly an anthropodicy (excuse the word!) as a theodicy: it puts the essential fact on a plane where Satan can prove by his lying sneers of self-interest, or the friends' poisoning of the wells by their theory of natural depravity. It comes back all to the story of J.: he lives the answer to the problem, his personality is the teaching.

We can best judge of the critical attacks that have been made on the structure and coherence of the Book of Job. The book has suffered its full share of negative didactic integration at the hands of the critics; mostly subjective it seems to me, arising from a too restricted view of its problem and purpose, or from lack of that long patient induction which will not be content until it sees all the elements of its creative idea in its proper order and proportion. To limit the purpose to the issue of a debated theodicy, is to put some parts in precarious tenure; accordingly, there are those to whom the Epilogue seems a superficiality, the Prologue an afterthought, ch. 28 a fugitive poem put in to fill up—not to go on to still more radical excisions. On the score of regularity of structure, too, this limitation of design has had equally grave results. Eliphaz has perhaps sense. God is judged after all; if such a result of desperate trial is possible in man, it is worth all the rigor of the experiment. But it is as truly an anthropodicy (excuse the word!) as a theodicy: it puts the essential fact on a plane where Satan can prove by his lying sneers of self-interest, or the friends' poisoning of the wells by their theory of natural depravity. It comes back all to the story of J.: he lives the answer to the problem, his personality is the teaching.

2. What Comes of Limiting the Purpose

3. The Book of God or Not for? is set on the track of import of it. To give that question a Godlike purpose and not a Satanic answer, to prove in the person of J. that man has in him to make his life an unbroken loyalty to the Divine, a purpose large enough to include many subsidiary purposes. But behind this appears, on the part of the author, a purpose which relates his story intimately to the intellectual tendencies of his day. The poems of Job, e.g., the Proverbs, a searching exegesis of the status to which the wisdom philosophy of his time had arrived. That philosophy was a nobly founded theory of life; J. himself had been and continued (cf. 28-29) thoroughly at one with it. Soundly identified with righteousness, wisdom, wisdom defined the elements of right and wrong living, and had in no uncertain terms fixed its sanctions of reward and penalty. But from a warm, pulsating life it had become an orthodoxy. Its rigid world view was: the righteous, bound for the sure rewards of life; the wicked, bound for sure failure and destruction. It brooked no real exception to this austere law of being. But two grave evils were invading its system: one was its hard blindness to facts, or, what is as bad, its determination at all hazards to explain them away. From the psalms of the period (cf. e.g. Ps. 37, 49, 73) we can see how the evident happiness and prosperity of the wicked was troubling doubt in Job's mind. The other was that J.'s teaching philosophy of life was becoming too cold-blooded and calculable a thing, a virtual feeder of self-interest. The doubt lay very near whether conduct so sanctioned was a thing intrinsic and sincere or a thing bought and sold. This equivocal state of things could not long endure. Sooner or later Satan's question of motive must stave it to the heart; and we may be sure that to the author of the book the impulse to ask the question was not all Satanic. The interests of true wisdom, an on a plane of personality, a4. Theodicy and Intrinsic Man

In other words, the problem is more deeply concerned with man's intrinsic nature than with God's mysterious dealings. When God created man in His own image, did He endow him most fundamentally with the spirit of commercialism, or with the spirit of un bought loyalty to the Godlike? And when created man was made fallible and mortal, did that mean an unescapable inherent depravity, or was the potency of noblest manhood still left at the center of his being, further, Zophar would bring no help to him out. I need not go into further detail. The foundation is something, I hope, to justify my conviction that the book has a homogeneous design and structure just as it is. Whatever its vicissitudes since the first draft was made, it may turn out after all that the last edition is the best.

We are not left in the dark as to the large purpose of the Book of Job, if we will follow its own indications consistently. Satan's question at the beginning, 'Doth Job fear God for nought?' sets us on the track of import of it. To give that question a Godlike purpose and not a Satanic answer, to prove in the person of J. that man has in him to make his life an unbroken loyalty to the Divine, a purpose large enough to include many subsidiary purposes. But behind this appears, on the part of the author, a purpose which relates his story intimately to the intellectual tendencies of his day. The poems of Job, e.g., the Proverbs, a searching exegesis of the status to which the wisdom philosophy of his time had arrived. That philosophy was a nobly founded theory of life; J. himself had been and continued (cf. 28-29) thoroughly at one with it. Soundly identified with righteousness, wisdom defined the elements of right and wrong living, and had in no uncertain terms fixed its sanctions of reward and penalty. But from a warm, pulsating life it had become an orthodoxy. Its rigid world view was: the righteous, bound for the sure rewards of life; the wicked, bound for sure failure and destruction. It brooked no real exception to this austere law of being. But two grave evils were invading its system: one was its hard blindness to facts, or, what is as bad, its determination at all hazards to explain them away. From the psalms of the period (cf. e.g. Ps. 37, 49, 73) we can see how the evident happiness and prosperity of the wicked was troubling doubt in Job's mind. The other was that J.'s teaching philosophy of life was becoming too cold-blooded and calculable a thing, a virtual feeder of self-interest. The doubt lay very near whether conduct so sanctioned was a thing intrinsic and sincere or a thing bought and sold. This equivocal state of things could not long endure. Sooner or later Satan's question of motive must stave it to the heart; and we may be sure that to the author of the book the impulse to ask the question was not all Satanic. The interests of true wisdom, an on a plane of personality, a

5. Considerations of Age and Setting.—The questions who was the personal author of the Book of Job, and what was its age, are at 1. Shadowy Contacts with History.—I wrote my Epic of the Inner Life, must go for what it is worth. It seems to me much better to regard a story so homogeneous and interrelated as in the main the composition of one mind than to distribute it, as some critics do, among various authors, supplementers to its stories and theories. The identification of an identifiable contact with political or ecclesiastical history that its composition has been ascribed to many periods, from the time of Abraham to late in post-exilic times. The fact that its scene is laid in the patriarchal past and in a land outside of Pal indicates the ad in religious and contemporary events and conditions; such contact
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with these as exist, therefore, must be read between the lines. The book does not hold with full consistency to patriarchal conditions. Job's friends appeal with the complemency of wisdom-prospered men to an ancient tenure of the land (16: 10); and yet, as Job explains, their landholding class in removing landmarks and oppressing the poor (24: 2-12) connotes the prevalence of such outrages as were denounced by Isaiah and Micah before the Assyrian crisis. Such evils would not decrease under the new imperial order. As FabriciusKraeling, this might well be portrayed in reminiscence by an exile writer. On the top of this consideration may be cited the most definite reference to a historical event that the book contains: the passage 12: 17-25, which vividly describes, by an eye-witness ("Lo, mine eye hath seen all this," 13: 1), a wholesale deportation and humiliation of eminent persons, just like that told of Jehoiachin and his court, in 2 K 24: 18-15. To my mind this is illuminative for the age of the book. It seems to have been written by one who saw the Chaldean deportation of 587 BC. May I be suffered to carry the suggestion a step farther? It will be remembered that the chief personage of that deportation was a state prisoner in Babylon, at the end of which time he was "taken from durance and judgment" (cf Isa 53: 14) and lived thenceforth honored with kings (2 K 25: 27-30 = Jer 52: 31-34). I take him to have been the original of the individualized Servant of Jehovah described and describing himself in Second Isa. In one of his self-descriptions he says that Jehovah has given him "the tongue of them that are taught" (Isa 50: 4); in another that Jehovah has made his "mouth like a sharp sword" and himself "a polished shaft" (Isa 49: 2). What he seeks or woos in his unceasing course unfruitful; but it is certain that in some cultural way he was a hidden power for good to his people. What if this Book of Job were a prison-made book, like Pilgrim's Progress and Don Quixote, but as much greater as the experience that underlay it was more momentous? I do not see but this suggestion is as probable as any that have been made; and some expressions of the book become thereby very striking, as, for instance, the reference to prisoners (3: 18-19), to the event, or ringing in memory of the release (7: 2), the genuine sense of being despised, the several references to Job as "my servant Job" or "my servant Job" (1: 8; 2: 3; 42: 7, 8), the description of his restoration as a turned captivity, and his successful intercession for the friends (42: 10 = Isa 53: 12). I would merely suggest the idea, however, not press it.

If the Book of Job is a product of the time of Jehovah's imprisonment, it is in worthy and congenial literary company. Isaiah, fostering the faith of a new-born spiritual "remnant," had gathered the elements of that sublime vision (Isa 1: 1) of Israel's mission among the nations which a later hand was even now, four generations after, working to supplement and finish. In a prophecy (Isa 40-66) which, as all recognize, constitutes the closest parallel in inspired idea to our book, Seers, priests and sages, have been busied themselves with the literary treasures of the past; drawing out of dusty archives and putting into popular idiom the ancient laws and counsels of Moses (De; see under JOSUAI); collecting and adapting the old Davidic psalms and composing new ones, as Hezekiah's reorganization of the worship required. Essekil was at Tel-Abib planning for the reconstruction of the temple, and his brother Huldah, by the use of the name "Abi" and "Abijam," veiling a cryptic reference (Ezk 14: 20). The affilations of the Book of Job, however, were more specifically with the literary and long before the "men of Hezekiah" (Prov 25: 1) had gathered their aftermarriage. The book contains the themes which had been the educational pabulum of the people (see under PROVERBS, BOOK OF). It was with this spirit of this diffused instruction, now the most popular vein of literature, that the Book of Job concerned himself. And the manner in which the maxims were coordinated in an anthology, and an introduction to the collection had been composed,

extolling Wisdom as the guide and savor of life. To a spiritually-minded thinker with the Job genius for religion the motivation of Wisdom's teaching must have come. With its values should be apprehended also its unguided points and tendencies. It was exposed to the one-sided drift of all popular literature; only the revision and deeper insight were the literary order of the day. Wisdom was furnished with the older literature for purification and maturing; and there was not wanting an experience, the basis of an almost unbelievable report (cf Is 33: 1) to give a touch of dignity to Job's personal story of suffering and integrity.

In the amazing sureness and vigor of its message the Book of Job stands out unique and alone; but it is by no means without its lesser 3. Parallels parallels in faith and doubt, above and Echoes which it rises like a thunderous cataract have its retinue of foothills. Mention has been made above of a number of Ps (e.g. 37, 49, 73) which with different degrees of assurance witness to the struggle of faith with the problem of the rampant and successful wicked. Ps 49, one of the psalms of the sons of Korah, is esp. noteworthy, because it expressly employs the popular meshal, that is, the Wisdom vehicle, to convey a corrective lesson about unblest riches, drawing a conclusion not unlike that of Job 27: 8-23, though on a different basis. Not less noteworthy also is the note of suffering and its mysteriousness which pervades many of the ps, esp. of Asaph and Heman. Ps 88 and 102 might both have been composed with special reference to Hezekiah's sickness and set beside his sagas (Isa 38: 8-20); but also they are so fully in the tone of J's complaint, esp. 88, that Professor Godet, not unplausibly, conjectures that the Book of Job was written by its author Heman. Hezekiah's deadly sickness itself (Isa 38), which rises out of his leprous nature, banishing him from the house of God, and which was miraculously healed—an experience regarding which Hezekiah's own writing (Isa 38: 10-20) is strikingly in the key of Job's complaint—furnishes the nearest parallel to, or adumbration of, Job's affliction; but also in the accounts of the Servant of Jehovah there are hints of a similar stroke of God's judgment (cf Isa 52: 14; 53: 3). The passage Job 17: 18 has been called "a bitter parody" of Ps 8: 4; it may be so, but the conditions are in utter contrast, and nothing can be concluded as to which is original and which echo. As to expression, the most remarkable parallel to Job, perhaps, is the passage Jer 20: 14-18, in which, like Job, the prophet of Jeremiah curses the day of his birth; and, as Job would naturally be remembered by all readers as one of the most characteristic features of the book; and in like manner the curse in Jer may have stood out in the memory of his disciples, of whom the writer of Job may have been one, or adumbration of a similar literary situation. Essekil's naming of Job along with Noah and Daniel (Ezk 14: 20), as a type of atoning righteousness, is doubly remarkable if the writer of Job was a contemporary; he may have taken the name from his kinsman Job; and there may have underlain it a double meaning, known to an inner circle, referring cryptically to one whose real name might be impolitic to pronounce. Whenever written, the outline and meaning of J's momentous experience must have won apodically to a permanent place in the universal Hebrew memory; so that centuries afterward St. James could write to the twelve tribes scattered abroad (6: 11), "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord."

JOEL, jô‘el (יֹאֵל, yô‘ēl), perhaps “homing”: (1) Son of Joktan (Gen 10:9; 1 Ch 1:23). See Table of Nations.

(2) An Edomite king (Gen 36:33:4; 1 Ch 1:44:5).

(3) King of Madon (Josh 11:1).

(4) 1 Ch 8:9; and (5) 1 Ch 6:18, Benjamites.

The name is confused with that of Job in LXX of Job 42:17.

JOCHEBED, jô’kè-bèd (יֹכֵ֣בֶד, yô‘kehbedh, “Jeh is glory”): Daughter of Levi, wife of Amram and mother of Moses (Ex 6:20; Nu 26:59). According to Ex 6:20, she was a sister of Kohath, Amram’s father.

JOD, jod (יוֹד, yodh), the tenth letter of the Heb alphabet. See Alphabet; Jot; Yodh.

JODA, jô’dâ (WH, יֹ֫וֺדָא, yô’dâ; TR, Ἰούδα, Iouda).

(1) A Levite, whose sons were “over the works of the Lord,” corresponding to Suddas (1 Esd 5:26), Hoadaviah (Est 2:40), Judah (Est 3:9), Hodevah (Neh 7:43).

(2) An ancestor of Jesus in Lk’s genealogy (Lk 3:26, AV “Juda”).

JOED, jô’ed (יוֹדֵע, yô‘ēd, “Jeh is witness”): A “son” of Benjamin (Neh 11:7), wanting in 1 Ch 9:7.

JOEL, jô’ēl (יוֹאֵל, yô‘ēl), popularly interpreted as “Jeh is God” but see HYP, 153; BDB, 222a: (1) The firstborn of Samuel (1 S 8:2; 1 Ch 6:33 [Heb 18], and supplied in RV of 1 Ch 6:28, correctly).

(2) A Simeon prince (1 Ch 4:35).

(3) A Reubenite chief (1 Ch 5:48).

(4) A Gadite chief, perhaps the same as (3) (1 Ch 5:12). He might be the chief of “a family or clan whose members might be reckoned as belonging to either or both of the tribes” (Curtis, 122).

(5) A Levite ancestor of Samuel (1 Ch 6:36 [Heb 21], called “Shaul” in ver 24 [Heb 9]).

(6) A chief of Issachar (1 Ch 7:3).

(7) One of David’s mighty men (1 Ch 11:38), brother of Nathan. 2 S 25:36 has “Igad son of Nathan,” and LXX B has “son” in 1 Ch, reading which Curtis adopts. See Igad.

(8) A Levite (1 Ch 16:7.11.17), probably the J. of 1 Ch 23:8 and 26:22.

(9) David’s tribal chief over half of Manasseh (1 Ch 27:20).

(10) A Levite of Hesekiiah’s time (2 Ch 29:12).

(11) One of those who had married foreign wives (Est 10:43) = “Joel” of 1 Esd 9:35.

(12) A Benjamite “overseer” in Jerus (Neh 11:9).

(13) Iowh, Ioth, the prophet (Joel 1:1; Acts 2:16). See following article.

JOEL, the Prophet.
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LITERATURE.

I. The Prophet.—The Book of Joel stands second in the collection of the Twelve Prophets in the Heb Canon. The name (יוֹאֵל, yô‘ēl), meaning “Jeh is God,” seems to have been common, as we find a dozen other persons bearing it at various periods of the Bib. history. Beyond the fact that he was the son of Pethuel, there is no intimation in the book as to his native place, date, or personal history; nor is he mentioned in any other part of the OT; so that any information on these points must be matter of inference, and the consideration of them must follow some examination of the book itself.

II. The Book.—This takes largely the form of addresses, the occasion and scope of which have to be gathered from the contents. There is no narrative, properly so called, except at one place (2:18), “Then was Jehovah for his land,” etc., and even then the narrative form is not continued. Yet, though the earlier portions at least may be the transcript of actual addresses in which the speaker had his audience before him, this would not apply to the later portions, in which also the direct address is still maintained (e.g. 3:11, “Haste ye, and come, all ye nations round about”). This form of direct address is, indeed, characteristic of the style throughout. There is also said to be an indication of its literary character, that “the style of Joel is bright and flowing,” his “imagery and language are clear” (Driver, LOT); “his book is a description, clear, well arranged, and carried out with taste and vivacity, of the present distresses and of the ideal future. Joel may be reckoned among the classics of Heb lit. The need of a commentary for details, as is the case with Amos and Hosea, is here hardly felt” (Reuss, Das AT).

The book in the original consists of 4 chapters, which, however, are in our VS reduced to 3, by making the portion which constitutes 2 Outline ch 3 in the Heb the concluding portion of Contents (vs 28–32) of ch 2. The book begins in gloom, and its close is bright. Up to 2:18 there is some great trouble or a succession of troubles culminating at 2:28–32 (ch 3 in Heb). And the concluding portion, ch 3 (ch 4 in Heb), in which the prophet projects his view into futurity, begins with judgment but ends with final blessedness. There is a progression in the thought, rising from the solid, sorely smitten earth to a region ethereal, and the stages of advance are marked by sudden, sharp calls (1:2.14; 3:9), or by the blasts of the trumpet which prelude the shifting scenes (2:1.15).

Ch 1 begins with an address, sharp and peremptory, in which the oldest inhabitant is appealed to whether such a calamity as the present has ever been experienced, and all are called to take note so that the record of it may be handed down to remotest posterity. The land has suffered from a succession of disasters, the greatest that could befall an agricultural country, drought and locusts. The two are in fact inextricably connected, and the features of both are mixed up in the description of their effects. The extent of the disaster is vividly depicted by the singling out of the classes on whom the calamity has fallen, the drinkers of wine, the priests,
the vine-dressers, the husbandmen; and, toward the close of the chapter, the lower animals are pathetically introduced as making their mute appeal to heaven for success (ver 18–20). Specially to be noted is the manner in which the priests are introduced (ver 9), and with them is associated the climax of the affliction. The prophet had just said “no land” (ver 6), “my vine” and “my fig-tree” (ver 7); and, though many modern expositors take the pronoun as referring to the nation or people, it would appear more appropriate, since the people is objectively addressed, to regard the prophet as identifying himself with the God in whose name he is speaking. And then the transition to ver 8 becomes intelligible, in which certainly the land is personified as a female: “Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth.” The underlying idea seems to be the conception of the land as Jeh’s and of Jeh as the bal’ lord,” or husband of people and land. This is the idea so much in evidence in the Book of Hos, and so much perverted by the people whom he addressed, who ascribed their corn and wine and oil to the Can. ba’as. The idea in its purer form is found in the 1st Beluah,” “married land” (Isa 62 4,5). If it was with this that was in J.’s mind, the mention of the priests coming to be recipients of the land were Jeh’s gifts, and the acknowledgment of His lordship was made by offerings of the produce laid on His altar. But if nothing was given, nothing could be offered, the ‘cutting off’ of the meal and drink offerings was the marking of the land’s destitution of the land. Hence the pathetic long- ing (2 14) that at least so much may be left as to assure the famished land that the supreme calamity, the loss of God, has not fallen. Thus the visitation is set in a religious light; the graphic description is more than a poetic picture. It is the Lord’s land that is wasted; hence the summons (1 14) to “cry unto Jeh,” and in the vs that follow the supplication by man and beast for deliverance.

Ch 2 up to ver 17 seems to go over the same ground as ch 1, and it has also two parts | respectively to two parts of that chapter: 2 1–11 is || to 2 12–13, and 2 12–17 to 1 13–20. The former part in both cases is chiefly descriptive of the calamity, while the latter part is more hortatory. Yet there is an advantage for, whereas in 2 12–13 the land is fixed on the devastation, in 2 1–11 it is the devast- ator, the loudest, that is particularly described; also, in 2 12–17 the tone is more intensely religious: “Reed thy heart, and not thy garments” (ver 13). This it is to be noted that it is at this phase of that portion that we get the first reference to external nations: “Give not thy heritage to re- proach, that the nations should use a byword against them: wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?” (ver 17). If the view given above of 1 6–8 be correct, this is merely an expan- sion of the germinal idea there involved. And so it becomes a pivot on which the succeeding portion turns: “Then was Jeh jealous for his land, and had pity on his people.” In point of fact, as the Heb student

will perceive, all the vs from ver 15 may be read, with a change of the points, as simple, perfect, with the exception of the vs for “weep” and “as,” in ver 17, which might be descriptive imperfects. But no doubt the imperative forms are to be read, expressing as they do more graphically the doing of the thing prescribed. And, this sharp turn having been made, it will be noticed how the dis- course proceeds on a higher gradient, forming a counterpart to the preceding context. Step by step, in inverse order, we pass the former points, beginning with the last the “reproach among the nations” (ver 19; cf ver 7), passing to the destruction of the great army (ver 20; cf 1 11), then touching upon the various kinds of vegetation affected (vs 21–24; cf 1 12,10, etc), and ending with the reversal of the fourfold devastation with which the prophet began (ver 25; cf 1 4). So that what at the outset was announced as a calamity unprecedented and unparalleled, now becomes a deliv- erance as enduring as God’s presence with His people is forever blessed.

Up to this point there has been an observable sequence and connection, so that, while the prophet has steadily progressed upward, we can look down from the point reached and see the whole course that has been traversed. But now in 2 28–32 (ch 3 in Heb) he passes another line come to pass afterward.” And yet no doubt there was a connection of thought in his mind, of which we obtain suggestions in the new features of the death of the land, in that, “is the sound of abundance of rain” (1 K 18 41) in this pouring out of the land upon all flesh; in the sons and daughters, old men and young, servants and handmaids, we seem to recognize the representative gathering of 1 15 f., those engaged in the priestly function of supplication here endorsed with praise, “and the dominion of priests, and a holy nation” (Ex 19 6), all the Lord’s people become prophets (Nu 11 29). Again we see the sky overcast and sun and moon darkened before the great and terrible day of the Lord, as if the prophet had said: There shall be greater things than these; a new era is coming in which God’s hand will be laid more heavily upon the world, and His people will be quickened to a clearer vision of His working. The “day of Jeh” was yet to come in to actualize the possibility suggested, and there will be a more effective deliverance than from drought and dearth; but then as now there will be found safety in Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. This, however, implies some danger with which Jeh had been threatened: a “remnant” or an “escaped” portion involves a disaster or crisis out of which new life comes. And so the prophet goes on in ch 3 (ch 4 in Heb), still speaking of “those days” and “that time,” to tell us of the greater deliverance from the greater trouble to which he has been alluding. There is nothing in the ante- cedent chapters to indicate what “that time” and “those days” are, or what the prophet means by bringing again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. These are questions of interpretation. In the meantime, we may note the general features of the scene now set before us. A great assize is to be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat, in which “all nations” there assembled by Divine summons will be judged for offences against God’s people and heritage (vs 1–8). And again, just as in chs 1, 2 the prophet exhibited the plague of locusts in two pictures, so here in vs 9–21 the picture of the great assize is transformed into a bloody picture in the same valley, not of locusts, but of slaughter, with a treading of the wine-press. There is a confused multitude in “the valley of decision”; sun and moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining; the “day of Jeh” has finally come; and, when the
din is silenced and clear light again falls upon the scene, all is peace and prosperity, the last of the enemies destroyed, and the Lord dwelleth in Zion.

(1) Literal.—Thus the book forms a fairly intelligible and connected whole when we read in the literal sense of the language. That is to say: a time of confusion connected with an unprecedented visitation of locusts gives rise to the recognition of the Divine hand and to earnest supplication that the threatened ruin of people and property may be averted. The language of the calamity is interpreted as a mark of restored Divine favor and an assurance of God’s unfailing care for His people. But these great doings of Nature’s God suggest yet greater deeds of Israel’s God of a more spiritual kind, the destroying, for instance, like rain and showers, of Divine blessing, so that the whole community would be set on a higher level of spiritual apprehension. And thus the prophet is led on to speak of the “last things.” Judah and Jerusalem, highly distinguished and significantly protected, are bound up with a world-wide purpose. Israel, in a word, cannot be conceived apart from non-Israel. And as non-Israel had in the past been an opposing power, in the great “day of Jehovah,” wrong should be at last righted, the nations judged, and Israel and Israel’s God exalted. No doubt this is figurative and without difficulties. We may not be able to detect the mead of transitions, or to say how much of the purport of the latter part was in the prophet’s mind when he was engaged on the former part. And the description of the locust is so highly poetical that there is a temptation to see in it a reference to a great international event.

(2) Allegorical.—These considerations, combined with the undue eschatological strain of the closing part of the book, and with the fact that early commentators (and they had followers in modern times) have turned the book into an allegorical interpretation of the whole Book of Joel, as pointing forward to future history. Thus, in Jerome’s time, the 4 names of the locust in 1:4 were supposed to designate (1) Egyptians and Babylonians, (2) Medes and Persians, (3) the Macedonians and Antiochus Eupator, and (4) Romans. But, apart from the consideration that the analogy of prophecy would lead us to look for some actual situation or occurrence of life to illustrate the descriptive language of Joel, the conception, coming from the N.E. or, coming from the E., might strike the country at a point to the N. of Pal and take advantage of the wind which destroys crops. Again, the locust (2:20) would be a northeasterly wind, driving the forepart into the Dead Sea and the hinder part into the Mediterranean Channel. Although the Book of Joel has been assigned by different authorities to very various dates, ranging over 4 or 5 cents.; but, as will appear in the sequel, it comes to be a question whether the book is very early or very late, in fact, whether J. is perhaps the very earliest or the very last among the last of the writing prophets. This diversity of opinion is due to the fact that there are no direct indications of date in the book itself, and that such indirect indications as it affords are held to be capable of explanation on the one view or the other. It will be noticed also that, to add to the uncertainty, many of the arguments adduced are of a negative kind, i.e., that the prophet of whom, if not mention or refer to, and the argument from silence is notoriously precarious. It will, therefore, be convenient to specify the indications available, and to note the arguments drawn from them in support of the respective views.

(1) Place in the Canon.—An argument for a very early date is based upon the place of the book in the collection of the “twelve” minor prophets.

It stands, in the Heb. Bible, between Hos and Am., who are usually spoken of as the earliest “writing prophets.” It is true that, in the LXX, the order is different, viz. Hos, Am., Mic, Joel, Ob,Jon; which may indicate that as early as the arrangement of the Canon of the Prophets there was uncertainty as to the place of Joel, Ob, and Jon, which contain no direct indication of date. But there has evidently been a regard to some chronological order, the books being arranged according to the names, and the intervals between the periods cannot be without significance that Joel has found a place so high up in the collection. The 3 inadmissibly post-Israelite books stand together at the end. If Joel is late, it must be as late as the latest of them, and the possibility of a great deal of later addition has been the greater likelihood of its date being known to the collectors. It would be a very hazardous assumption that preitical theory was not read or copied from the time of their first composition till the time they were gathered into a Canon. And, if these books were copied, surely the people who copied them took some interest in preserving the knowledge of their origin and authorship.

In this connection, attention is directed to the resemblances to the Book of Am before which Joel stands. These are regarded by Reuss as favoring the early date. That large and beautiful passage with which the Book of Am opens dwells upon the thought that the threatenings, which had formerly been uttered against the nations, are about to receive their fulfilment, and that Jehovah could not take back His word. Now it is just such a threatening that fills the last part of the Book of Joel. Indeed Amos begins his book with the very phrase in which J. opens his closing address, “Hear ye the word of Jehovah, you children of Jacob; and let my prayer be heard.” Joel, however, in unmistakable speech, rather than J. in the plural, says: “He that is, Jehovah, has put a mark between the children of Jacob and all the nations upon the day of Jehovah the God of hosts.” (Am 1:2; Joel 4:16). At the end of Am the happy fertility of Canaan is described in similar terms to those in Joel (Am 9:13; Joel 1:16). Reuss, moreover, draws attention to the remarkable expression found in Joel, and also in modified terms, in two Prophets of the Assyrian period: “Beat your plow-shares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears,” says J. (2:10), whereas we have the cycle in Isa 2:4 and 3:1-4, and in the LXX of 2 Cor 6:7, “Ye have taken their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks.” Ex. 9:23, “I will send a rain of blood, and a fire out of the sky, and a scorching wind.” Also, the prophet says: “Hinder the rain . . . . when there were yet three months to the harvest,” and smitten them with blasting and mildew and the palmer worm (Am 4:7-9); and all this is the more striking because J. represents the distress of his day as unprecedented in magnitude.

To all this, advocates of the late date reply that we cannot determine the date of a book by its place in the Canon; for that the collectors were guided by other considerations. As to the resemblance to Am, it may have been on the strength of these very resemblances that the Book of Joel, bearing no date in itself, was placed beside that of Am. Moreover, it is maintained, as we shall see presently, that J. has resemblances to Am, but never confidedly of late date, proving that he was acquainted with writings of a very late time.

(2) Language and style.—Another argument for an early date is based upon the purity of the language and style of the book. The book is written in what may be described as classical Heb, and shows no trace of decadence of language. It is no doubt true that the Hebrew style is the man; as is strikingly illustrated in the very different styles of Amos and Hosea, who were practically contemporaneous; so that arguments of this kind are precarious. Still, it is to be noted, that though there is nothing archaic in the style of Joel, neither is there anything archaic in the style of Amos. Without the exclusion of Joel, we have our earliest example of written prophecy.

The advocates of the very late date reply that the style of J. is too good to be archaic; and that his admittedly classic style is to be explained by the supposition
that, living at a late date, he was a diligent student of earlier prophetic lit., and molded his style upon the classical.

(3) Quotations.—Here, therefore, must be mentioned an argument much relied upon by the advocates of a very late date. It is said that there are so many resemblances in thought and expression to the O.T. books that it is probable that so many writers posterior to the early date claimed for Joel should have quoted from this little book or expanded thoughts contained in it. A very elaborate comparison of J. with late writers has been made by Holzinger in ZATW, 1889, 89-131; his line of argument, while early writers might doubtless have written as the poet in the Renaissance imitating older models, the resemblances to others known to be late, such as Jer, Ezk, II Isa, Pss, Neh, Ch, etc., cannot be so explained if Joel is taken to be early. The principal passages in question are given in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, “Book of Joel,” by Professor Driver, who also takes the view that Joel is late.

The list is perhaps, so formidable as its length would imply. Both writers confess that from several of the passages no conclusion of any value can be drawn, and that there is always a difficulty in determining priority when similarities in diction and arrangement are ascribed to two different writers, as if they might have been commonplaces of the prophetic lit.; and, if it was possible for a very late writer to quote from so many antecedent writings, it was as possible and much easier for a number of late writers to go back to the very earliest prophetical esp. if their words were memorable and germinal. We have heard of the man who objected to Shakespeare because he was full of quotations; and there is perhaps not a line of Gray’s “Elegy” that has not been quoted somewhere, while some of his lines have become household words. But the strongest objection to this argument is this: if Joel had the minute acquaintance with antecedent writers and followed them so closely as is implied, he not only varies from them in essential particulars, but falls below them, as we shall see, in his anticipations of the future.

(4) Situation.—We have now to look at features of a more concrete and tangible character, which promise to give more positive results. It is mainly with the situation and immediate outlook of the prophet are not only consistent with the late date but preclude any prexilian date altogether. The elements of the argument are these: Whereas all the prophets before the downfall of Samaria (722 BC), and even Jeremiah and Ezekiel, mention the Northern Kingdom, it is not once named or referred to in Joel; for the occurrence of the name “Israel” in 2: 27; 3: 2-16 cannot support this sense. Judah and Jerusalem fill our prophet’s actual horizon (2: 1-2; 3: 6.16 f. 20); no king is mentioned or implied, but the elders with the priests seem to be the prominent and ruling class. Further, the temple and its worship are central (1: 14; 2: 15 f) and so important that the cutting off of the meal offering and drink offering is tantamount to national ruin (1: 9; 13.16; 2: 14). Again, there is no mention of the prevailing sins of prexilian times, the high places with their corrupt worship, or indeed of any specific sin for which the people were to be punished. At the same time, while fasting and mourning on sackcloth seem to have a special virtue. All the circumstances, it is held, conform exactly to the time of the post-exilian temple and to no other time. The Northern Kingdom was no more, there was no king in Jerusalem, or, if there were, of the line of Solomon, the center of prestige of national life, its ritual the pledge and guarantee of God’s presence and favor; the period of legalism had set in. It is confidently averred that at no period prior to the régime inaugurated by Ezra and Nehemiah was there such a conjunction of circumstances.

(a) Political: In reply, it is urged in favor of the early date that there was a period in prexilian times when such a situation existed, viz. the early years of the reign of Joash, when that prince was still an infant; for Jehoiada the priest actually took practical power as regent after the death of Athaliah, 836 BC (2 K 11 1-17). This would sufficiently account for the absence of mention of a king in the book. At such a time the priesthood must have yielded a prominence to which the ritual would have overshadowed the palace in importance. The omission of the Northern Kingdom may be accounted for by the fact that at that time the two kingdoms were on friendly terms; for the two royal houses were connected by marriage, and the kingdoms were in alliance (2 K 3 6 ff; 8 28 ff). Or the omission may have no more significance than the fact that J. was concerned with an immediate and near present distress and had no occasion to mention the Northern Kingdom. To draw conclusions from such silence, it may be observed that throughout the first 5 chapters of Isa, larger in bulk than the whole Book of Joel, only Judah and Jerusalem are mentioned, and, even if it should be doubted whether at any time, either before or after the exile, such a condition prevailed. The post-exilian prophets certainly knew of sins in their time, sins, too, which restrained the rain and blasted the wine and oil and corn (Hag 1 11). For all that J. says on the subject, the condition of things implicit is as consistent with the time of Jehoiada as with that of Nehemiah. And what shall we say of Isaiah’s positive description of the condition of Jerusalem before his time: “the faithful city, whose right is that was full of justicive righteousness lodged in her” (Isa 1 21)? When was this uttered?

“I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, a faithful city.” Higher praise could scarcely be bestowed, and there is nothing in the Book of Joel to imply that he assumed so much.

(c) Ritualistic: Too much has been made of the references to ritual, as if they necessarily implied a post-exilian date. It is not legitimate here to assume that the idea of centralization of worship originated in Josiah’s days, and that the priestly legislation is post-exilian. The mention of “old men” or “elders” is no such indication. Wellhausen himself maintains that the expression everywhere in Joel means nothing other than old men; and, even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although this is not so in the book of Joel; and even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel.
noted by the phrases in the legal codes, and was evidently on the footing of such observances as are common and instinctive at all times and among all persons (Gen 20:18; 1 Sam 27:6; 2 Sam 1:12; Judg 3:3). The prohibition of lying on one's own blood 'Tehin' has not enjoyed to lie all night in sackcloth (1 Sam 13:13). Or what, prescription in any code requires young and old, bridegroom and bride, to press together into the temple (2 Sam 17)? And why should not any or all of these things have been in the face of a sudden emergency threatening the ruin of an agricultural people? Moreover, J., so far from ascribing virtue to these outward marks of humiliation in a legalistic spirit, immediately after mentioning them says: "Render your hearts, and not your garments, and turn unto Jeh your God" (2 K 13).

The only ritual references are to the meal offering and the drink offering (8:13; 2 K 14), and these were not characteristically post-exilian. Indeed, they may be regarded as primitive forms of offering, the produce of the ground without which, among an agricultural people, we can hardly imagine a system of offerings to exist. They are both ancient. Amos regards the meal offering as well known (5:22. 25). The meal offering of Amos: and citations of speaking of its absence ( Isa 1:13). And though the noun for drink offering is not mentioned in the older prophets, Hosea knows the related vb. and the act of pouring out wine to the Lord ( Hos 9:4), and it is clear either that the people who performed the act and had no name for the offering itself. Moreover, in an undisputed passage (2 K 13:13.15), both offerings are mentioned in the time of Ahas. As for the contention that our prophet regards the offerings of this period as not important that the cessation of them would be fatal, if our interpretation of 8:13 above be correct, the earlier date would be much more appropriate. It was not because the offering threatened to cease, but because the thing offered threatened to be cut off, that J., was so perturbed. The popular view as to the relation of Jeh to His land was ancient, and had a foundation of truth; and in fact Hosea's teaching would fitly follow and complete that of Joel. Finally it is to be said that J.'s fine forecast of the outpouring of the Spirit, and of the universal extension of prophetic activity is as far removed as possible from the "legalistic" tendency that set in after the exile. And if the argument from silence is of any force, then evidently a very important thing that in a book of post-exilian times, there should be no mention of prince or governor, or even of high priest.

(5) Foreign nations mentioned or omitted.—Allusions to foreign nations, or the absence of allusion, would obviously promise to afford indications of the time of the prophet; and yet here also the allusions have been added in support of either of the divergent dates. The facts here are as follows: In the first two chapters, when the Lord speaks of the "northern" army (2:20), which some refer to the Assyrians, while others explain it of a northern army in late or apocalyptic time. In ch. 3, however, when the prophet is speaking of "those days" and "that time" in the future, when the Lord shall bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerus., there is to be a gathering of "all nations" in the valley of Jehoshaphat (3:11); and later on "all the nations" are summoned to appear in the same valley for judgment. (Ob 1:14) It is clear that the word "all" is used in a wider sense than in the earlier chapters; and the "regions of Philistia" are specially reproved (ver 4) because they have carried into their temples the sacred treasures, and have sold the children of Judah and Jerus unto the "sons of the Grecians" (ver 6); in recompense for which their sons and daughters are to be sold into the hand of the children of Judah, that they may remain there for a time or far off (ver 8). Finally, at the close (vs 19f), "Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence done to the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land in their midst."

It is acknowledged, that on either hypothesis, there are difficulties in accounting for the presence or absence of names of foreign nations in this presentation. Those who advocate the late date point with confidence to the silence as to the kingdom of the ten tribes, or to the kingdom of Damascus, which, on their hypothesis, had passed away, and the equally significant silence as to Assyria, which had long ago been superseded by the Bab and Pers empires of the East. As to the mention of Tyre and Sidon and the coasts of Philistia (3:4-6), Driver says: "The particular occasion referred to by J. must remain uncertain: but the Phoenicians continued to act as slave-dealers long after the age of the prophetic J. (see Jastrow's "Jeh," J. of the east," better a later time, when Syrian slaves were in request in Greece" (Cambridge Bible, "Joel," 17). The same writer says on 3:19: "There is so little that is specific in what is said in this verse with reference to the Phoenicians, that it may be probably named (at a time when the Assyrians and Chaldaeans had alike ceased to be formidable to Judah) as typical examples of countries hostile to the Jews." It is pointed out, moreover, that the events of the Edom war was particularly manifest at a late period when Jerus was destroyed by the Chaldaeans, and that this was remembered and resented long afterward (Ob vs 10-16; Ezek 25:12 ff; 35; Ps 137:7).

On the hypothesis of the early date, it is urged that there was no occasion to refer to the Northern Kingdom. If it was friendly, the inclusive name of Israel for the whole people was sufficient to denote this, and that it was not hostile in the early days of Joash has already been pointed out. As to Damascus, it was not till the last years of the reign of Joash that Hazael showed hostility to Jerus (2 K 13:17); and danger from Assyria had not yet emerged, and appears only faintly in the reign (3:11; is 1:14). It is probable that history records how, in the reign of Jehoram, the grandfather of Joash, "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves" (2 K 6:20; 2 Ch 21:5), and the historian adds that the revolt continued "unto this day." It may well have been that in such a revolt the resident Judaeans in the land of Edom suffered the violence referred to in 3:19. Moreover, the Chronicler mentions that, in the same reign, "Jeh and Philistia carried up against Judah, and" (1 K 14:29) the Philistines and the Arabians that are beside the Ethiopians: and they came up against Judah, and brake into it, and carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house, and his sons also, and his wives," etc (2 Ch 21:16 f). This might be what is referred to in 3:4-6. If the royal family were carried away there would most probably be a deportation of other prisoners, who, taken by the seaborde Philis, would, through the great maritime power of the day, be sold in Egypt. And here it is pointed out that Joash singles out the very nations mentioned by J.: Philis, Tyre and Sidon and Edom, and reproaches them with offences such as J. specifies (Am 1:6-12). And then, it is added, if the book is an late one, Nehemiah, why is nothing said of Samaritans, Moabites, Ammonites, who showed such marked hostility in his days (Neh...)}
2 19; 4 7; 6 1)? For Ezekiel also, from whom it is supposed J. derived his reference to the Edomites, mentioned Edomites and Ammonites as hostile to Israel (Ezk 25 1–11). And why is not a word said of the Babylonians, at whose hands Israel had suffered so much? So strongly, indeed, are these objections felt by Reuss, that he declares that, should the view of the late origin come to be finally accepted as the more probable, he would decide for a date after the Pers domination, i.e. subsequent to 322 BC. For, he says, the names of peoples introduced at the end of the book, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Philis, Edomites, must surely in some way have had an actual significance for the author, who cannot out of caprice have passed over Syrians, Assyrians, Chaldaeans, and Persians. Accordingly, if we are to have nothing to do with the pre-Assyr period, we must come down to the late Selucid and Ptolemaean dynasties whose hostile collisions with Judaea were certainly involved in severe trouble. But then, how are we to account for the position of Joel so high up in the collection of prophetical writers? For, on this supposition, we should expect his book to be placed in the third division of the Canon.

(6) Some notable expressions.—There remain to be noticed some significant expressions which have a bearing on the question of date and, at first sight, seem to indicate a late origin. And yet there is a difficulty. For there is no doubt that our familiarity with the details of the great downfall of the Jewish state leads us to think of the destruction of Jerusalem when we read of the captivity or scattering of the people.

There is, however, a saying in the Talm that a greater distress makes a lesser one forgotten; and the question is whether there may not have been national experiences at an earlier time to which such expressions might be applicable; or, in other words, how early such phrases were coined and became current.

Joel: "Bring back the captivity". There is, first of all, uncertainty as to the origin of the phrase "bring back the captivity." Some connect the word "captivity" (יוֹרֵעַ, šĕbh'ūth, יֹרֵעַ, šĕbh'ūth) with the vb. "to take captive" (יוֹרֵעُ, šŏbhab), while others make it the cognate noun of the vb. "to return" (יוֹרֵע, šōbhab), with which it stands connected in the phrase "bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem" (3 1). In the former case the reference would be to the return of captives taken in war, or the return of exiles from captivity, and that view has led to the tr in our VS. On the latter view, the expression would mean the restoration of prosperity, of which use we have an unquestioned example in the passage: "Jehovah shall bring back the captivity of Job" (Job 42 10). We can conceive either of the views to have been the original, and either to be quite early. A main feature of early warfare was the carrying away of prisoners, and the return of such captives was equivalent to a restoration of prosperity. Or again, the relief from any illness or trouble might be expressed by saying that there was a restoration, as e.g. in Scotland a sick person is said to have "got the turn." As to the significance of the phrase in Joel, J. is probably to be deemed the "captivity of Joel" (3 1). In the time of Hezekiah, the ambassadors of Sennacherib delivered their taunting message, which is described as reproaching the living God (2 K 19 4). It was the method of ancient warfare, as is seen in the boasting of Goliath; for it is the same word that is used in that narrative, though rendered in our VS "defy" (1 S 17 10.25f. 36). And, if we read between the lines of the historical books, we shall see how common was this habit of "defying" or "reproaching," and how sensitive the people were to it (e.g. 1 K 20 21.5.f.13. 28). All this is anterior to the earliest possible date of J., and proves that, at an early time, there was a consciousness in Israel that the fortunes of the people were bound up with the honor of the national God. It is noted out by the author of the early part of the book, for when he is concerned with the drought and locust, that J. uses this expression.

(7) "Strangers passing through": Toward the close of the book it is predicted that, in the time of final glory, strangers shall no longer go in and out of Jerusalem (3 17). This again would certainly be applicable to a late time, after the land had suffered...
many hostile invasions. Yet it can well be understood how a prophet at a very early period, thinking of the glorification of Zion, should imagine a state in which no "stranger" or foreigner should have a footing on the sacred soil, and Israel should dwell in solitary and preeminent exclusiveness. If so, it was of a more primitive kind than the late date would suggest, esp. if we postulate a prophet who had deeply studied earlier prophets, to whom Jerusalem was the religious metropolis of the world, and Zion the place to which all the nations of the earth would come (Isa 11:11; Mal 4:5). So far as it bears upon the date of Joel the question is: How does his usage compare with those of the other prophets? We find that he uses the expression twice in connection with the visitation (Eccl 1:33-34; and Lam 3:38-39) and the outpouring of the Spirit (2:31), and once again near the close of the book (3:14). Now, in regard to the earliest occurrences, it will be perceived that J is on a lower plane than succeeding prophets. He anticipates the day of the Lord with a heavy visitation upon material nature, precisely as the simple Oriental of the present day, on the occurrence of an eclipse, or at a visitation of locusts or pestilence, begins to talk of the end of the world. And, as a sort of poetical drama, in the mind of the prophetic writer the horizon wider, at the close of the book, is to be remarked that the highest point attained is the conception of the day of the Lord as the deliverance of Zion. At this point J is not a hint of that day being a time of testing and sifting of Israel itself, as in Amos and elsewhere (Am 5:18-20; Isa 2:12). In fact, so far is he from going beyond the other prophets in his conception, that we may say J leaves the matter at the point where Amos takes it up.

In view of all these perplexing questions, Professor Ad. Merx has written a most suggestive book, Die Propheten des Jeremias und die Ausleger von den antiken Zeiten (1879), a work devoted to the question of the typologies of the prophetic book. In a very able exposition of the passage, he endeavored to show that there is an underlying typology in the Book of Joel, and that it is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple. In the succeeding chapters, he attempts to show that Joel is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple. In the succeeding chapters, he attempts to show that Joel is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple. In the succeeding chapters, he attempts to show that Joel is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple. In the succeeding chapters, he attempts to show that Joel is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple. In the succeeding chapters, he attempts to show that Joel is a sequel to the Book of Ezekiel, as extending down to the Second Temple.
kield and Jeremiah, he has nothing to say of the inclusion of Gideon in the destruction of Israel, but contemplates the final destruction of all Israel's enemies. If he is a contemporary of Malachi or later, he is less legalistic than that prophet; and whereas in Mal we see the beginning of the fading away of prophecy, J. looks for the time when the Spirit shall be poured out on all flesh, and the sobs and daughters shall prophesy (2:28).

It is this last element in the prophecy of J. that links his book particularly with the NT, for St. Peter quoted J.'s words in this passage as he went on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit was poured forth on the assembled multitude (Acts 2:16ff.). Yet, even as the OT prophets one after another caught up the idea, unfolding and expanding it, so the NT writers see the approach of the day of the Lord in their own time (1 Thess 5:2; 2 Pet 3:10); for that day is always coming, always near, though still in the future. St. Paul saw the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain, as J. did, and the pouring out of the Spirit at Pentecost was part of, and also more than, the effusion seen by J. What J. said he said truly, though he could not say all. For "that day" has grown in significance as the ages have rolled on; men have seen its approach in the various commotions and upheavals of the world, depicting its features in the colors of the changing times, now praying for it, now dreading its approach; and how far from precision are our thoughts in regard to it still! Yet, early or late, unerring is the true word of prophecy.

The concrete historical situations crumble away and leave the eternal truth as fresh as ever: "Jehovah reigneth; let the earth rejoice" (Ps 97:1); it is the hopeful burden of OT prophecy, for "righteousness and justice are the foundation of thy throne" (Ps 89:14).

LITERATURE besides that cited above.—Credner, Der Prophet Joel übersezt u. erklär't (1831); Westermann, Die Weissagungen des Propheten. Joel übersezt u. erklär't (1892); Day the comm. on the Minor Prophets by Pusey, Orelli, Kell, Wilhelmsen, G. A. Smith, Mouvrick in Speaker's Commentary; Nowack, in Handkommentar am AT; Marti, in Kurzer Handkommentar am AT.

JOELAH, jō-e-la (יוֹאֵל), yōʾē-lāh, perhaps יְאֵל, yēʾēl, "may he avail!": One of David's recruits at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:7 (Heb 8)); a Benjamite or perhaps a Judanean (see Curtis, Ch. 1957).

JOEZER, jō-e-zēr (יוֹזֶר), yōʾēzēr, "Jeh is help!": One of David's Benjamite recruits at Ziklag, though perhaps a Judanean (1 Ch 12:6 (Heb 7)).

JOBEHAAH, jōbē-hāh (יוֹבֵהָה), yōgbēḥāh): A city in Gil-Maleh assigned to Gad and fortified by that tribe (Nu 32:35). It lay on the line along which Gideon chased the Midianites (Jgs 8:11), and the indication there leaves no doubt that it is represented today by Jibneh. The name attaches to 3 groups of ruins which date from Roman times. The position is about 7 miles N.W. of 'Ammān, and about midway between that city and the town of el-Sall. It stands 3,465 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean.

LITERATURE.—Oliphant, Land of Gilead, 232; Baedeker-Socin, Pal.

JOGLI, jō-gōl (יוֹגְלִ), yōgōl, perhaps "led into exile": Father of Bukki, a Danite chief (Nu 34:23).

JOHA, jō-hā (יוֹהָ), yōhā, meaning unknown, but perhaps יַיוֹהַ, yōhāh, "Jehosh"; see HPN, 283.

1. A Benjaminite (1 Ch 8:10).
2. One of David's mighty men (1 Ch 11:40).

JOHANAN, jō-hānān (יוֹהָנָן), yōhanān, "Jehovah is gracious": "Teach-them, and I will (will be) a pasture for my people; of JOHANAN.
1. Son of Kereah, and one of the captains of the forces who were in the field's; (i.e. probably guerilla bands), who allied with Gedaliah, governor of Judah, after the fall of Jerus, 556 BC (2 K 25:23; Jer 40:7—43:7). He warned Gedaliah of the plot of Ishmael ben Netaniah, who was instigated by the Ammonite king Baalis, to murder the governor; but the latter refused to believe him nor would he grant J. permission to stay Ishmael (40:8—16). After Ishmael had murdered Gedaliah and also 70 northern pilgrims, J. went in pursuit. He was joined by the unwilling followers of Ishmael, but the murderer escaped. Thereupon J. settled at Geruth-Chimham near Bethel (ch 41). As Ishmael's plan was to take the remnant to the land of Ammon, so that of J. and his fellow-chiefs was to go to Egypt. They consulted the Divine oracle through Jeremiah, and received the answer that they should remain in Judah (ch 42). But the prophet was accused of giving false counsel and of being influenced by Baruch. The chiefs then turned to Egypt, but forced Jeremiah and Baruch to accompany them (ch 43).
2. The eldest son of King Josiah (1 Ch 3:15), apparently "Jehoahaz" (2 K 23:30—33).
3. Son of Elcemi, and a Davidic post-exilic prince (1 Ch 3:16).
4. Father of the Azariah who was priest in Solomon's time (1 Ch 6:9–10 (Heb 5:36)).
5. A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag, but perhaps a Judanean (1 Ch 12:4 (Heb 5)).
6. A Gadite recruit of David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:13 (Heb 13)).
8. A returned exile (Ezr 8:12) —"Joannes" (1 Esd 8:38; AV "Johannes").
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JOHANNINE, jō-hān'īn, in, THEOLOGY, THE:

I. THE ANTICEDENTS
1. Personality of the Writer
2. Earlier NT Writings
3. Christian Experience and Teaching of History
4. Widening Contact with Gentile World
5. The Odes of Solomon
6. Antagonism to Gnostic Speculation

II. THE DIVINE NATURE
1. God Is Spirit
2. God Is Life
3. God Is Light
4. Ethical Attributes—God Is Righteous
5. God Is Love
   (a) The Love of God—
      (b) Embodied in Christ's Self-Sacrifice
      (c) Love in Redemption
   (2) Love Is God's Nature

III. THE INCARNATION
1. Historical Antecedents of the Logos-Doctrine
2. The Logos-Doctrine in St. John
3. The Incarnation as Delineated in the Fourth Gospel
4. The Incarnation in the First Epistle
5. Practical Implications of the Incarnation

IV. THE HOLY SPIRIT
1. The Work of the Spirit—in the Fourth Gospel Perpetuates, but also Intensifies the Consciousness of Christ
2. In the First Epistle
   (1) A Divine Teacher
   (2) Other Aspects
3. The Person of the Spirit
   His Deity Implied

V. DOCTRINE OF SIN AND PROPITIATION
1. Sin
2. Propitiation
   (1) In the Gospel
   (2) In the Epistle
   (3) One with NT Teaching

VI. ETERNAL LIFE
1. Ethical Rather Than Eschatological
2. Metaphysical Aspect
   (1) Citation to criticism
3. Development of Doctrine
(1) Source in God
(2) Mediated by Christ
(3) Through the Spirit
(4) The Divine "Begetting"
(5) The "Children of God"
(6) The Divine Abiding

VII. HUMAN NATURE AND ITS REGENERATION
1. The World
2. Two Classes in the Human Race

VIII. THE GOSPEL AND SACRAMENTS
1. The Church
2. The Sacraments

IX. ESCHATOLOGY
1. Type of Thought Idealistic
2. Yet History Not Ignored
3. Not Eschatology
4. Eschatological Ideas
(1) Eternal Life
(2) Antichrist
(3) Resurrection
(4) Judgment
(5) The Parousia
(a) A "Manifestation"
(b) Relation to Believers

LITERATURE
The materials for the following sketch of the Johannine theology are necessarily drawn from the Fourth Gospel and the Epp. and First Ep. of St. John. The question of authorship is not here considered (see articles on the Gospel and on the Epp. of St. John). These writings, whether by the same or by different authors, are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine, and which presents an interpretation of Christianity scarcely less distinctive and original than Paulinism. Where there are differences in the point of view, these will be indicated.

1. The Antecedents of the Theology.—To attempt a full account of the historical sources and antecedents of the Johannine theology is beyond the scope of the present article; but the following may be briefly indicated. Much must be attributed to the personality of the great anonymous writer to whom we directly owe this latest development of NT thought. Only a thinker of first rank among the idealists and mystics, a mind of the Platonic order, moving instinctively in the world of supersensuous realities, absorbed in the passion for the infinite, possessing in a supertative degree the gift of spiritual intuition, could under any conditions have evolved a system of thought having the special characteristics of this theology.

Yet with all his originality the builder has raised his structure upon the foundation already laid in the teaching represented by the earlier NT writings. The synoptic tradition, NT thought though freshly interpreted, is presupposed. At certain points there is a strong affinity with the Ep. to the He. In the main, however, the Johannine doctrine may be seen to be a natural and inevitable development of Paulinism—the conclusion to which the earlier writer's mind is visibly moving in e.g. the Ep. to the Col.

Among the influences which have stimulated and guided this development, the first place belongs to the natural growth of Christian experience. In the closing decades of the 1st cent. and Teach- Christianity was compelled by the force of events to liberate itself from the husk of Jewish Messianism in which its Divine seed had first been deposited. The faith of the first Christian generation in the Messiahship of Jesus and the triumph of His cause had expressed itself (necessarily so, under the historical conditions) in vivid expectation of His Second Coming. He was

only waiting behind the clouds, and would speedily return to the earth for the restitution of all things (Acts 3:21). But after the fall of Jesus this primitive apocalypticism became, with the passing years, more and more discredited; and the Christian faith had either to interpret itself afresh, both to its own consciousness and to the world, or confess itself "such stuff as dreams are made of." It would be difficult to overestimate the service which the Johannine theology must have rendered in this hazardous transition by transferring the emphasis of Christian faith from the apocalyptic to the spiritual, and leading the church to a profounder realization of its essential and indelible resources in the new spiritual life it possessed through the ever-living Christ. Eternal life was not merely a future felicity, but a present possession; the most real coming of Christ, His coming in the Spirit. The Kingdom of God is here: the eternal is now. Such was the great message of St. John to his age, and to all ages.

In another direction, the widening contact of Christianity with the gentile world had stimulated the development of doctrine. A disentanglement from Jewish nationalism, involving contact more complete than that of St. Paul had with Gentile accomplished, had become a necessity. World

If Christianity was to find a home and a sphere of conquest in the Gr-Rom world—to recreate European thought and civilization—the person of Christ must be regarded as having a vastly larger significance than that of the Jewish Messiah. That this necessity hardened the process of thought which reached its goal in the Logos-doctrine of St. John cannot well be doubted. The way had so far been prepared by Philo and the Jewish-Alexandrian school. And while it is probably mere coincidence that Epheusus, with which the activity of St. John's later years is associated by universal tradition, was also the city of Heraclitus, who, 500 years earlier, had used the term Logos to express the idea of an eternal and universal Reason, immanent in the world, there is as little room as there can be motive for questioning that in the Johannine theology Christian thought has been influenced and fertilized at certain points by contact with Hellenism.

On the other hand it is possible that this influence has been overrated. Fresh material for the investigation of the sources and connections of the Jo-

4. Widen- the recent discovery of the Odes of Solomon

5. The Odes of Solomon (J. Rendel Harris, M.J. Odes of Solomon, Cambridge, 1909; Adolf Harnack, Ein judisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrtausend, Leipzig, 1910). This collection of religious poems is regarded by its dis-}

covery, Rendel Harris, as the work of a writer who, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians who for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs. But though the Odes in their present form contain distinctly Christian elements (references, e.g., to the Son, the Incarnation, the Second Birth, the Passion, the Resurrection), Harnack's closer analysis tends to the conclusion that in their original form they were purely Jewish, and that they have been adapted to Christian use by a process of interpretation. For the original work Harnack gives as an possible date the begin-}

ning of the Christian era, the Christian passion and the fall within the 1st cent. Harnack recognizes a possibility that the redactor may have been acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. The religious feeling of the writer is throughout individual and mystical, rather than national-
has resulted in great diversity of view regarding their origin. They have been assigned to Gnosticism, and on the other hand, are described (Bernard) as Christian baptismal hymns. In view of this division of critical opinion, it is hard to say whether the Gnostics are a collateral development or a true branch of the Gnostic symbology, which has been widely admitted. In this way both development, the recognition of which necessitates a revision of current assumptions which have been made regarding the extent to which the Johannine theology is indebted to Hellenistic philosophy.

One other factor in this theological development remains to be mentioned—antagonism to gnostic speculation. In the Gospel this has left the few traces, in the way both development, the recognition of which necessitates a revision of current assumptions which have been made regarding the extent to which the Johannine theology is indebted to Hellenistic philosophy.

Theological development

6. Antagonism to Gnostic Speculation

In the Gospel this has left the few traces, in the way both development, the recognition of which necessitates a revision of current assumptions which have been made regarding the extent to which the Johannine theology is indebted to Hellenistic philosophy.

Johannine Theol.

2. God Is... Light, Righteousness and Love. Righteousness and Love are the primary ethical qualities of the Divine nature: Life the energy by which they act; Light the self-revelation in which they are manifested throughout the spiritual universe. God is Love. He is the ultimate eternal Reality. He was "in the beginning" (Jn 1 1), or "from the beginning" (1 Jn 1 1; 2 13). These statements are made of the Logos, therefore a fortiors of God. But the Divine nature is not mere abstract being, infinite and eternal; it is being filled with that inscrutable element of energy which we call Life. In God this energy of life is self-originating and self-sustaining ("The Father hath life in himself," Jn 6 26, and the consequent of all life, "the eternal life," which is the possession of which in fellowship with God is the chief end for which every spiritual nature exists. The Divine elements presuppose the Divine nature: Life are these: (1) The ethical: the life God lives is one of absolute righteousness (1 Jn 2 29), and perfect love (1 Jn 4 9). (2) The metaphysical: the Divine life is nothing else than the Divine nature itself, and of that nature, as the ground and source of all its own activities, the animating principle or energy which makes Divine righteousness and love to be not mere abstractions, but active realities. (3) In Johannine thought the Divine life is esp. an energy of self-reproduction. It is this by inherent moral necessity. Love cannot but seek to beget love, and righteousness to beget righteousness, in all beings capable of them. With St. John this generative activity of the Divine nature holds a place of unique prominence. It is this that constitutes the Fatherhood of God. Eternally the Father imparts Himself to the Son (Jn 5 26), the Word whose life from the beginning consisted in His relation to the Father (1 Jn 1 1; 2). To mankind the emanation of the Logos is the result of a Divine begetting (Jn 1 13; 3 15; 1 Jn 2 29; 3 9; 4 7, etc) by which they become "children of God" (Jn 1 12; 1 Jn 3 1, etc). (4) God is not only the transcendent final source, He is also the immanent source of Life. This is clearly implied in all those passages, too numerous to be quoted, which speak of God's abiding in us and our abiding in Him. Life is maintained only through a continuous vitalizing union with Him, as of the branches with the vine (Jn 15 1-4). It is observed, however, that St. John nowhere merges the idea of God in that of life. God is personal; life is impersonal. The eternal life is the element common to the personality of God, of the Logos, and of those who are the "children of God." Any pantheistic manner of thinking is as foreign to St. John as to every other Bib. writer.

God is not life only; He is Light also (1 Jn 5). That God is life means that He is and is self-incarnating; that He is life means that He is self-revealing. (1) As the essential property of light is to shine, so God by His very nature of righteousness and love is necessitated to reveal Himself as being what He is,
so as to become the Truth (ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἡ ἀλθεία), the object of spiritual perception (γνώσεως, γνώστικη), and the source of spiritual illumination to enable a man to know the revelation of God as "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." In God there is nothing that hides, nothing that is hidden. The Divine character is utterly transparent—goodness without a shadow of evil. (2) This self-revelation of God is given in its perfect form in Jesus, the incarnate Word, who is the light of men (Jn 1:4), the light of the world (Jn 8:12; 9:5), the true light (Jn 1:9; 1 Jn 2:5). (3) It is in their illumination by this Divine light that there exists, even for the sinful, a moral fellowship with God. We can "come to the light" (Jn 3:19—21) and "walk in the light" (1 Jn 1:7). In the translucent atmosphere of the true light, we, even while morally imperfect and impure, may come to have a common view of spiritual facts with God (1 Jn 1:5—10; 2:9,10). This is the basis of a spiritual religion, and distinguishes Christianity from all irrational superstitions and unethical rituals. In gnostic speculation the Divine nature was conceived as a spiritual essence, in eternal separation from all that is material.

4. Ethical and mutable. But while St. John Attributes also, as we have seen, conceives it in this way, with him the conception is primarily and essentially spiritual. The communication of which is life and the revelation of which is light, has, as its two great attributes, Righteousness and Love; and with his whole soul St. John labors to stamp on the minds of men that all righteousness and love can only shine in God's light and have fellowship in the life of God. It is characteristic of St. John's intuitive fashion of thought that there is no effort to correlate these two aspects of the ethical perfection of God; but, broadly, it may be said that they are respectively the negative and the positive. Love is the sum of all that is positively right; righteousness the antithesis of all that is wrong, in character and conduct.

God is righteous.—(1) That such righteousness—antagonism to all sin—belongs to, or rather is, the moral nature of God, and that this lies at the basis of Christian ethics is categorically affirmed. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him" (1 Jn 3:9). (2) This belongs to the inward character of God extends necessarily to all His actions: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins" (1 Jn 1:9). When on the ground of Christ's propitiation God forgives those who by confessing their sins make themselves possible, He acts "rightously; and because He acts righteously, He acts also faithfully, that is, consistently. He does not "deny himself" (2 Tim 2:13), but does what is in accordance with His own unchangeable character. (3) God's righteousness is related imperatively to the whole moral activity of His creatures, rendering sin inadmissible in them—inadmissible de jure in all, de facto in all who are "begotten of him." This St. John maintains with unexampled vigor (cf 1 Jn 2:29; 3:5—10; 5:18). It is true, however, that in its doctrine of Divine righteousness the Johannine theology makes no notable contribution to the sum of NT thought, but simply restates in peculiarly forceful fashion the conception of it which pervades the whole Bib. revelation.

(1) The love of God.—It is far otherwise with the next of the great affirmations which constitute its doctrine of God: God is love. Love is the Gospel and Epistle rise to the summit of all revelation, and for the first time clearly and fully enunciates the truth which is the innermost secret of existence.

(a) Primarily a disposition: Love is primarily a disposition, a moral quality of the will. What this quality is is indicated by the fact that the typical object of love in human relation is invariably our "brother." It is the disposition to act toward others as it is natural for those to do who have all interests in common and who realize that the full self-existence of each can be attained only in a larger corporate existence. It is the mysterious power by which egoism and altruism meet and coalesce, the power to live not only for another but in another, to realize one's own fullest life in the fulfillment of other lives. It is self-communication which is also self-natural fellowship.

(b) Embodied in Christ's self-sacrifice: In history love has its one perfect embodiment in the self-sacrifice of Christ. "Hereby know we love [i.e. perceive what love is], because he laid down his life for us" (1 Jn 3:18). The world had never been without love; but till Jesus Christ came and laid down His life for the men that hated and mocked and slew him, it had not known what love in its greatness and purity could be.

(c) Love in redemption: But here history is the invisible translated into the visible. The self-sacrifice of Christ in laying down His life for us is the manifestation (1 Jn 4:9), under the conditions of time and sense, of the love of God, eternal and incorporeal.

5. God is love. (1) Love of God. —God is love (1 Jn 4:8,16). (a) God is love essentially. Love is not one of God's moral attributes, but that sum which they all proceed, and in which they all unite. The spring of all His actions is love. (b) Therefore also His love is universal. In a special sense He loves those who are spiritually His children (Jn 14:23); but His undivided and exclusive love is also to the whole world (Jn 3:16; 1 Jn 2:2). That is St. John's great truth. He does not attempt to
reconcile with it other apparently conflicting truths in his theological scheme; possibly he was not conscious of any need to so do. But of this he is sure—God is love. That fact must, in ways we cannot yet discern, include all other facts. (c) The love of God is eternal and unchangeable, for it does not depend on any merit or reciprocation in its object, but overflows from its own infinite fulness. We may refuse to it the inlet into our life which it seeks (Jn 3 19, 8 40); we may so identify ourselves with evil as to turn it into an antagonistic force. But as we eschew evil and call it forth, neither can our evil cause it to cease. (d) If love is an essential, the essential attribute of God, it follows that we cannot ultimately conceive of God as a simple single personality. It is at this point that the fuller Johannine conception of multiple personality in the Godhead becomes most helpful, enabling us to think of the Divine life in itself not as an eternal solitude of self-contemplation and self-love, but as a life of fellowship (Jn 1 1, 1 Jn 4 2). The Godhead is filled with love: “The Father loveth the Son” (Jn 3 35); and the prayer of the Son for His followers is “that the love wherewith thou lovest me may be in them” (Jn 17 26). The eternal giving and receiving of Divine love between the Father and Son is, in the Johannine understanding, an essential element of the Divine nature.

III. The Incarnation.—The 2d great contribution of the Johannine writings to the development of Christian theology is their doctrine of Christ—the love of God manifested within Nt times to relate intellectually the church’s faith in Jesus to its faith in God. In these writings the superhuman personality of Jesus is expressed by three titles which are used as practically synonymous (Jn 1 18): “Son of God,” “only begotten Son of God”), the “Word” (Logos). The last alone is distinctly Johannine.

Historically, the Logos-doctrine of St. John has undoubted links of connection with certain speculative developments both of Gr and Heb thought. The Heraclitean use of the term “Logos” (see above, I) to express the idea of an eternal and all-embracing Reason immanent in the world was one; while the concept was further elaborated, by the Stoics. On the other hand, the later developments of Heb thought show an increasing tendency to personify the self-revealing activity of God under such conceptions as the Angel, Glory, Shekinah, etc., in the life of Christ. In special significant to the “Word” (μαθηματικαί) by which He created the heaven and the earth, and to describe “Wisdom” (Job, Prov) in something more than a figurative sense as His agent and co-worker. These approximations of Gr pantheism and Heb monothelism were more verbal than real; and, naturally, Philo’s attempt in his doctrine of the Logos to combine philosophies so radically divergent was less successful than it was courageous. How far, and whether directly or indirectly, St. John is indebted to Philo and his school, are questions to which widely different answers have been given; but some obligation, probably indirect, cannot reasonably be denied. It is evident, indeed, that both the idea and the term “Logos” were current in the Christian circle for which his Gospel and First Ep. were immediately written; in both its familiarity is assumed. Yet the Johannine doctrine has little in common with Philo’s except the name; and it is just in its most essential features that it is most original and personal. As the First Ep. begins with the affirmation, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” so the Fourth Gospel begins with the similar affirmation, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (Jn 1 1). The Word was the medium of Divine action in creation (Jn 1 3). In the Word was life, not merely self-existing but self-imparting, so that it became the light and life of men (Jn 1 4)—the true light, which, in the earth, shines into every man (Jn 1 9). And finally it is declared that this Divine Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, so that “we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth” (Jn 1 14). Here faith in Jesus as Divine has been traced back to, and grounded in, a duality within the Godhead itself. In the twofold mode of the Divine existence, it is seen that there is God who is just God (so to say), God in Himself; and there is God-with-God, God who is God’s other self, God going forth from Himself in thought and action. The first without the second would be essence without manifestation, mind without utterance, light without effulgence, life without giving, fatherhood without sonship. It is seen that within the Divine Being there is one through whom, as there is also one from whom, all Divine energy goes forth. Above all it is seen that there is a Divine mode of existence in which it is inherently possible and natural for God immediately to relate to created being and even to become incarnate in humanity, as there is also a mode of Divine existence which cannot be immediately communicated or revealed to created life. Thus the Johannine notion within Nt times relates intellectually the church’s faith in Jesus to its faith in God.

In the Gospel the term “Logos” does not recur after the opening verses; yet the thesis of the Prologue, so far from being irrelevant, dominates the entire biographical presentation. The creative and cosmic significance of the Logos-Christ is naturalized in the fact that the Word became flesh” (Jn 1 14). The Fourth Gospel in the Epistle (4 22, 5 20) of men; the supreme moral authority (14 15); the hearer of prayer (14 14); the giver of the Spirit (7 38, 17 6); and endowed with all the prerogatives of God (5 23; 10 30, 36—38).

In the First Ep. the central thesis is the complete, personal, and permanent identity of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (1 1), the Christ and Son of God (5 5). This Incarnation is maintained in a vigorous polemic against certain heretical teachers whom the writer calls “antichrists,” who in docetic fashion denied that Jesus is the Christ (2 22), or, more definitely, the “Christ come in the flesh” (4 3), and who asserted that He was begotten not by God only but by blood also (5 6; see John Epistles of). Against this doctrine of a merely apparent or temporary association of Jesus with the Christ St. John bears vehement testimony. "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 Jn 4 3).
the Christ?" (22). 'Every spirit that confesseth Jesus as Christ come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God' (4 2). 'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood' (5 6). These passages all promulgate the same truth in substantially the same way. Without ceasing to be what He is, the Christ, the Son of God, has become Jesus; and Jesus, without ceasing to be truly human, is the Son of God. As to the manner of the incarnation—by what process of self-emptying or by what conjunction of Divine-human attributes the eternal Son became Jesus—the Johannine writings, like the NT everywhere, are silent. They proclaim Jesus Christ as human and Divine; but the distinguishing of what in Him was human and what Divine, or whether the one is distinct from the other, this they do not even consider. Gnosticism drew such a distinction; St John does not. His one truth is that Jesus is the Son of God and the Son of God is Jesus, and that in Him the life of God was manifested. This is given (5 1). 

In this truth, viewed in its practical consequences, St John sees the core of the church's faith and the root and safeguard of its life. (a) 5. Practical This alone secures and guarantees the Implications of the manifestation of the Son of God. The denial that revelation is canceled. Incarnation "Whousoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father" (23). (b) Above all, it is only in the life and death of Jesus, the incarnation, that we possess a valid representation of God's self-sacrificing love. "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his Son into the world that we might live through him" (4 9). With the denial of this the Christian ethic is drained of its very life-blood. There was no merely external and accidental connection between Docetism and the moral indifferentism of the Gnostic. The natural result of making man's salvation easy, so to say, for God, was to make it easy for man also—salvation by creed without conduct (2 4 6; 3 7), knowledge without love (4 8), or love that paid its debts with goodly phrases and empty words (3 17 18). A docetic Christ meant docetic Christianity. (c) Finally, St John sees in the incarnation of the Son of God the only possible redemption. It was not for a word or a formula he was concerned, but for the raising of humanity to Divine life through the God-man. The ultimate significance of the incarnation of the Son is that in Him the eternal life of God has flowed into our humanity and become a fountain of regenerative power to as many as receive Him (1 Jn 1 12). "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life" (1 Jn 5 12). This is the incarnation of the Spirit as the agent of human Christ, who stands in a unique, vital relation to men, reproducing in them His own character and experiences as the vine reproduces itself in the branches, doing that, the mysterious reality of which is only expressed, not explained, when it is said that He is our "life" (Jn 14 19 20; 15 5).

IV. The Holy Spirit.—In one direction the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is uniquely developed in the Johannine writings. The conception of the Work of the Christ's presence with and activity in the church is presented with a fulness and cleanness unequalled in the Gospel NT. The departing Christ promises his friends a new friend, different from Himself in own in that it was to be not a bodily but a spiritual presence, and yet really His own—a presence in which all and more than all the effects of His bodily presence would be perpetuated (Jn 14 18; 16 22). In truth, it was expedient for them that He should go away, in order that this other Paraclete Son of God (16 7). In the body His presence with His followers had been local and intermittent; in the Spirit He would come to take up His abode with them forever (16 16). Formerly He had been still external to them, but now was not only to dwell with them, but to be in them (16 17). Instead of the external voice of their Teacher addressing to them the words of eternal life, they should possess the very Spirit of truth (16 17), a well-spring of illumination from within, giving them an 'understanding' to know Him that is true (1 Jn 5 20); and instead of His visible example before their eyes, an inward community of life with Him like that of the vine and the branches. The complete, vital, permanent union of Christ and His people, which had been prevented by the necessary limitations of a local, corporeal state of existence, would be attained, when for this there was substituted the direct action of spirit upon spirit. Perpetuates, but also intensifies the consciousness of Christ.—Then the function of the Paraclete, as chiefly emphasized in the Johannine writings is that by which He perpetuates but also intensifies, enlightens, and educates the consciousness of Christ in the church and in the Christian life. In this respect His nature is that of the Logos, the self-revealing God. The Holy Spirit never reveals Himself to human consciousness; He reveals the Son and the Father through the Son. His operations are wholly secret and incalculable, known to them only, and only is this result (Jn 3 8). He is this silent inward monitor and remembrancer of the disciples (Jn 14 20); the illuminator, the revealer of Christ (16 14); a spirit of witness who both Himself bears witness concerning Christ to His people and makes of them ready and joyful witness-bearers (15 26 27); a guide by whom a steady growth in knowledge is secured, leading gradually on to the full truth of Christ (16 12 13); a spirit of conviction working in men an immediate certainty of the truth regarding sin and righteousness, and the Divine judgment which marks their eternal antagonism (16 8 11).

In the Ep. we find the promise of the Gospel accomplished in actual experience. There is no record of the manner of His sending. But that the Holy Spirit was coming of the first age, the prophetic alius of the First excepted (1 Jn 4 1). But whether Epistle through the prophetic "medium" or the normal Christian consciousness, the function of the Spirit is always to "teach" or to "witness" concerning Christ. This is finely brought out in the parallelism of 1 Jn 5 6: "This [Jesus Christ] is he that came" (once for all fulfilling the Messiah's mission); "It is the Spirit that beareth record, whatsoever His Spirit witnesseth to every man that heareth the words of His mouth" (Jn 15 26). The specific testimony the Spirit bears to Christ is defined (1 Jn 4 23); "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; 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." (1) A Divine Teacher.—The gift of the Spirit is an "anointing from the Holy One" (1 Jn 2 20); and the result of this "anointing" is that "we know all things" (or that "ye all know how long", the reading is doubtful), and "need not that any one teach you" (2 27). The apostle's comfort concerning his readers, encompassed as they are by the snares of Aesence, different from his own in that it was to be not a bodily but a spiritual presence, and yet really His own—a
ters to them an invincible assurance of the truth of the Gospel. “The anointing abideth in you, and teacheth you concerning all things.” The spirit is not a source of independent revelation, but makes the revelation of Christ effectual. The truth is placed beyond all reach of controversy and passed into absolute knowledge. “Ye know all things.” It may be added that the history of Christianity furnishes an always growing verification of this Johannine doctrine of a living power of witness and enlightenment present in the church, by which, notwithstanding the converse of human imperfection, the development of the Christian faith has been steadily advanced, its forgotten or neglected factors brought to remembrance. Old truths have been presented in new aspects and filled with fresh life, and all has been brought to pass with marvelous adaptation to the church’s needs and in proportion to its receptivity.

(2) Other aspects.—In other directions the doctrine of the Spirit is less developed. The agency of the Spirit in regeneration is repeatedly and emphatically declared in a single passage (Jn 3:5-8), but is nowhere else referred to either in the Gospel or the First Ep. More repeatedly referred to in the Gospel nor Ep. is the Spirit once spoken of as the Divine agent in sanctification. This sense is also present in John’s declaration that in which St. John speaks of the ethical “fruit of the Spirit” (Gal 5:22,23). The Spirit is the spirit of truth, the revealer, the inspirer of all truth spoken of as the spirit of love and holiness. If those who are begotten of God cannot sin, it is simply in the sense that “he cannot sin” because “this spirit abideth in them” (1 Jn 3:9). The explanation of this peculiarity (which has been little observed) in the Johannine theology may be that the Spirit’s work of revealing Christ is regarded as all-inclusive. Thus enabling Christ’s disciples to abide in the vine, he assures also their bringing forth “much fruit” in all Christlikeness of character and conduct.

Passing now from the work to the Person, we observe that in the Fourth Gospel the attribution of the work to the Spirit reaches the same of distinctness. He is person “another Paraclete” (Jn 14:16 m.), personal to Christ Himself is personal; and all the functions ascribed to Him to remind, to teach, to testify, to guide, to convict—such are as are possible only to a personal being. Nor is it otherwise in the First Ep. The expressions in it in which have been alleged (Pfleiderer and others) as inconsistent with personality (the “anointing,” 2 Jn 17) have been given various interpretations; but none such interpretation. The “anointing” denotes the Spirit, not in His essence or agency, but as the gift of the Holy One with which He anoints believers (John 7:38,39), and the expression “He hath given unto me both this name and the glory” is no more incompatible with personality than is the saying “to Him whom he hath sent . . . , God giveth not the Spirit by measure” (Jn 3:4), or than our speaking of Christians as having more or less of the Spirit.

His Deity implied.—The essential Deity of the Spirit is nowhere explicitly asserted, but is necessarily implied in His relation both to Christ and to the church as the “other Paraclete.” There is not, however, the same theological development as is achieved regarding the Logos. The Divinity of Christ is grounded in an essential duality of being within the Godhead itself; but there is no similar effort to trace back the threefoldness in the revelation of God, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to an essential threefoldness in the Divine nature. The fact is that both historically and logically the doctrine of the Spirit as the third person in the Godhead depends upon that of the Divine Son as the second. It was through its living experience in Christ that the church first developed its thought of God beyond the single monothelion of the OT; but having advanced to the conception of a twofold Godhead, in which there is Fatherhood and Sonship, it was bound to enlarge it still further to that of a threefold Godhead—Father, Son and Spirit. The Son and the Spirit were equally manifestations of God in redemption, and must equally stand in essential relation to the Divine existence.

V. Doctrine of Sin and Propitiation.—This theme is not elaborately developed, but characteristic of the Johannine views that salvation is looked at from the terminus ad quem rather than from the terminus a quo. The infinite good, eternal life, is more in view than the infinite evil, sin. It seems safe to assert that the same range of human imperfection, the development of the Christian faith has been steadily advanced, its forgotten or neglected factors brought to remembrance. Old truths have been presented in new aspects and filled with fresh life, and all has been brought to pass with marvelous adaptation to the church’s needs and in proportion to its receptivity.

1. Sin. It is true that the Spirit not only takes away the sin of the world (Jn 1:29), but also draws it forth in its utmost intensity and guilt. All sin culminates in the rejection of Christ (15:22); the spirit convicts men of sin because they have sinned (10:19). “No one who abides in Christ” is a servant of righteousness (Rom 6:1). The sin of the world (Jn 1:29), but also draws it forth in its utmost intensity and guilt. All sin culminates in the rejection of Christ (15:22); the spirit convicts men of sin because they have sinned (10:19). “Every one who has sinned is the bond-servant of sin” (8:34); but what reveals the true character of this bondage is that in the presence of the light, men “loved the darkness” (8:19). That the malign quality and power of evil are fully revealed only in the presence of the light, but that the brightness of the light, the darker is the shade of guilt created by its rejection—all this St. John teaches; but such teaching is by no means peculiar to him, and to infer from it that “to his mind sin in itself involves no moral culpability” is nothing more than a wayward paradox.

In the Ep., the guilt of sin as constituting an objective disability to fellowship with God is strongly emphasized. “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves” (1 Jn 1:8). The phrase “to have sin” is peculiar to St. John, and specifically denotes the culpability of the agent (cf Jn 9:41; 15:22,24; 19:11). Sin is essentially that which needs God’s forgiveness (1 Jn 1:9; 2:1-2); and to this end an intercessor (1:1-3) is provided. Such culpability is universal: “If we say that we have not sinned, we”—not only deceive ourselves—“we make him a liar” (1 Jn 1:10).

A second passage (1 Jn 3:4-8) emphasizes the ethical quality (as it is a divided entity) no more incompatible with personality than is the saying “to Him whom he hath sent . . . , God giveth not the Spirit by measure” (Jn 3:4), or than our speaking of Christians as having more or less of the Spirit.

His Deity implied.—The essential Deity of the Spirit is nowhere explicitly asserted, but is necessarily implied in His relation both to Christ and to the church as the “other Paraclete.” There is not, however, the same theological development as is achieved regarding the Logos. The Divinity of Christ is grounded in an essential duality of being within the Godhead itself; but there is no similar effort to trace back the threefoldness in the revelation of God, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to an essential threefoldness in the Divine nature. The fact is that both historically and logically the doctrine of the Spirit as the third person in the Godhead depends upon that of the Divine Son as the second. It was through its living experience in Christ that the church first developed its thought of God beyond the single monothelion of the OT; but having advanced to the conception of a twofold Godhead, in which there is Fatherhood and Sonship,
said, to expound a doctrine of propitiation; yet his frontispiece to the ministry of Jesus is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and, as Dr. Inge has pointed out, the Paschal Lamb underlies the whole narrative of the Passion. In the high-priestly prayer Our Lord expressly represents Himself as the covenant-sacrifice which consecrates His disciples as the people of God (17:19); while the Synoptic "ransom for many" is paralleled by the interpretation of Christ's death as effectual "for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad" (11:51,52; cf 1 Jn 2:2).

2. In the Epistle.—In the Ep. the doctrinal statement is much more explicit. The fact of propitiation is placed in the forefront. The passage which immediately follows the Prologue (1:6—2:2) introduces a group of ideas—propitiation, blood, forgiveness, cleansing—which are taken directly from the sacrificial system of the OT, and are expressed, indeed, in technical Levitical terms. The mode of action by which Christ accomplished and still accomplishes His mission as the Saviour of the world is: He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (2:2). Propitiation has its ultimate source in the moral nature of God. It is no device for inducing a reluctant Deity to forgive; it is the way by which the Father stirs up His children to Himself. In St. John's conception it is the supreme act of God's supreme attribute, love. "Herein is love" (4:10). Yet it is a real work of propitiation in which this love goes forth for man's salvation—a work, that explains the guilt of the sin, which restores sinful offenders to God by rendering their sin null and ineffectual as a barrier to fellowship with Him. This propitiatory virtue is regarded as concentrated in the "blood of Jesus his Son" (1:7), that is to say, in the Divine-human life offered to God in the sacrifice of the cross. This, if we walk in the light as He is in the light, "cleanseth us from all sin"—removes from us the stain of our guilt, and makes us clean in God's sight. In virtue of this, Christ is the penitent sinner's advocate (paraclete-helper) with the Father (2:1). The words "with the Father" are highly significant. Even the Father's love can urge nothing in apology for sin, nothing that avails to absolve from its guilt. But there is one who can urge on our behalf when at once the strongest condemnation of our sin and plea for its remission—Himself, "Jesus Christ the righteous" (2:1). And he [Himself] is the propitiation for our sins. St. John does not speak of Christ as "making propitiation": He, Himself, in virtue of all He is—Jesus Christ, in whom the Divine ideal of humanity is consummated, in whom the Father sees His own essential righteousness revealed, Jesus Christ the Righteous—is both propitiation and Advocate. This conception is not only united in one person, but constitute the one reconciling work by which there is abiding fellowship between God and His sinning people.

3. One with NT teaching.—In this statement of the doctrine of propitiation, memorable as it is, there is nothing notably original. It tacitly presupposes, as NT teaching everywhere does, that God, in bestowing the sovereign grace of pardon and sonship, must deal truthfully and adequately with sin as a violation of the moral order; and with Christ, as with other NT writers, the necessity and efficacy of sacrifice as the means by which this is accomplished are simply axiomatic. His great contribution to Christian thought is the vision of that spiritual heart of things suggestive these two statements when placed side by side! "Herein is love . . . that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 Jn 4:10); and "Hereby know we love [recognize what it is], because he laid down his life for us" (3:16). He is sending His Son and laying down His life are mere equivalents. The sacrifice of Christ is the sacrifice of God. St. John's doctrine of propitiation follows as a moral necessity from his doctrine of God. If God is love, nothing is more inevitably true than that He suffers on account of man. And if God is love, the power to help and save men by bearing their burden would be to deny to Him love's highest prerogative.

VI. Eternal Life.—The development of the conception of eternal life must be set along with the development of the doctrine of the moral nature of God and the frontine of the incarnation as one of the greatest contributions of the Johannine theology to NT thought. With this conception the Gospel begins (1:4) and ends (20:31); and, in like manner, the Ep. (1:2; 6:28). The designation most frequently employed is simply "the life" (και ἀμών), 17 t in the Gospel and 6 t in the First Ep. It is described qualitatively as "eternal"; but the adj. brings out only what is implicit in the noun. In harmony with the universal Bib. conception, St. John regards the "hymnum bonum, in which the right of fellowship with God consists, which therefore fulfills the highest idea of being—"perfect truth in perfect action" (Westcott). Christ Himself is "the life" (Jn 14:6), its only bestower and unfailing source. But He came that we might have it abundantly (10:10).

But this conception is uniquely developed in two directions. While the eschatological element is not lost, it is absorbed in the ethical. The ideas of duration and futurity, which are properly absorbed by the adj. "eternal" (αιωνιος—belonging to an æon—specifically to "the coming æon"), become secondary to that of timeless moral quality. Always life is regarded as a present possession rather than as future felicity (e.g. Jn 3:36; 20:31; 1 Jn 3:14; 5:12). For St. John the question whether it is possible to make the best of both worlds is meaningless. Eternal life is the best, the Divine, kind of life, whether in this world or in the kind of life that has its perfect manifestation in Christ (1 Jn 1:2; 5:11). To possess that nature which produces thoughts and motives and desires, words and deeds like His, is to have eternal life.

Metaphysically the conception undergoes a development which is equally remarkable, the elimination of many, of more questionable value. It has already been noted that life is conceived as the animating principle or essence of the Divine nature, the inward energy of which all its activities are the manifestation and outgo. And this conception is carried through with strict consistency. The spiritual life in men, which is "begotten of God," is the vital essence, the mystic principle which is manifested in all the capacities and activities of Christian personality. It does not consist in, and still less is it a result flowing, repentance, faith, obedience or love; it is that of which these are the fruits and the evidence. Thus instead of "This do, and thou shalt live" (Lk 10:29), St. John says, conversely, "Hereby shall ye know that doth righteousness is [has been] begotten of [God] (1 Jn 2:29), the "end of faith" (Rom 1:17 AV). "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is [has been] begotten of God" (1 Jn 5:1). The human activity which expresses the essence of Divine life already imparted, not the condition or manner of its attainment. In this Johannine conception life is cause, not effect; not phenomenon but essence; not the complex whole of the qualities, activities and experiences of the spiritual life of the individual, but that makes them possible—the Insurmountable, Divinely-comprehended principle (1 Jn 3:8). The capacity for them is given and by which also it is realized.

Reply to criticism.—This Johannine conception of life is vigorously criticized by some writers along the lines of Christian experience principles and modes of thought borrowed from Gr philosophy. But the tendency to infer causes from effects is to render
phenomena to essence is not peculiar to Gr philosophy; it is native to the human intellect. The Johannine conception of spiritual life is closely analogous to the concept of physical life. We do not deceive that a man lives because he breathes and feels and says, "I live," but because he lives, because there is in him that mystic principle we call life. Only to the thinker trained in the logic of empiricalism, in which life is possible only to define life solely by its phenomena, as e.g. "the continuous adjustment of inert matter to external stimuli" (Spencer). The ordinary mind instinctively passes behind the phenomena to an entity of which they are the manifestation. The Johannine concep­tion of life, moreover, lies in the natural life, far-reaching development for NT thought. It is implicit in what Jesus himself refers to when he says God made man as He made the sheep (John 10:10). This is the meaning of the Johannine term for life, the "eternal life," which existed in relation to the Father (John 1:2). By the incarnation of the Son the eternal life of man in its Divine fulness has become incorporated with humanity, a permanent source of regenerative power to "as many as received him" (John 1:12). It is His very power to be the Father that He reproduces in men (John 17:23).

(3) Through the Spirit.—In the communication of this life the Spirit is the sole agent (John 3:5-8; see above, under IV).

The "begotten".—The act of Divine self-communciation is constantly and exclusively expressed by the word "begot" (genânän—John 1:18; 3:5-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:9, etc.). The word is of far-reaching significance. It implies not only that life has its ultimate origin in God, but that its com­munication is directly and solely His act. In how literal a sense the Divine begetting is to be understood appears very strikingly in John 3:9: "Who­soever is begotten of God doeth no sin; because his seed abideth in him." The unique expression "his seed" signifies the new life-principle which is the formative element of the "children of God." This abides in him who has received it. It stamps its own character upon his life and determines its whole development.

The "children of God."—Those who are "begotten of God" are "iooio fato "children of God" (îkêan thead, John 1:12; 11:52; 1 John 3:12.10; 5:2).
The term connotes primarily the direct communication of the Father's own nature; and secondarily the fact that the natural man who has not as yet reached its full stature, but contains the promise of a future glorious development. We are now children of God, but what it fully is to be children of God is not yet made manifest (1 John 3:2). Participation in this life creates a family fellowship (koinônia) at once human and Divine. Those who are begotten of God and walk in the light have "fellowship one with another" (John 1:7). They are "brethren" and are knit together by the bond of the Son (John 1:35) and the duties of mutu­al love (1 John 3:13; 15:12; 1 John 3:16; 4:11) and of mutual watchfulness and intercession (John 15:16).

On the Divine side they have fellowship "with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (John 1:3). In this Divine fellowship lies grounded the unique nourishment and sustenance of love. Only in the love of the indwelling of Christ in the members of His body. And while it is no doubt true that the Johannine conception of life was immedi­ately influenced by contact with Heilensm, it is one which was sure, sooner or later, to emerge in Christian theology.

1) Source in God.—In the development of the doctrine we note the following points. (1) The sole and absolute source of life is God, the Father, revealed in Christ. "The Father hath life in himself" (John 5:26). He is the "vinedresser," and by whom the Son lives (John 6:57).—the "true God, and eternal life" (John 5:20). Eternal life is nothing else than the immu­nity of the God in moral beings created after His likeness; the Divine nature reproducing itself in human nature; the energy of the Spirit of God in the spiritual nature of man. This is its ultimate definition.

(2) Mediated by Christ.—Of this life Christ is the sole mediator (John 6:33.57; 11:25; 14:6). The word 'Gott' is the "life," and this life is in His Son" (John 5:11). This mediation is grounded in the relation, eternally subsisting within the Godhead, of the Logos to the Father. The life manifested and seen in the historic Christ (John 1:1) is the "life, the eternal life," which existed in relation to the Father (John 1:2). By the incarnation of the Son the eternal life of man in its Divine fulness has become incorporated with humanity, a permanent source of regenerative power to "as many as received him" (John 1:12). It is His very power to be the Father that He reproduces in men (John 17:23).

(3) Through the Spirit.—In the communication of this life the Spirit is the sole direct agent (John 3:5-8; see above, under IV).

The "begotten."—The act of Divine self-commication is constantly and exclusively expressed by the word "begot" (genânän—John 1:18; 3:5-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:9, etc.). The word is of far-reaching significance. It implies not only that life has its ultimate origin in God, but that its com­munication is directly and solely His act. In how literal a sense the Divine begetting is to be understood appears very strikingly in John 3:9: "Who­soever is begotten of God doeth no sin; because his seed abideth in him." The unique expression "his seed" signifies the new life-principle which is the formative element of the "children of God." This abides in him who has received it. It stamps its own character upon his life and determines its whole development.

The "children of God."—Those who are "begotten of God" are "iooio fato "children of God" (îkêan thead, John 1:12; 11:52; 1 John 3:12.10; 5:2).
The term connotes primarily the direct communication of the Father's own nature; and secondarily the fact that the natural man who has not as yet reached its full stature, but contains the promise of a future glorious development. We are now children of God, but what it fully is to be

VII. Human Nature and Its Regeneration. — The necessity of regeneration is fundamental to the whole theological scheme (John 3:5.7). Life which consists with God does not become a man as he is naturally constituted; those who know that they have eternal life know that it is theirs because they have "passed out of death into life" (1 John 3:14; 5:24).
The unregenerate state of human nature is specially connected with the Johannine conception of the "world" (kosmos). This term has a peculiar definiteness of application; and the idea of its origin is "the ordure of finite being, regarded as apart from God"—may be taken as expressing the widest idea that underlies St. John's use of the word. When the kosmos is material, it signifies (1) the existing terrestrial creation (Jn 1:10; 13:1; 18:24), etc., as contrasted with the sphere of the heavenly and eternal. When it refers to humanity, it is either (2) the totality of mankind as needing redemption and as the object of God's redeeming love (Jn 3:16; 1 Jn 2:2; 4:14), or (3) the mass of unbelieving men, hostile to Christ and resisting salvation (e.g. Jn 15:18). Of the world in this sense it is said that it has no perception of the true nature of God and of the Divine glory of Christ (Jn 1:10; 17:5); that it hates the children of the heavenly Father (Jn 15:18,19; 17:14; 1 Jn 3:13); that the spirit of Antichrist dwells in it (1 Jn 4:3,4); that to belong to the false prophets and their adherents (1 Jn 4:15); that it is under the dominion of the wicked one (Jn 12:31; 14:30; 15:20); that there are "the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life" (1 Jn 2:16); that it passes away (1 Jn 2:17); that Christ has conquered it (1 Jn 5:18), and that "whatsoever is begotten of God" is "manifested in him" (1 Jn 4:4) by the power of the Father in Him (1 Jn 5:5). Thus the "world" (in this darker significance) is composed of those who still love the darkness rather than the light (Jn 3:19), who, when Christ is presented to them, obstinately retain their blindness and enmity. Nevertheless, the "world" is not beyond the possibility of salvation. The Holy Spirit, acting in the Christian community, will convince the world with regard to sin and righteousness and judgment (Jn 16:8); and the evidence of the unity of Divine fellowship among Christ's disciples will lead it to believe in His Divine mission (1 Jn 23).

Thus it is true that St. John teaches "a distinction that it hates the children of the heavenly Father—those who are from above and those who are from beneath—children of light and children of darkness." But that he teaches this in any agnostic or semi-materialistic sense is a misapprehension, for there is no natural basis. He distinguishes between those who love the light and those who love the darkness rather than the light, between those who "receive" Christ and those who "will not receive Him" (Jn 1:11). This distinction, however, he traces not to anything in the natural constitution of the two classes, but solely to the regenerating act of God (Jn 1:13; 6:44). His doctrine of regeneration is, in fact, his solution of the problem created by the actual existence of those two classes among men, a problem which is forced upon every thoughtful Christian mind by the diverse and opposite results of evangelism. It is this that lies behind such utterances as 15:10; "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (Jn 18:37); "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice... and they follow me" (Jn 10:26,27); "Every one that hath heard from the Father, cometh unto me. No man can come unto me except it be given unto him of the Father" (Jn 6:44,45). In these and all similar passages, belief or unbelief in Christ, when he is presented, depends upon antecedent spiritual predisposition (St. John's equivalent to the Pauline predestination). There exists in every man, that is, a latent spiritual determination by which Christ is recognized, a capacity and a predisposition to receive Him. But this predisposition is not (any more than St. Paul's predestination) theirs by gift of nature. St. John refuses to find its source in human personality (Jn 1:13; 1 Jn 5:1). The children of God are, all of them, "humbled" (1 Jn 3:1). They are men who have passed from death into life, and who have done so because they are begotten of God. St. John's doctrine is thus the antithesis of Gnosticism. The gnostic distinction of two classes in the human race glorified a personal spiritual power in the manner of被盗的身分, who was spiritual pride. The effect of St. John's doctrine is to humble man and glorify God, to satisfy the innermost Christian consciousness that not even for their appropriation of God's grace in Christ can believers take credit to themselves; that in nothing can the human spirit do more than respond to the Divine, and that, in the last analysis, this power itself is of God. Regeneration in the Johannine sense is not to be identified with conversion; it is the communication of that vision of truth and that capacity for new moral activity which issue in conversion. The doctrine of regeneration contained in the Johannine writings is the fullest recognition in the NT that all the conscious experiences and activities of the Johannine period were under the seal of God's own inscrutable work of begetting in the depths of human personality, and of renewing and replenishing there, the energies of the Divine.

VIII. The Church and Sacraments.—While the word "Church" is not specifically used in the Johannine literature, the Church is the Church of the Johannine theology. The Divine life communicated to men creates a Divine community, a "fellowship" which is with the Father and "with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 Jn 1:4), and which "are all one with another" (1 Jn 5:7) —a fellowship which is consecrated by the self-consecration of Jesus (Jn 17:19), in which men are cleansed from all sin by blood (1 Jn 1:8), and which is maintained by His intercessory action as the Advocate with the Father (1 Jn 2:1). This fellowship is realized in the actual Christian community and there only; but it is essentially inward and spiritual, not mechanically ecclesiastical. In the visible community spurious elements may intrude themselves, as is proved when schism unites those who, though they have belonged to the external organization, have never been partakers of its real life (1 Jn 3:18). Only among those who walk in the light of God does there exist the truth (1 Jn 1:7).

From the doctrine of the Divine nature as life and light one might a priori infer the possibilities of a Johannine view of the sacraments. It is evident that there is the Johannine system of thought for a genuinely sacramental action in a Divine action—the employment of definite external acts not as symbols only, but as real media of Divine communication. On the one hand, heテンソ1すが考えられることや Church with a tendency that God is life only but light also—self-revealing as well as self-imparting—would necessarily exclude any magical efficacy which the theologians of a later period attributed either to the physical elements in themselves or to the physical act of participation. And (though there is little or no explicit statement) such is the type of doctrine we actually find. With regard to all sacramental rites the universal principle applies: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing' (Jn 6:63).

1. Baptism.—Yet baptism is the physical counterpart of the Spirit's work in regeneration, and great importance is attached to it as the means of admission to the new life of the kingdom (Jn 3:5).

2. The Lord's Supper.—The omission of all reference to the institution of the Lord's Supper by the Johannine accounts of the feast-washing and the proclamation of the new commandment taking its place in the life of the church, thought to indicate that St. John was conscious of a tendency to attach a superstitious value to the outward observance, and desired emphasis upon the spiritual and essential nature of this to what was spiritual and essential. The omission, to whatever motive it may have been due, is perfectly balanced by the sacramental discourse (Jn 6). While the language of this discourse is not to be interpreted as a technically eucharistic service, the idea of its purpose, undoubtedly, is to set forth the significance of the Lord's Supper in its spiritual significance, which gives to men the bread of life, which is His own flesh and of which men must eat if they may live (Jn 6:50—63). "He that eateth this bread, even as I, abideth in me and I in him." This eating and drinking is essentially the spiritual and essential nature of the Spirit. It signifies a derivation of life analogous to that of the Son Himself from the Father.
"As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because I am the bread of life. 

17. That is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. 

18. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: for the bread that cometh down from heaven is that which the Father hath given me, and is of more value to them who have apprehended its true meaning. The material elements represent the flesh and blood of Christ—His Divine Incarnation for the life of the world. He is present in them, not merely by way of symbol, but actually; but the spiritual is something in the realm corresponding to the spiritual reality, which is conveyed through the gift. The outward act of participation must be accomplished in Christ and a true insight into the nature of His work and a will to know and see Him. The sacrament becomes operative as a bread of life through this receptive spirit on the part of those who observe it." (Scott, The Fourth Gospel, 127-28).

IX. Eschatology.—The type of mind revealed in the Johannine writings is one that instinctively leans to the ideal and the spiritual in its contemplation of life, grasping what is of universal significance and dwelling upon events only as they are the embodiment of eternal principles.

1. Type of Thought Not for him events are not merely symbols; history is not allegory. The incarnation is a historical fact, the Parousia a future event. His thought does not move in a world of mere abstractions, a world in which nothing ever happens. His true distinction as a thinker lies in the success with which he unites the two strains of thought, the historical and the ideal. The word which may be said to express his conception of history is "manifestation" (of Jn 2 11; 9 3; but esp. 1 Jn 1 2; 2 19.28; 3 2.5.8; 4 9). The incarnation is only the manifestation of "what was from the beginning" (1 Jn 1 2); the mission of Christ, the manifestation of the love eternally latent in the depths of the Divine nature (1 Jn 4 9). The successive events of history are the emergence into visibility of what already exists. In them the potential becomes actual. Thus St. John has an eschatology, as well as a history. He profoundly spiritualizes. He reaches beyond the world of representations of the traditional apocalyptic and inquires what essential principle each of these embodies. Then he discovers that this principle is already universally and inevitably in operation; and this, the present spiritual reality, becomes for him the primary thought. Judgment means essentially the sitting and separation, the classification of men according to their spiritual affinities. But every day men are thus classifying themselves by their attitude toward Christ; this, the true judgment of the world, is already present fact. So also the coming and presence of Christ must always be essentially a spiritual fact, and as such it is already a present fact. There is the deep significance of the word, a perpetual coming of Christ in Christian experience. This, however, does not prevent St. John from firmly holding the certainty of a fuller manifestation of these facts in the future, when tendencies will have reached their final culmination, and principles which are now apprehended only by faith will be revealed in all the visible magnitude of their consequences.

We shall now briefly survey the Johannine presentation of the chief eschatological ideas.

1. Eternal Life.—It has already been said that the most distinctive feature in the conception of eternal life is that it is not a future immortal felicity so much as a present spiritual state. The category of duration recedes before that of moral quality. Yet the term "eternal" is not merely a symbol, but contains a corresponding actuality. In triumphant contrast with the poor ephemeralities of the worldly life, he that doeth the will of God "abideth for ever" (Jn 2 17); and the complete realization of the life eternal is still in the future (Jn 4 36; 6 27; 12 27).

2. Antichrist.—The view of Antichrist is strikingly characteristic. Tacitly setting aside the lurid figure of popular traditions, St. John grasps the essential fact that is expressed by the name and idea of Antichrist (= one who in the guise of Christ opposes Christ), and finds its fulfilment in the false teaching which substituted for the Christ of the gospel the fantastic product of gnostic imagination (1 Jn 4 3). But in this he reads the sign that the world's day has reached its last hour (1 Jn 2 18).

3. Resurrection.—While the Fourth Gospel so carefully records the proofs of Christ's resurrection, noticeably little (in the Ep., nothing) is made of the thought of a future resurrection from the dead. For the Christian, the death of Christ was an incident. "Whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die" (Jn 11 26; cf 8 51). Regeneration—union with Christ—is the true resurrection (Jn 6 50.51.55). And yet, again, the eschatological idea is not lost. Side by side with the eternal truth the supplementary and interpretative truth is given its right place. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (Jn 6 54). If Christ says "I am the life; whoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die," He also says "I am the resurrection: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live" (Jn 11 25).

4. Judgment.—As has already been said, St. John regards judgment as essentially a present fact of life. Christ does not pass judgment upon men—that is not the purpose of His coming (Jn 3 17; 12 47). Yet Christ is always of necessity judging men—compelling them to pass judgment upon themselves. For judgment is the world (Jn 9 39). By their attitude toward Him men involuntarily but inevitably classify themselves, reveal what spirit they are of, and automatically register themselves as being or as not being "of the truth" (Jn 18.30). The assigning of a character from without, but the revelation of a character from within. And this is not future, but present. "He that believeth not hath been judged . . . because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God" (Jn 3 18). Yet the apostle indubitably looks forward to a future Day of Judgment (Jn 12 48; 1 Jn 4 17). Nor is this simply an "unconscious concession to orthodoxy." The judgment to come will be the full manifestation of the judgment that now is, that is to say, of the principles according to which men are in reality approved or condemned already. What this present judgment, the classification of men by their relation to Christ, ultimately signifies, is not at all realized by the "world," is not fully realized even in Christian faith. There must be a day when all self-deception shall cease and all reality shall be manifested.

5. The Parousia.—In like manner the conception of the Parousia is primarily spiritual. The substitution in the Fourth Gospel of the Supper Discourse (Jn 14-16) for the apocalyptic chapters in the Synoptics is of the utmost significance. It is not a Christ coming on the clouds of heaven that is presented, but a Christ who has come and is
ever coming to dwell in closest fellowship with His people (see above under IV). Yet St. John by no means discards belief in the Parousia as a historical event. He does, in fact, employ the abiding-place that love Him and keep His word, there is also a Father’s House in which there are many abiding-places, whither He goes to prepare a place for them and whence He will come again to receive them unto Himself (Jn 14:23). Still more is this emphasized in the Ep. The command “Love not the world” is sharpened by the assurance that the world is on the verge, aye, in the process of dissolution (1 Jn 2:17). The exhortation “to abide in Him” is enforced by the dread of being put to shame at His impending advent (2:25). The hope of being made partakers in His manifested glory is the consummation of all that is implied in our being now children of God (1 Jn 3:2).

(a) A ‘manifestation’. But this future crisis will be only the manifestation of what already exists (3:2). The Parousia will, no more than the incarnation, be the advent of a strange Presence in the world. It will be, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, the outshining of a latent glory; not the arrival of one who is absent, but the self-revealing of one who is present. As to the manner of Christ’s appearing, the Ep. is silent. As to its significance, we are left in no doubt. It is a historical event; occurring once for all; the consummation of all Divine purposes; the consummation of human existence; the crisis in the history of the church, of the world, and of every man.

(b) Relation to believers: Especially for the children of God, it will be a coming unto salvation. “Beloved, we are children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (1 Jn 3:2). Here the Johannine idea of “manifestation” is strikingly employed. “What we shall be” will be essentially what we are—children of God. No new element will be added to the regenerate nature. All is there that ever will be there. But the epoch of full development is not yet. The Christ who is already in the world—shall be manifested, then also the children of God who are in the world will be manifested as being what they are. They also will have come to their Mount of Transfiguration. As eternal life here is mediated through the manifestation (1 Jn 1:2), so eternal life hereafter will be mediated through this second and final manifestation. “We know that we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is.” It is true that here according to our capacity we behold Him as He is (1 Jn 4:13); but perception, now dim and wavering, will then be intense and vivid. The vision of the future is in some sense corporeal as well as spiritual. Sense and faith will coincide. It will then have ceased to be expedient that Christ should go before the Spirit of truth may come. We shall possess in the same experience the privilege of the original eyewitnesses of the incarnate life and the inward ministry of the Spirit. And seeing Him as He is, we shall be like Him. Vision will beget likeness, and likeness again give clearness to vision. And as the vision is in some unconjecturable fashion corporeal as well as spiritual, so also is the assimilation (cf Phil 3:21). The very idea of the spiritual body is that it perfectly corresponds to the body to which it belongs. The outward man will take the mold of the inward man, and will share with it its perfect likeness to the glorified manhood of Jesus Christ. Such is the farthest view opened to our hope by the Johannine eschatology; and it is that which, of all others, has been most eagerly pursued by the authors of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The abiding-place, the final manifestation, is a means to get to the inward man, in whose simulacrum of the children of God.


R. LAW

JOHN, son (Ἰωάννης, Ἰάκωβος): The name of several persons mentioned in the Apocalypse:

(1) Father of Mattathias, grandfather of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers (1 Macc 2:1).
(2) Eldest son of Mattathias, surnamed GADDAI (q.v.).
(3) Father of Eupolemus, one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 4:11).
(5) One of the envoys sent to treat with Lydius (2 Macc 11:17).

J. HUTCHISON

JOHN (Ἰωάννης, Ἰάκωβος): The name of 4 persons:

(1) JOHN THE BAPTIST (q.v.).
(2) The apostle, the son of Zebedee, and brother of James (see JOHN, THE APOSTLE).
(3) A relative of Anna’s, the high priest, who sat in the Sanhedrin when Peter and John were tried (Acts 4:6). Lightfoot supposes him to be the Jochanan ben Zacchai of the Talm, who, however, did not belong to the family of the high priest. Nothing is really known of him.
(4) JOHN MARK (q.v.).
(5) Father of Simon Peter (Jn 1:42; 21 15,17, m “Gr Iohannes: called in Mt 16 17, Jonah”).

S. F. HUNTER

JOHN, THE APOSTLE: The sources for the life of the apostle John are of various kinds, and of different degrees of trustworthiness.

Sources of the Life of St. John:

There are the references in the Synoptic Gospels, which may be used simply and easily without any preliminary critical inquiry into the question as to which of them is trustworthy as sources; for these Gospels contain the common tradition of the early church, and for the present purpose may be accepted as trustworthy. Further, there are the statements in Acts and in Gal, which we may use without discussion as a source for the life of St. John. There is next the universal tradition of the 2d cent., which we may use, if we can show that the John of Ephesus, who bulked so largely in the Christian literature of the 2d and 3d cents., is identical with the son of Zebedee. Further, on the supposition that the son of Zebedee is the author of the Johannine writings of the NT, there is another source of unequalled value for the estimate of the life and character of the son of Zebedee in these writings. Finally, there is the considerable volume of tradition which has been gathered around the life of John of Ephesus, of which, picturesque and interesting though the traditions be, only sparing use can be made.

I. Witness of the NT.—Addressing ourselves first to the Synoptic Gospels, to Acts and to Gal, we ask, What do we learn from these about the life of the apostle John? A glance only need be taken
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at the Johannine writings, more fully discussed elsewhere in relation to their author.

That John was one of the two sons of Zebedee, that he became one of the disciples of Jesus, that at His call he forsook all and followed Jesus, and was thereafter continuous with Jesus to the end, are facts familiar to every reader of the Synoptic Gospels.

The call was given to John and to his brother James at the Sea of Galilee, while in a boat with their father Zebedee, "Gneming their nets together" (Mt 4:21, 22, and i passages). "Come ye after me," said Jesus, "and I will make you to become fishes of men" (Mk 1:17; on the earlier call in Judaea, Jn 1:35 ff., see below). That Zebedee was a man of considerable wealth may be inferred from the fact that he had "hired servants" with him (Mk 1:20), and that his wife was one of those women who ministered of their substance to Jesus and His disciples (Mk 7:55-56). Comparison of the latter passage with Mk 16:40-41 identifies the wife of Zebedee, John's mother, with Salome, and it seems a fair inference from Jn 19:25, though all do not accept it, that Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Salome, the wife of Zebedee, were sisters. On this view, James and John were cousins of Jesus, and were also related to the family home in the Baptist region.

The name of John appears in all the lists of the apostles given in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 10:2 and i passages). While his name appears rarely in a position by itself, he is still one of the most prominent of the disciples. With Peter and James he is placed at the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Mk 5:37; Lk 8:51 ff.). These three were also present at the transfiguration (Mt 17; Mk 9; Lk 9). They were nearest to the Lord at the agony of Gethsemane. In all these cases nothing characteristic is given of John. It is important to note that he is simply present as one of the three, and therefore one of the most intimate of the disciples. But there is something characteristic in an incident recorded by Luke (9:54), in which James and John are celebrated as wishing to call down fire on a Samaria village, which had refused them hospitality. From this we may infer something of the earnestness, zeal, and enthusiasm of the brothers, and of their high sense of what was due to their Master.

It is also stated here that James and John were among the four who asked Jesus about the prophecies He had uttered: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" (Mk 13:4). Then the question is put to the rest of the disciples, whether she desired for her sons in the coming kingdom (Mk 10:35 ff.). To Peter and John was entrusted the task of preparation for the keeping of the Passover (Lk 22:8). Once John stands alone, and asks what we may consider a characteristic question: "Teacher, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us" (Mk 9:38; Lk 9:49). From these notices we see that John was in the front rank of the disciples, and we see also that he was far conscious of the position he held, and of the intimate connection he had with the Master. We note further that John was a young man of fiery zeal, and of a tendency toward intolerance and exclusiveness. The zeal and the intolerance are in evidence in the desire to call down fire upon the Samaria village, and the tendency toward exclusiveness is manifested in the request of his mother as to the place her sons were to occupy in the kingdom. They desire to have the highest position. These tendencies were not encouraged by Jesus. They were rebuked by Him once and again, but the tendencies reveal the men.

In harmony with these notices of character and temperament is the name given to the brothers by Jesus, "Boanerges," "Sons of thunder" (Mk 3:17), which, whatever else may be meant by it, means strength, unexpectedness, and zeal approaching to methods of violence.

John is found in company with Peter in the opening scenes in Acts. He is with Peter while the man at the gate was healed (3:1 f.). He is then with Peter on the mission to Samaria Gal (8:14 f.). He is with Peter and James, the Lord's brother, at the interview with St. Paul recorded in Gal 2, and the three are described by St. Paul as the pillar apostles (2:9). This interview is of importance because it proves that John had survived his brother James, whose death is recorded in Acts 12; at all events that John and James were not killed by the Jews at the same time, as some now contend that they were. This contention is considered below.

Much is to be learned of the apostle John from the Fourth Gospel, assuming the Gospel to have been written by him. We learn from it that he was a disciple of John the Baptist (1:35), that he was one of the first six disciples called by Jesus in His Gospel early ministry in Judaea (vs 37-51), and that he was present at all the scenes which he describes in the Gospel.

We find later an account given of the death which was acquainted with many there. To that home he took Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom the dying Saviour entrusted to his care (19:26-27). Much more also we learn of him and of his history, for the Gospel is interwoven into the records of the growth of faith on the part of the writer, and of the way in which his eyes were opened to see the glory of the Lord, and of the promises that have come to fruition.

It was in the inner circle of the disciples, indeed, that John is so described as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (13:25; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7-20), and, because of that love, became the apostle of love (see, further, JOHN, GOSPEL OF; JOHN, EPISTLES OF; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY).

The Book of Rev, likewise traditionally ascribed to John, bears important witness to the apostle's banishment in later life to the isle of Patmos in the Aegean (1:9). There he received the visions recorded in the book. The banishment probably took place in the reign of Domitian (96-98 A.D.); cf. the Rev. 1:19), with whose practice it was entirely in consonance (on the severity of such exile, see Sir W. M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, ch viii). The testimony is of high importance in its bearing on the question as to the position of John's residence in Asia, a point now to be discussed.

II. Alleged Early Martyrdom of John: Criticism of Evidence.—The consistent testimony of the church of the 2nd cent. is that the later years of St. John were spent at Ephesus, where he wrote his Gospel, and St. John's Residence in Ephesus (see the evidence drawn out in detail in Ephesians in Godet, Comm. on Gospel of St. John, 45-48). It was also Lightfoot, "The School of Ephesians," in Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"), that, before, however, we can use the traditions connected with this residence at Ephesus, it is needful to inquire into the statement alleged to be made by Papias that John, the son of Zebedee, was killed by the Jews at an early date. It is plain, that, if this statement is correct, the apostle could not be the author of the Johannine writings in the NT, universally dated near the end of the 1st cent.

The evidence for the statement that St. John was early killed by the Jews is thus summed up by Dr. Moffatt: "The evidence for the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee is, in fact, threefold: (a) a prophecy of Jesus pre-
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served in Mk 10:30—Mt 20:23, (b) the witness of Papias, and (c) the calendars of the church

(***Intro to Lit. of NT,*** 692). Our limit

On this point of view is an exhaustive evi-

dence, but, happily, an exhaustive examina-
tion is not needed.

(a) The first head proceeds on an assumption which is not warranted, viz. a prophecy of John should not be credibly ad

nicted in the present instance, a literal fulfillment of the prophecy ('"(hangel') is not out of question, for there is no hint that either James or John

was crucified. We must therefore fall back on the passage in **John** which contains the declaration of John: "I am the voice of one

which cries in the wilderness: 'Make straight the way of the Lord.' **John the Baptizer** (Fourth Gospel) (1911).

(b) Dr. Moffatt lays great stress on what he calls the testimony of Papias. Papias is not found in any early authority, and then

occurs in writers not of any great value from the point of view of critical investigation. It is found in a passage of Georgius Hamartolius (9th cent.), and is held to be corre-

sponded to by Papias. (genuine) bracketing and copy

and as Moffatt admits (op. cit., 694), bears out the meaning attached to it. Origen is of opinion that the prophecy is not sufficiently fulfilled by the fact of

John's banishment to Patmos and his sufferings there. Then the whole question is what tradition taught and what the prophecy meant. From the whole statement of Georgius, which expressly declares that John survived the time of Nerva, nothing of Nerva's banishment is found in the so-called quotation from Papias. It is to be remem-

bered that the writings of Papias were known to Irenaeus and to Eusebius, and it is inconceivable that, if such a statement was to be found in these, they would have ignored it, and have given currency to a state-

ment contradictory to it. No stress, therefore, can be laid on the alleged quotation. We do not know its context, nor is there anything in the lit. of the 1st 3 centuries confirmatory of it. In the citation in the

epitome of Philip, Papias is made to speak of "John the divine" (*theologo*). This title is not applied to John till the 4th cent.

(c) As regards the 3rd line of evidence cited by Dr. Moffatt—church calendars, in which James and John are called "the Baptizers"—it is more

worthless than the other two. On the nature and origin of these martyrlogies, Dr. J. Drummond may be quoted.

There were cause of the existence of these calendars, at some period in the 2d half of the 4th cent., nothing of Nerva's banishment is found in the so-called quotation from Papias. It is to be remem-

bered that the writings of Papias were known to Irenaeus and to Eusebius, and it is inconceivable that, if such a statement was to be found in these, they would have ignored it, and have given currency to a state-

ment contradictory to it. No stress, therefore, can be laid on the alleged quotation. We do not know its context, nor is there anything in the lit. of the 1st 3 centuries confirmatory of it. In the citation in the

epitome of Philip, Papias is made to speak of "John the divine" (*theologo*). This title is not applied to John till the 4th cent.

1. John the Apostle, and the Baptist

John the Presbyter

**The Ephesian Traditions.**—Thus the early traditions of the churches are available for the life of John the son of Zebedee. But there still remain certain blank spaces in that life. After the reference to the pillar apostles in Gal, we find nothing in the lit. of John, and we
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3. His Dress and Manner
4. His Message
5. His Severity

V. Baptism
1. Significance
   (1) Lustrations Required by the Levitical Law
   (2) Anticipation of Messianic Lustrations Foretold by the Prophets
   (3) Prosectly Baptism
2. Baptism of Jesus

VI. The Ministry and Death
1. The Time
2. The Occasion

VII. John and His Disciples
1. The Inner Circle
2. The Training
3. Their Fidelity

VIII. John and Jesus
1. John’s Relation to Jesus
2. Jesus’ Estimate of John

In summary, the sources of first-hand information concerning the life and work of John the Baptist are limited to the NT and Jos. Lk and Mt give the fuller notices, and these are in substantial agreement. The Fourth Gospel deals chiefly with the ministry of the Baptist. In his single notice (Ant., XVIII, v, 9), Jos. was an interesting reference to the cause of John’s imprisonment. See II, below.

II. Parentage.—John was of priestly descent. His mother, Elisabeth, was of the daughters of Aaron, and was espoused to a man named Zacharias, the father of the Baptist. His name being “John” is probably derived from returning to its Biblical usage. His credit was that of a “good man,” and one who lived a blameless life. He was a priest by birth, and was therefore a member of the family of Aaron. He was, therefore, a Levite, and was not subject to the commonwealth, but was united to the ancient Priesthood. He was a Levite, and was not subject to the commonwealth of Israel, but was united to the ancient Priesthood. He was a Levite, and was not subject to the commonwealth of Israel, but was united to the ancient Priesthood. He was a Levite, and was not subject to the commonwealth of Israel, but was united to the ancient Priesthood.

III. Early Life.—We infer from Luke’s account that John was born about six months before the birth of Jesus. Of the places we know only that it was a city of the hill country of Judah. Our definite information concerning his youth is summed up in the angelic prophecy, “Many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and in the sight of men he shall be great.” The character and spirituality of the Baptist are shown in the incidents recorded. The Baptist was a fitting preparation for his great mission.

IV. Ministry.—The scene of the Baptist’s ministry was partly in the wilderness of Southern Judaea, and partly in the Jordan Valley. Two locations are mentioned, Bethany or Paneas. The usual array of dates with which Mark marks the beginning of John’s ministry (Lk 3:12) reveals his sense of the importance of the event. His first public appearance is assigned to the 15th year of Tiberius, probably 26 or 27 AD, for the first Passover attended by Jesus can hardly have been later than 27 AD (Jn 2:21). John’s dress and habits were strikingly suggestive of Elijah, the old prophet of national judgment. His desert habits have led some to 3. His Dress and Manner

In this connection, the fact that the chief settlement of this sect was near the home of his youth. It was natural that John should continue the manner of his youthful life in the desert, and it is not improbable that he intentionally copied his great prophetic model. It was fitting that the one who called men to repentance and the beginning of a self-denying life should show renunciation and self-denial in his own life. But there is no evidence in his teaching that he required such asceticism of those who accepted his baptism.

The fundamental note in the message of John was the announcement of the near approach of the Messiah’s age. But he pronounced himself as the herald voice preparing the way of the Lord, and because of this the expectant multitudes crowed to hear his word, his view of the nature of the kingdom was probably quite at variance with that of his hearers. Instead of the expected day of deliverance from the foreign oppressor, it was to be a day of judgment for Israel. It meant good for the penitent, but destruction for the ungodly. ‘He will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff will he burn up with unquenchable fire forever’ (Mt 3:12).

But this idea was perhaps not entirely unfamiliar. That these were the delay in the coming of the Lord, the sinfulness of the people and their lack of repentance, was a commonplace in the message of their teachers (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, 169).

The call to repentance was then a natural message of preparation for such a time of judgment. But to John repentance was a very real and radical thing. It meant a complete change of heart and life. “Bring forth . . . fruits worthy of repentance” (Lk 3:8). What was this “fruit”? The Baptist’s wording makes it clear in his answers to the inquiring multitudes and the publicans and soldiers (3:10–14). It is noticeable that there is no reference to the usual ceremonies of the law or to a change of occupation. Do good; be honest; refrain from extortion; be content with wages.

John used such violence in addressing the Pharisees and Sadducees doubtless to startle them from their self-complacency. How hopelessly blind were they to blase the assurance of security as the children of Abraham, and by their confidence in the merits of the law, is attested by the fact that these parties resisted the teachings of both John and Jesus to the very entrance. With what vigor and fearlessness the Baptist pressed his demand for righteousness is shown by his stern reproof of the sin of Herod and Herodias, which led to his imprisonment and finally to his death.

V. Baptism.—The symbolic rite of baptism was such an essential part of the work of John that it is not only gave him his distinctive title of “the Baptist” (v. 29, ko baptismos), but also carried his message to be styled “preaching the baptism of repentance.” That a special virtue was ascribed to this rite, and it was regarded as a necessary part of the preparation for the coming of the Messiah, are shown by its important place in John’s preaching, and by the eagerness with which it was sought by the multitudes. Its significance may best be understood by giving attention to its historical antecedents, for while John gave the rite new significance, it certainly appealed to ideas already familiar to the Jews.

1. Lustrations required by the Levitical law.—The divers washings required by the law (Lev 11–15) have, without doubt, a religious import. This is
shown by the requirement of sacrifices in connection with the cleansing, esp. the sin offering (Lev 14 8.9.19.20; cf Mk 1 44; Lk 2 22). The designation of John's baptism by the word βαπτίσμα, baptism, which by NT times was used of ceremonial cleansing, also indicates some historical connection (cf Sir 34 25).

(2) Anticipation of Messianic incitations foretold by prophets.—John understood that his baptism was a preparation for the Messianic baptism anticipated by the prophets, who saw it for a true cleansing the nation must wait until God should open in Israel a fountain for cleansing (Zec 13 1), and should sprinkle His people with clean water and give them a new heart and a new spirit (Ezk 36 25.26; Jer 33 8). His baptism was at once a preparation and a promise of the spiritual cleansing which the Messiah would bestow. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Mt 3 11 m).

(3) Proselyte baptism.—According to the teaching of later Judaism, a stranger who desired to be adopted into the family of Israel was required, along with circumcision, to receive the rite of baptism as a means of cleansing from the ceremonial uncleanness attributed to him as a Gentile. While it is not possible to prove the priority of this practice of proselyte baptism to the baptism of John, there can be no doubt of the fact, for it is inconceivable, in the case of any people, that it would be borrowed from John or after this time. While it seems clear that in the use of the rite of baptism John was influenced by the Jewish customs of ceremonial washings and proselyte baptism, his baptism differed very essentially from these. The Levitical washings restored an unclean person to his former condition, but baptism was a preparation for a new condition. On the other hand, proselyte baptism was administered only to Gentiles, while John required baptism of all Jews. At the same time his baptism was very different from Christian baptism, as he himself declared (Lk 3 16). His was a baptism of water only; a preparation for the baptism "in the Spirit" which was to follow. It is also to be observed that it was a baptism of repentance, and that it was offered to the nation as a preparation for a specific event, the advent of the Messiah.

We may say, then, that as a "baptism of repentance" it meant a renunciation of the past life; as a baptism symbolized the forgiveness of sin (Mt 3 4), and as preparation it implied a promise of royalty to the kingdom of the Messiah. We have no reason to believe that Jesus experienced any sense of sin or felt any need of repentance or forgiveness; but as a Divinely appointed preparation for the Messianic kingdom His submission to it was appropriate.

While the multitudes flocked to the Jordan, Jesus came also to be baptized with the rest. 'John would have hindered him, saying, I need to be baptized of thee, and loest thou come unto me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfi all righteousness' (Mt 3 13-15). Wherein was this act a fulfillment of righteousness? We cannot believe that Jesus felt any need of repentance or change of life. May we not regard it rather as an identification of Himself with His people in the formal consecration of His life to the work of the kingdom?

V. Imprisonment and Death.—Neither the exact time of John's imprisonment nor the period of time between his imprisonment and his death can be determined. On the occasion of the unnamed feast of Jn 6 1, Jesus refers to John's witness as already past. At least, then, his arrest, if not his death, must have taken place prior to that incident, i.e. before the second Passover of Jesus' ministry.

According to the Gospel accounts, John was imprisoned because of his rebuke of Herod's marriage with Herodias, the wife of his brother.

2. The Philip (Lk 3 19.20; cf Mt 14 3.4; Occasion Mk 6 17.18). Jos says (Ant, XVIII, v. 2) that Herod was influenced to put John to death by the 'fear lest his great influence over the people might put it in his power or inclination to raise a rebellion. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machaerus, and was there put to death. This account of Jos does not necessarily conflict with the tragic story of the Gospels. If Herod desired to punish or destroy him for the reasons assigned by the evangelists, he would doubtless wish to offer as the public reason some political charge, and the one named by Jos would be near at hand.

VII. John and His Disciples.—Frequent reference is made in the Gospel narrative to the disciples of John. As the multitudes crowded to his baptism, it was natural that he should gather about him an inner circle of men who should receive special instruction in the meaning of his work, and should aid him in the work of baptism, which must have soon increased beyond his power to perform alone. It was in the formation of this inner circle of immediate followers that he prepared a sure foundation for the work of the Messiah; for it was from this inner group that the disciples of Jesus were mainly drawn, and that with his consent and through his witness to the superior worth of the latter, and the tragic character of his own mission (Jn 1 29-44).

Concerning the substance of their training, we know from the discourses of Jesus (Lk 11 1) that it included forms of prayer, and from his own disciples (Mt 9 14) we learn that frequent fastings were observed. We may be sure also that he taught them much concerning the Messiah and His work.

There is abundant evidence of the great fidelity of these disciples, of which at least two may be observed in their concern at the overshadowing popularity of Jesus (Jn 3 26); in their loyalty to him in his imprisonment and in their reverent treatment of his body after the sign of his death (Jn 19 40). That John's work was extensive and his influence lasting is shown by the fact that 20 years afterward Paul found in far-off Ephesus certain disciples, including Apollos, the learned Alexandrian Jew, who knew no other baptism than that of John (Acts 19 1-7).

VIII. John and Jesus.—John assumed from the first the role of a herald preparing the way for the approaching Messianic age. He clearly regarded his work as Divinely appointed for the subordinate relation to the Messianic kingdom (Mt 1 7) and of the temporary character of his mission (Jn 3 30). The Baptist's work was twofold. In his preaching he warned the nation of the true character of the new kingdom as a reign of righteousness, and by his call to repentance and baptism he prepared at least a few hearts for a sympathetic response to the call and teaching of Jesus. He also formally announced and bore frequent personal testimony to Jesus as the Messiah.

There is no necessary discrepancy between the synoptic account and that of the Fourth Gospel in reference to the progress of John's knowledge of the Messianic character of Jesus. According to Mt 3 14, John is represented as declining at first to baptize Jesus because he was conscious of His
superiority, while in John 1:29–34 he is represented as claiming not to have known Jesus until He was manifested as the heavenly Light. The latter may mean only that He was not known to him definitely as the Messiah until the promised sign was given.

The message which John sent to Jesus from prison seems strange to some in view of the signal testimony which he had previously borne to His character. This need not indicate that he had lost faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, but rather a perplexity at the course of events. The inquiry may have been in the interest of the faith of his disciples or his own relief from misgivings due to Jesus’ delay in assuming the expected Messianic authority. John evidently held the prophetical view of a temporal Messianic kingdom, and some readjustment of view was necessary.

Jesus was no less frank in His appreciation of John. If praise may be measured by the worth of the one by whose lips it is spoken, then no man ever received such praise as he who was called by Jesus a shining light (Jn 1:8, 9), more than a prophet (Mt 11:9), and of whom He said, “Among them are those that are the bond maids of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist” (Mt 11:11). If, on the other hand, He rated him as less than the least in the kingdom of heaven, this was a limitation of circumstances, not of worth.

Jesus’ tribute is a character and worth of John’s baptism; first, by submitting to it Himself as a step in the fulfilment of all rightousness; later, by repeated utterance, esp. in associating it with the birth of the Spirit as a necessary condition in inheriting eternal life (Jn 3:5); and, finally, in adopting baptism as a symbol of Christian discipleship.


**RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER**

**JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF:**

**I. GENERAL CHARACTER**
1. A True Letter
2. Subject-Matter
3. Characteristics of the Writer
4. Style and Diction

**II. POLITICAL AIM**
1. Gnosticism
2. Docetism
3. Antinomianism
4. Cerinthus

**III. STRUCTURE AND SUMMARY**
1. The Prologue, I 1–4
2. First Cycle, I 5–28
   - The Christian Life as Fellowship with God (Walking in the Light) Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief
   - (a) Paragraph A, I 5–8
   - (b) Paragraph B, I 9–17
   - (c) Paragraph C, I 18–28
3. Second Cycle, I 29–4:6
   - Divine Sonship Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief
   - (a) Paragraph A, II 29–3:10
   - (b) Paragraph B, II 13–18
   - (c) Paragraph C, II 24–4:6
4. Third Cycle, II 4:7–5:21
   - The Correlation of Righteousness, Love and Belief
   - (a) Section I, II 7–5:21
   - (b) Section II, II 5:22–6:21

**IV. CANONICITY AND AUTHORITY**
1. Traditional View
2. Critical Views
3. Internal Evidence

**V. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL**
1. Common Characteristics
2. Coincidence of Vocabulary
3. Diversities of Vocabulary
4. Arguments against Unity of Authorship
5. Conclusion
6. Question of Priority

**LITERATURE.**—Among the 7 NT ep., which from ancient times have been called “catholic,” there is a smaller group of three in which the style alike of thought and language points to a common authorship, and which are traditionally associated with the name of the apostle John. Of these, again, the first differs widely from the other two in respect not only of intrinsic importance, but of its early reception in the church and unquestioned canonicty.

**THE FIRST EPISTLE**

1. A True Letter. —Not only is the Ep. an anonymous writing; one of its unique features stands among the books of the NT that it does not contain a single proper name (except Our Lord’s), or a single definite allusion, personal, historical, or geographical. It is a composition, however, with a personal touch. It sends to certain other persons whom he calls “you,” and is, in form at least, a letter. The criticism which has denied that it is more than formally so is unwarranted. It does not fall under either of Deissmann’s categories—the true letter, intended only for the perusal of the person or persons to whom it is addressed, or the ep., written with literary art and with an eye to the public. But it does possess that character of the NT ep. in general which is well described by Sir William Ramsay (Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, 24): “They spring from the heart of the writer and speak direct to the heart of the readers. They were often called forth by some special crisis in the history of the persons addressed, so that they rise out of the actual situation in which the writer conceives the readers to be placed; they express the writer’s keen and living sympathy with and participation in the fortunes of the whole class addressed, and are not affected by any thought of a wider public. . . . On the other hand, the letters in this class express general principles of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a wider range of circumstances than those which called them forth; and they appeal as emphatically and intimately to all Christians in all time as they did to those addressed in the first instance.” The 1st Ep. of St. John could not be more exactly characterized than by these words. Though its main features are didactic and controversial, the personal note is frequently struck, and with much tenderness and depth of feeling. Under special stress of emotion, the writer’s paternal love, sympathy and solicitude break out in the affectionate appellation, “little children,” or, yet more endearingly, “my little children.” Elsewhere the prescriptive “beloved” shows how deeply he is stirred by the sublimity of his theme and the sense of its supreme importance to his readers. He shows himself intimately acquainted with their religious environment (2 19; 4 1), dangers (2 19; 5 7; 21), attainments (2 12–14:21), achievements (4 4) and needs (3 19; 5 13). Further, the Ep. is addressed primarily to the circle of those among whom the author has habitually exercised his ministry as evangelist and teacher. He has been wont to announce to them the things concerning the Word (1 1), that they might have fellowship with him (1 3), and now, that his (or their) joy may be full, he
writes these things unto them (1 4). He writes as light shines. Love makes the task a necessity, but also a delight.

There is no NT writing which is throughout more vigorously controversial: for the satisfactory interpretation of its express teaching, there is need of a recognition of the polemical aim that pervades it is indispensable. But it is true also that there is no such writing in which the presentation of the truth more widely overflows the limits of the immediate occasion. The writer so constantly fights against the error and error combats, the simple, sublime and satisfying facts and principles of the Christian revelation, so lifts up every question at issue into the light of eternal truth, that the Ep. pursues its course through the ages, bringing to the church of God the vision and the inspiration of the Divine. The influence of the immediate polemical purpose, however, is manifest, not only in the contents of the Ep., but in its limitations as well. In a sense it may be said that the field of thought is a narrow one. God is seen exclusively as the Father of Spirits, the Light and Life of the universe of souls. His creativeness and government of the world, the providential aspects and agencies of salvation, the joys and sorrows, hopes and fears that spring from the terrestrial conditions and changes of human life, their disciplinary purpose and effect—to all this the Ep. contains no reference. The themes are exclusively theological and ethical. The writer's immediate interest confined to that region in which the Divine and human vitally and directly meet—to that in God which is communicable to man, to that in man by which he is capax Dei. The Divine nature as life and light, and love and righteousness; the Spirit of Divine activity in Jesus, and its presuppositions and consequences, metaphysical and ethical; the imparting of this Divine nature to men by regeneration; the antithesis to it—sin—and its removal by propitiation; the work of the Holy Spirit; the Christian life, the mutual indwelling of God and man, as tested by its beliefs, its antagonism to sin, its inevitable debt of love—such are the fundamental themes to which every idea in the Ep. is directly related. The topics, if fewer, are stupendously great; and even if retardations of the field of vision are more than compensated by the profundity and intensity of spiritual perception.

The Ep. is in a sense impersonal to the last degree, offering a strange contrast to that frankness which gives such charm to St. Paul's letters; yet few writings so clearly reveal the deepest characteristics of the writer. We feel in it the high serenity of a mind that lives in constant fellowship with the greatest thoughts and is nourished at the eternal fountainhead; but also the fervent indignation and vehement recoil of such a mind in contact with what is false and evil. It has been truly called "the most passionate book in the N.T. The spirit of the text has not erred in giving to its author the title, "Apostle of Love." Of the various themes which are so wonderfully intertwined in it, that to which it most of all owes its unifying charm and imperishable value is love. It rises to its sublimest height, to the apex of all revelation, in those passages in which its author is so divinely inspired to write of the eternal life, in God and man, as love.

But it is an inveterate misconception which regards the Ep. as a "book of love". Equally he reveals himself as one whose mind is dominated by the sense of truth. There are no words more characteristic of him than "true" (aléthein, denoting that which both ideally and really corresponds to the name it bears) and "the truth" (althéia, the reality of things sub specie aeternitatis). To him Christianity is not only a principle of ethics, or even a way of salvation; it is both of them, because it is primarily the truth, the one true disclosure of the realities of the spiritual and eternal world. Thus, as a whole, the theme constantly develops by antithesis. Each conception has its fundamental opposite: light, darkness; life, death; love, hate; truth, falsehood; the Father, the world; God, the devil. There is no shading, no gradation in the conception. It is more characteristic of the writer than this: "Ye know that no lie is of the truth" (2 21). But again, his sense of these radical antagonisms is essentially moral, rather than intellectual. It seems impossible that any writing could display a more impassioned sense, than this Ep. does, of the tremendous imperative of righteousness, a more rigorous intolerance of all sin (2 4; 3 8.9.10). The absolute antagonism and incompatibility between the Christian life and sin of whatsoever kind or degree is maintained with a vehemence of utterance that verges at times upon the paradoxical (3 9; 5 18). So long as the church lays up this Ep. in its heart, it can never lack a moral tonic of wholesome severity.

The style is closely, though perhaps unconsciously, molded upon the Heb. model, and esp. upon the parallelistic forms of the Wisdom lit.

4. Style and Diction are attentive enough to perceive that, though using another language, the writer had in his own ear, all the time, the swing and cadences of Heb verse. The diction is inartificial and unadorned. Not a simile, not a metaphor (except the most fundamental, like "walking in the light") is used. The limitations in the range of ideas are matched by those of vocabulary and by the unvarying simplicity of syntactical form. Yet limited and austere as the literary medium is, the writer handles its resources often with consummate skill. The crystalline simplicity of the style perfectly expresses the simple profundity of the thought. Great spiritual intuitions shine like stars in sentences of clear-cut gnomic terseness. Historical (1 1) and theological (1 2; 4 2) statements are made with exactness of myth. The frequent reiteration of nearly the same thoughts in nearly the same language, though always with variation and enrichment, gives a cumulative effect which is singularly impressive. Such passages, with their calm challenge to the arrogant materialism of the world—"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever"—or the closing vs. of the Ep., with their thrice-repeated triumphant "we know" and their last word of tender, urgent admonition, have a solemn magnificence of effect which nothing but such simplicity of language, carrying such weight of thought, could produce. If it has been true of any writer that "le style est l'homme," it is true of the author of this" book.

II. Polemical Aim.—The polemical intention of the Ep. has been universally recognized; but there has been diversity of opinion as to its actual object. By the older commentators, generally, this was found in the perilous state of the church or churches addressed, which had left their first love and lapsed into Laodicean lukewarmness. But the Ep. gives no sign of this, and it contains many passages that are inconsistent with it (2 13.14.20.21.27; 4 4; 5 18-20). The danger which immediately threatens the church is from without, not from within.

There is a "spirit of error" (4 6) abroad in the world. From the church itself (2 18), many "false prophets" have gone forth (4 1), corrupters of the gospel, veritable antichrists (2 18). And it may be as-
served as beyond question that the peril against which the Ep. was intended to arm the church was that of some form of Gnosticism.

The pretensions of Gnosticism to a higher esoteric knowledge of Divine things seems to be clearly referred to in several passages. In

1. Gnosticism 4.6.9, e.g. one might suppose that they are almost verbally quoted ("He that saith","I know not""); "I abide in Him"; "I am in the light"). When we observe, moreover, the prominence given throughout the idea of knowledge and the special significance of some of these passages, the conviction grows that the writer's purpose is to refute the false, but to exhibit apostolic Christianity, believed and lived, as the true Gnosis—the Divine reality of which Gnosticism was but a fantastic caricature. The confidence he has concerning his readers is that they "know him who is from the beginning," that they "know the Father" (2 13).

"Every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God" (4 7); and the final note upon which the Ep. closes is: "We know him that is true, and we are in him that is true" (5 20). The knowledge of the ultimate Reality, the Being who is the eternal life, is for Christian and Gnostic alike the goal of aspiration.

But it is against two closely related developments of gnostic tenacity, a docte view of the incarnation, and an antinomian view of morals, that the Ep. is specifically directed. Both of these sprang naturally from the dualism which was the fundamental and formative principle of Gnosticism in all its manifestations. According to a Sin of existence, the moral schism of which we are conscious in experience is original, eternal, inherent in the nature of beings. There are two independent and antagonistic principles of being from which severally come all the good and all the evil that exist. The source and the seat of evil were found in the material element, in the body with its senses and appetites, and in its sensuous earthly environment; and it was held inconceivable that the Divine nature should have immediate contact with the material side of existence, or influence upon it.

To such a view of the universe Christianity could be adjusted only by a docte interpretation of the Person of Christ. A real incarnation of moral influence of the Gnostic Christ, and the understanding with a corporeal organism. The human nature of Christ and the incidents of His earthly career were more or less an illusion. And it is with this docte subversion of the truth of the incarnation that the "antichrists" are specially identified (2 22.23; 4 23), and against it that St. John directs with wholehearted fervor his central theme—the complete, permanent, personal identification of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (3 1), the Christ (4 2) and the Son of God (5 6): "Jesus is the Christ in the flesh." In Jn 5 6 there is a still more definite reference to the special form which gnostic Christology assumed in the teaching of Cerinthus and his school. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.26, 1) this Cerinthus, who was St. John's prime antagonist in Epistles, taught that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and was distinguished from other men only by superiority in justice, prudence and wisdom; that at His baptism the heavens opened upon the form of a dove; that on the eve of His Passion, the Christ again left Jesus, so that Jesus died and rose again, but the Christ, being spiritual, did not suffer. That is to say, that, in the language of the Gnostics, the Christ was "water... not with the water only, but with the blood..." (5 6). He who was baptized of John in Jordan, and He whose life-blood was shed on Calvary, is the God-man, and the same Christ, the same Son of God eternally.

A further consequence of the dualistic interpretation of existence is that sin, in the Christian meaning of sin, disappears. It is no longer a moral opposition (anomia), in the conception of the Gnostics, to good; it is a physical principle inherent in all non-spiritual. Not the soul, but the flesh is its organ; and redemption consists, not in the renewal of the moral nature, but in its emancipation from the flesh. This is no mere general contingency, but a definite tendency that is contemplated in the repeated warning: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 8.10). With the nobler and more earnest spirits the practical corollary of this irreconcilable dualism in human nature was the ascetic life; but to others, the same principle readily suggested an opposite method of achieving the soul's deliverance from the yoke of the material—an attitude of moral indifference toward the deods of the body. Let the duality of nature be boldly reduced to practice. Let body and spirit be regarded as separate entities, each obeying its own laws, not united, not united as its own nature, without mutual interference; the spiritual nature could not be involved in, nor affected by, the deods of the flesh. Vehehm opposition to this deadly doctrine is prominent in the Ep. ("Sin is the law..." (3 4) and its converse "All unrighteousness is sin" (6 17), but esp. in the stringent emphasis laid upon actual conduct, "doing" righteousness or "doing" sin. The false spiritualism which regards the contemplation of heavenly things as of far superior importance to the requirements of commonplace morality is sternly reproved: "Little children, let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous" (3 7); and the converse application of the same doctrine, that the mere "doing" of sin is of little or no moment to the "spiritual" man, is met with the trenchant declaration, "He that doeth sin is of the devil" (3 8). The whole passage (2 29—3 10) presupposes, as familiar to its readers, a doctrine of the preexistence of the spiritual man, according to which the status of the spiritual man is not to be tested by the commonplace facts of moral conduct. It is only as a passionate contradiction of this hateful tenet that the paradoxical language of 3.8.9 and 3.16 can be understood.

To the same polarized necessity is due the uniquely reiterated emphasis which the Ep. lays upon brotherly love, and the almost fierce tone in which the new commandment is promulgated. To the Gnostic, knowledge was the sum of attainment. "They give no heed to love," says Ignatius, "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." That a religion which banished neglected love should call itself Christian or claim affinity with Christianity excites St. John's hottest indignation; against it he lifts up his supreme truth, God is love, with its immediate consequence that to be without love is to have no love; the capacity for knowing God (4 7.8). The assumption of a lofty mystical piety apart from dutiful conduct in the ordinary relations of life is ruthlessly underlined as the vaunt of a self-deceiver (4 20); and the crucial test by which we are accused is that of the truth" is love "not in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth" (3 18).
The question is raised whether the polemic of the Ep. is directed against the same persons throughout or whether in its two branches, the Christological and the ethical, it has different objects of attack. The latter view is maintained on the ground that the charge of a denial of the humanity of Christ is brought against the "antichrists," and there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor lay open to such a charge. But the other view has greater probability. The Ep. suggests nothing else than that the same spirit of teaching which is assailing the faith of the church (4 6) is also a peril to the moral integrity of its life (3 7). And if there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor was also antinomian, there is no proof that it was not. The probability is that it was. Docetism and the emancipation of the flesh were both natural fruits of the dualistic theory of life.

The name which unvarying tradition associates with the Ep., as St. John's chief antagonist in 1-3 and a doctrinarian of the crisis in 4-5 is that of Cerinthus. Untimely.

4. Cerinthus fortuitously the accounts which have come down to us of Cerinthus and his teaching are fragmentary and confused, and those of his character, though unambiguously, come only from opponents. But it is certain that he held a docetic view of the incarnation, and, according to the only accounts we possess, his character was that of a volubility. So far as they go, the historical data harmonize with the internal evidence of the Ep. to determine that the difference at the different periods in which it was written and the tendencies it combats are such as would be naturally evolved in the thought and practice of those who held, as Cerinthus did, that the material creation, and even the moral law, had its origin, not in the Same as God, but in an inferior power.

III. Structure and Summary.—In the judgment of many critics, the Ep. possesses nothing that can be called an articulate structure of thought, its aphoristic method admitting of no logical development; and this estimate has a large measure of support in the fact that there is no not writing regarding the plan of which there has been greater variety of opinion. The present writer believes, nevertheless, that it is coherent, and that, in its own unique way, the Ep. is a finely articulated composition. The word that best describes the author's mode of thinking is "spiral." The course of thought does not move from point to point in a straight line. It is always moving about the same center, always recurring to the same topics, but at a higher level.

Carefully following the topical order, one finds, e.g., a paragraph (2 3–6) insisting upon practical righteousness as a guaranty of the Christian life; then one finds this treated a second time in 2 29–3 10; and yet again in 5 3 and 5 18. Similarly, we find a paragraph on the necessity of love in 2 7–11, and again in 5 10–20, and yet again in 4 7–13, and also in 4 17–5 2. So, a paragraph concerning the necessity of holding the true belief in the incarnate Son of God in 2 18–28, in 4 1–6, and the same subject recurring in 4 13–16 and 5 4–12. And we shall observe that everywhere these indisputable characteristics of the Christian life are applied facts; that in effect the Ep. is an apparatus of tests, its definite object being to furnish its readers with the necessary criteria by which they may sift the false from the true, and satisfy themselves of their being "begotten of God." These things are written that ye may know that ye have eternal life (6 13). These fundamental tests of the Christian life—doing righteousness, loving one another, believing that Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh—are the connecting themes that bind together the whole structure of the Ep. Thus if we divide the Ep. into 3 main sections, the first ending at 2 28, the second at 4 6, the result is that in the first and second of these sections we find precisely the same topics coming in precisely the same order; while in the third section (7–6 21), though the sequence is somewhat different, the material is basically the same.

The leading themes, the tests of righteousness, love, and belief, are all present; and they alone are present. There is, therefore, a natural division of the Ep. into these three main sections, or, as they might be described, "cycles," each of which the same fundamental themes appear. On this basis we shall now give a brief analysis of its structure and summary of its contents.

The writer announces the source of the Christian revelation—the historical manifestation of the eternal Divine life in Jesus Christ—and declares himself a personal witness of the facts in 1:1–4 under which he fought. The incarnation of the Word, which was from the begining—"the eternal life, which was with the Father, and which we have seen, and which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, which we have beheld, and in which we have handled," (1:1–4).

1. The Prologue, 1:1–18.

2. First Cycle, 1:19–2:28. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (ver. 5). What does this determine? The condition of fellowship with Him; and this, therefore, is not fortuitous; first, namely, that there must be fellowship with him and walk in the darkness" (1:6); positively (1:7): "If we walk in the light, what then is it to walk in the light, and what to walk in darkness? The answer is given in what follows.

(a) Paragraph A 1 8–2 6 (walking in the light tested by righteousness).

(b) Paragraph B 2 27–17 (walking in the light tested by love).

(c) Paragraph C 2 18–28 (walking in the light tested by belief).

The light of God not only reveals sin and duty, the children of God (our "brothers and the world") in their true character; it also reveals Jesus in His true character, as the "Son of God. And all that calls itself Christianity is to be tested by its reception or rejection of that truth. In this paragraph the light and darkness are referred to; but the continuity of thought with the preceding paragraphs is unmistakable. Throughout this first division of the Ep. the point of view is that of fellowship with God, through receiving and acting according to the light which He has shed upon the great things in the spiritual realm. Unreal Christianity in every form is cast down by this light. It is the antinomian "life" of him who says he has no light (2 5) yet is indifferent to keeping God's commandments (2 5), the life of leviness (2 6), or the life of claiming spiritual enlightenment, yet denies that Jesus is the Christ (2 22).

Divine salvation tested by righteousness, love and belief.

The main division of the Ep. began with the assertion of what God is as self-revealing—light. He
becomes to us the light in which we behold our sin, our duty, our power, the world, our Maker, and all that we behold. In this fellowship with God, this second division, on the other hand, begins with the assertion (2) that the nature of sin is love, and thence deduces the essential characteristics of the "begotten of God." (a) Paragraph A, 2, 29—3 10a (Divine sonship testified by righteousness): This text is inevitable (vs 10a). The thought that the natural sonship of Cain is law is advanced (vs 4); (2) in the light of Christ's character, in which there is no sin, and of the purpose of His mission, which is to take away sin and break the power of sin (vs 5); (3) that doth righteousness is begotten of him (10a). But this now does, "begotten of God," arises for a time from the special application of this text by wonder and thanksgiving at the thought that sinful man is begotten of God (vs 11). (b) Paragraph A, 2, 29—3 10b (Divine sonship testified by love): This text is inevitable (vs 10b). The thought that the present endeavor after moral likeness to Christ (ver 3) leads back to the main theme, that the life of Divine sonship is by necessity of nature one of absolute antago nism to all sin. This necessity is exhibited (1) in the light of Christ's mission, that God is love (vs 4); (2) in the light of Christ's character, in which there is no sin, and of the purpose of His mission, which is to take away sin and break the power of sin (vs 5); (3) that doth righteousness is begotten of him (10a). But this now does, "begotten of God," arises for a time from the special application of this text by wonder and thanksgiving at the thought that sinful man is begotten of God (vs 11).

2. Third Cycle, 3:29—4:6

(a) Paragraph C, 3:29—4:4 (Divine sonship testified by belief): This text is inevitable (3:29). We know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us, and the Spirit is truth (1 John 2:27); the Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (3:29). On the other hand, the Spirit that confessesteth that Jesus is the spirit of Antichrist (3:14). Then follows recapitulation (vs 23, 24b), combining, under the category of "manifestation," love and belief on His Son, Jesus Christ. Thus a transition is made to Paragraph C.

(b) Paragraph C, 3:10—4:6 (Divine sonship testified by love). In this closing part, the Ep. rises to its loftiest heights, the logical analysis of it is more difficult. It may be divided into two main sections 1. 3:1—7 2. 3:7—12. The good news that God is love is the mission of Christ (ver 9); which is also the absolute revelation of what love, truly so called, is (ver 10). But this love of God imposes upon us an unceasing obligation to love one another (ver 11); and only from the flowing over of this love in love can we obtain the assurance that "God abideth in us" (ver 12).

(i) Paragraph B, 4:13—15: This paragraph strives to emphasize its practical application to the Christian life. The true belief is indispensable as a guaranty of correct belief; and because the Spirit of God is the author (ver 13). The true belief is that "Jesus is the Son of God" (ver 14:15). In this is found the vital ground of Christian love (ver 16).

(ii) Paragraph C, 4:17—5:3a: Here the subject is the effect, motives and manifestations of brotherly love. The effect is coördination toward God (vs 17—18); the motives: (1) God's love to us (ver 19); (2) that only the person begotten of God (1 John 4:7) is capable of this love (ver 20); (3) that this is Christ's commandment (ver 21); (4) that it is the natural instinct of spiritual children (5:1); but separable from righteousness. We truly love the children of God only when we love God, and God only when we keep His commandments (vs 23, 24).

(iii) Paragraph C, 4:17—5:3a: Here the subject is the effect, motives and manifestations of brotherly love. The effect is coördination toward God (vs 17—18); the motives: (1) God's love to us (ver 19); (2) that only the person begotten of God (1 John 4:7) is capable of this love (ver 20); (3) that this is Christ's commandment (ver 21); (4) that it is the natural instinct of spiritual children (5:1); but separable from righteousness. We truly love the children of God only when we love God, and God only when we keep His commandments (vs 23, 24).

(b) Paragraph A, 5:5a—21, on belief. — (i) Paragraph A, 5:5a—21, on belief. It is impossible only through belief. It is our faith which makes the commandments "not grievous," otherwise it becomes the world. (vs 5, 6) Then follows a restatement of the contents of the true belief, specially directed against the Cerinthian heresy (vs 6); and then a reiterated declaration of its being the test and guaranty of possessing eternal life (vs 11, 12).

2. Critical Views

2. Critical Views. — The Epistle to the Jewish Christians is not applicable to the Jewish church. All the Fathers already mentioned as quoting the Ep. (excepting Polycarp, but including Irenaeus) quote it as the work of St. John; and, until the end of the 16th. cent., this opinion was held as unquestionable. The first of modern scholars to challenge it was Joseph Scaliger (1540—1609), who rejected the entire right of Johannean Ep. as unapostolic; and in later times a dual authorship of the Gospel and the First Ep. has been maintained by Baur, R. J. Holtmann, Pflüger, von Soden, and others; although on this particular point other adherents of this conundr. (e.g., Jülicher, Wrede and Wenzel) accept the traditional view.

Thus two questions are raised: first, what light does the Ep. shed upon the personality of its own author? And second, whether or not 3. Internal Evidence

3. Internal Evidence. — The Ep. furnishes no clue by which we can identify the writer, it enables us very distinctly to class him. His relation to his readers, as we have seen, is intimate. The absence of explicit reference to either writer or readers only shows how intimately it was. For the writer to the Jewish Christians, his style is superficial. Thought, language, tone—all were too familiar to be mistaken. The Ep. bore its author's signature in every line. His position
toward his readers was, moreover, authoritative. As has already been said, the natural interpretation of 1:23 is that the relation between them was that of teacher and taught. (By this fact we may account for the enigmatic brevity of such a passage as that on the unbelief of the Jews, “and so he is, for what is born of the Spirit is life eternal,” John 3:36.) The writer intended, only to recall fuller oral expositions formerly given of the same topics. The writer is at any rate a person of so distinctive eminence and recognized authority that it is not necessary to remind the reader that he is or by what circumstances he is compelled now to address them through the medium of writing; their knowledge of both facts is taken for granted. And all this agrees with the traditional account of St. John’s relation to the churches of Asia Minor in the last decades of the 1st cent. Further, the writer claims to be one of the original witnesses of the facts of the incarnate life: “That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and we have manifested to you) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us” (1:1-3). To understand the “Word of life” here as the gospel (Westcott, Rothe, Haupt) seems to the present writer frankly impossible; and not less so the theories by which the words “what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes,” etc., are regarded as utterances of the “faith-mysticism” or the “collective testimony” of the early church. It is difficult, and was doubtless not primarily adapted to convey the impression that the writer is one of the original, first-hand witnesses of Christ’s life and resurrection (“that which we beheld, and our hands handled”); cf. Lk 24:39. At furthest, the use of such language is otherwise compatible with veracity only on the supposition that the writer was recognized by the church as so closely identified with the original witnesses that he could speak of their testimony as virtually his own. But, apart from the presumption that he cannot mean to imply that the church and all the disciples of Jesus, there is really nothing to be said for this supposition. So far as the internal evidence is concerned, the ancient and unbroken tradition which assigns to it the apostle John must be regarded as binding the church, and, indeed, the traditional authorship is dispelled by arguments of the most convincing kind. Whether the arguments brought against the apostolic authorship of the Johannine writings as a whole possess this character is too large a question to be investigated here. Yet the kernel of it lies in small compass. It is whether room can be found within the 1st cent. for so advanced a stage of theological development as is reached in the Johannine writings, and whether this development can be conceivably attributed to one of the disciples of Jesus, who was not a member of the original apostles. To neither of these questions, as it appears to the present writer, is a dogmatically negative answer warranted. If within a period comparatively so brief, Christian thought had already passed through the earlier and later Pauline developments, and through such a development as we find in the Ep. to the He, there is no obvious reason why it may not have attained to the Johannine, within the lifetime of the last survivor of the apostles. Nor, when we consider that John’s thought was manifesting itself in the church, which was surrounded, if, as tradition says, he lived on to a green old age in Ephesus, is there any obvious reason why he may not have been the chief instrument of that development. V. Relationship to the Fourth Gospel.—The further question remains as to the internal evidence the Ep. supplies regarding its relation to the Fourth Gospel. Prima facie, Character-istics—the case for identity of authorship is strongly suggestive. The two writings are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere; they are equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine and which presents an interpretation of Christ wholly different from any other than that of Paul. Both exhibit the same mental and moral habit of viewing every subject with an eye that stoically beholds radical antagonisms and is blind to approximations. There is in both the same strongly Hobist style of composition; the same development of ideas by parallelism or antithesis; the same repetition of keywords like “begotten of God,” “abiding,” “keeping his commandments”; the same monotonous simplicity in the construction of sentences, with avoidance of relative clauses and singular parsimony in the use of connecting particles; the same apparently tautological habit of resuming consideration of a subject from a slightly different point of view; the same restricted range of vocabulary, with words more or less identical to an extent unparalleled in two independent writings. The evidence for these statements cannot be presented here in full; but the following are some of the words and phrases characteristic of both and not found elsewhere in the Gospels of NT. —The Word, joy fulfilled, to see the Father, the Spirit, the world, to have sin, Paraclete, to keep the word of Christ, to believe, to be begotten of God, to be pure, to do sin, to take away sins, the devil, works of the devil, to be abiding, to be the truth, to have eternal life, life in the present sense, to believe. The following are some of the terms common to both, which are found very rarely elsewhere in the NT: Beginning (= past eternity), to be manifested, (9 times), to receive, based on the Ep., 33 in the Gospel, once only in Mt, once in Lk, not at all in Mk, light (metaphorical), walk (metaphorical), to lead astray, to know (God, Christ, or Spirit, 8 in the Ep., 10 in the Gospel), true (allelúghê), to confess Jesus (elsewhere only in Rom 10:9), children of God, to destroy (lithéin, elsewhere only in 2 Pet), the spirit of truth, to send (apostellein, of mission of Christ), only begotten son, to have the witness (elsewhere only in Apoc), to hear (= to answer prayer.) On the other hand, the divergences of vocabulary are not more numerous. One particular instance, of which the Gospel is largely composed, are foreign to the Ep. The discrepancy, when closely examined, sometimes turns out to be a point of real similarity. Thus the particle oùs occurs nearly 200 times in the Gospel, 30 in the Ep. Moreover, in the Fourth Gospel it is used only in narrative, no occurrence of it being found, e.g. in chs 14-16. Of the words and phrases contained in the Ep., but not in the Gospel, the great majority are accounted for by the fact that they are used in-con-
nection with topics which are not dealt with in the Gospel. Apart from these, the following may be noted: the last part being italicized: "Word of life, fellowship, to confess sins (nowhere else in the NT), to cleanse from sin, propitiation (killaomai, nowhere else in the NT), perfected or perfect love, last hour, Antichrist, awaiting, to give of the spirit, to have (Father, Son) boldness (Godward), Parousia, inscrutableness, seed (of Christ), come in the flesh, God is a liar, understanding. As regards style and diction, therefore, it seems impossible to con-
tact of two independent literary productions having a striking affinity.

Arguments for a dual authorship are based chiefly on certain theological emphasis and developments in the Ep., which are absent from the Gospel; and invariably these arguments have been pressed with complete disregard of the fact that the one writing purports, at least, to be a "popular" idiom of a Judgment Day. But it ought to be noted that in the Ep., as compared with the Gospel, the eschatological perspective is foreshort-
ened. The author writes under the conviction that "the world is passing away" and that the "last hour" of its day has come (3:18). And it is an unwar rantable assumption that he must, if he wrote the Gospel, have been guilty of the manifest anachronism of importing this conviction into it.

Apart from this the fundamental similarities between the eschatology of the Ep. and that of the Gospel are far more striking than the differences. In both, eternal life is conceived of as a present and not merely a future possession. In both, Christ's presence is an abiding reality—"Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1:3). If the Gospel speaks of the revelation of Christ as bringing present and inevitable "judgment" into the world, the Ep. is saturated with the same thought. If, on the other hand, the Ep. speaks of a visitation, a parousia, this is plainly a divine projection (2:28). If the Ep. makes a single reference to the Day of Judgment (4:17), the Gospel has 6 passages which speak of the "last day," and in these the "last day" is explicitly the day of resurrection (11:24) and of judgment (12:48). In the two writings different themes of the eschatological picture may be made or less con-
spicuous; but there is no such diversity as to warrant the hypothesis of a separate authorship.

Again, it is urged that in the Ep. the Logos is modified in the direction of conformity to traditional doctrine. The conception of the personal, pre-existent Logos, who "in the beginning was," and "was with God," and "was God" (1:1) was new, it is said, and, because of its gnostic tinge, was to be avoided. But in the Ep. the personified "Word of life" (1:1). But why should the "Word of life" necessarily signify anything less personal than the phraseology of the Gospel? The phraseology in both cases is exactly adapted to the situation. The relation between them in this respect is far closer than that between the Acts of the Apostles and the Third Gospel, or even any two of St. Paul's Ep., except those to the Eph and the Col.

Arguments for a dual authorship are based chiefly on certain theological emphasis and developments in the Ep., which are absent from the Gospel; and invariably these arguments have been pressed with complete disregard of the fact that the one writing purports, at least, to be a "popular" idiom of a Judgment Day. But it ought to be noted that in the Ep., as compared with the Gospel, the eschatological perspective is foreshort-
ened. The author writes under the conviction that "the world is passing away" and that the "last hour" of its day has come (3:18). And it is an unwar rantable assumption that he must, if he wrote the Gospel, have been guilty of the manifest anachronism of importing this conviction into it.

Apart from this the fundamental similarities between the eschatology of the Ep. and that of the Gospel are far more striking than the differences. In both, eternal life is conceived of as a present and not merely a future possession. In both, Christ's presence is an abiding reality—"Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1:3). If the Gospel speaks of the revelation of Christ as bringing present and inevitable "judgment" into the world, the Ep. is saturated with the same thought. If, on the other hand, the Ep. speaks of a visitation, a parousia, this is plainly a divine projection (2:28). If the Ep. makes a single reference to the Day of Judgment (4:17), the Gospel has 6 passages which speak of the "last day," and in these the "last day" is explicitly the day of resurrection (11:24) and of judgment (12:48). In the two writings different themes of the eschatological picture may be made or less con-
Theology of the NT; articles by Salmon in HDB; by Schmiedel in EB; and by Häring in Theologische Abhandlungen. W. Weissacker's German, the fullest investigation of the relationship of the Ep. to the Fourth Gospel will be found in a series of articles by H. Holtzmann in the Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie (1882–83); in English, in Brooke's Compare the Lamps of Life, 3d ed. See also Drummond, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, ch iii.

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES

It is not surprising that these brief and fugitive Epp. are among the NT writings which have had the hardest struggle for canonical recognition. One is probably, the other certainly, a private letter; and neither has the same reason nor the same opportunity for their circulation existed, as in the case of church letters. The 2d Ep. contains little that is distinctive; the 3d Ep. is occupied with a vexatious episode in the internal history of a single congregation. Both are written by a person who designates himself simply as “the Presbyter”; and the names of the person (or church) to which the one is addressed and of the church with whose affairs the other is concerned are alike unknown.

The fact, therefore, that, in spite of such obstacles, these letters did become widely known and eventually attained to canonical rank is proof of a general conviction of the soundness of the tradition which assigned them to the apostle John.

Like all the cath. epp., they were unknown to the early Syriac church; when 1 Jn, 1 Pet and Jas were included in the canon at an early date, in Gaul (Irenaeus); Rome (Mamertine Papyri, 3d cent.), where, however, the reading is corrupt, and it is doubtful whether their authorship is ascribed or denied to the apostle John; Alexandria (Clement, who is not to be considered among the fathers, speaks of John's larger epistle, implying the existence of one or more minor epp.); Africa (Cyprian reports that 2 Jn was appealed to at the Synod of Carthage, 256 AD). Dionysius, Origine's disciple and successor, speaks of John's calling himself in them “the Presbyter.” Eusebius, though conscientiously placing them among the antilegomena, elsewhere writes in a way which indicates that he himself did not share the doubt of their authenticity.

It is evident that the ultimate decision of the early church regarding these letters. Quite evidently the 2d Ep. must have been written by the author of the 1st, or was an arrant and apparently purposeless piece of plagiarism. The 3d Ep. is inevitably associated with the 2d by the superscription, “the Presbyter,” and by other links of thought and phraseology.

The mention of this title opens up a wide question. The famous extract from Papias (Euseb., HDB, II, 30) would seem to indicate that the title “Presbyter” John (see John, GOSPEL OF, II, 5). Jerome, moreover, speaks of the two smaller Epp. as, in contrast with the 1st, ascribed to the Presbyter (De Vir. Illust., ix); Eusebius inclines to ascribe to him the Book of Rev.; and modern critics, like Weizäcker and Harnack, have improved upon the hint by finding in this shadowy personage the author of the Fourth Gospel. Into this farreaching controversy I make no attempt to enter. See also DRUMMOND, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, ch iii.

1. Canon and Authorship.

2. The Presbyter.

The Second Epistle. — The brief note gives a uniquely authentic and intimate glimpse of some aspects of church life as it existed in Asia Minor (this may be taken as certain) somewhere about the end of the 1st cent. It concerns a certain episode in the history of one of the churches under the writer's supervision, and incidentally furnishes character-sketches of two of its members, the large-hearted and hospitable Gaius, to whom it is written (and to whom it is no other than the same Gaius mentioned in the NT), and the loquacious, overbearing Diotrephes; also of the faithful Demetrius, by whose hand probably the letter is sent. The story which may be gathered from the Ep. seems to be as follows. A band of itinerant teachers had been sent for by the presbyter's authority, no doubt, and furnished by him with letters of commendation to the various churches, and among others to that of which Gaius and Diotrephes were the members. Diotrephes, however, through jealousy for the right to control the local community or for some personal reason, not only declined to receive the itinerant teachers, but exerted his authority to impose the same course of action upon the church as a whole, even to the

Presbyter (De Vir. Illust., ix); Eusebius inclines to ascribe to him the Book of Rev.; and modern critics, like Weizäcker and Harnack, have improved upon the hint by finding in this shadowy personage the author of the Fourth Gospel. Into this far-reaching controversy I make no attempt to enter. See also DRUMMOND, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, ch iii.
length of threatening with excommunication (ver 10) those who took a different view of their duty. Gaius alone had not been intimidated, but had welcomed to his home the repulsed and disheartened teachers, who when they returned (to Ephesus, probably) had testified to the church of his courage and large-hearted behavior (ver 6). At 2d time, apparently, the teachers are now sent forth (ver 6), with Demetrius as their leader, who brings this letter to Gaius, commending his past conduct (ver 5) and encouraging him to persevere in it (ver 10). The Epistle is addressed to a letter to the church also (ver 9); but evidently he has little hope that it will be effectual in overcoming the headstrong opposition of Diotrephes; for he promises that he will speedily pay a personal visit to the church, when he will depose Diotrephes from his pride of place and bring him to account for his sordid "prating" and overbearing conduct (ver 10). So far as appears, the cause of friction was purely personal or administrative. There is no hint of heretical tendency in Diotrephes and his party. Pride of place and own importance and a violent jealousy for what he regarded as his own prerogative, which he was afraid to identify with the autonomy of the local church.

The Second Epistle.—The letter is addressed to 'the elect lady' (better, to "the lady Electa"). Its tone throughout is peculiarly affectionate; there is a warm rush of emotion, esp. in the opening verses, than is characteristic of St. John's usual reserve. But in these verses the keynote of the Ep. is struck—truth. The writer testifies love for his correspondent and his children "in truth;" this love is shared by all who "know the truth" (ver 1), and it is "for the truth's sake which abideth in us, and shall be with us for ever" (ver 2). What follows (vs 4—9) is in effect an epitome of the 1st Ep. After declaring his joy at finding certain of her children "walking in truth," he proceeds to expound, quite in the style of the 1st Ep., what "walking in truth" is. It is to love one another (ver 5; cf 1 Jn 2 7—11); but this love is manifested in keeping God's commandments (ver 6; cf 1 Jn 5 2,3); and no less in steadfast adherence to the genuine doctrine of the Gospel (cf 1 Jn 3 12—15). But besides these duties, he adds, there is a world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh" (ver 7; cf 1 Jn 4 1—3). Then follows an exhortation to stedfastness (ver 8), and a warning that whoever in the name of progress departs from it, departs from the faith of the simple (vs 10,11); and the Ep. closes with the hope of a speedy and joyful meeting "face to face" of the writer and his correspondent, to whom he conveys greetings from the children of her "elect sister."

Whether the "elect lady," or "lady Electa" of his letter is a real person or the personification of a church is a point which has been debated from ancient times and is still unsolved. The solution has been found, it is true, if we can accept the hypothesis (put forward by Zahn and Schmiedel and adopted by Findlay) that this is the letter referred to in 3 Jn ver 9. It is urged on behalf of this supposition that the two Ep. are curiously identical in phraseology. In both the writer begins by describing his correspondent as one whom "I love and desire to come to you both because of his fruit (eschärmen lian). 2 Jn ver 4, "I rejoice greatly," not found elsewhere in the NT to declare his joy at finding "thy [my] children walking in the truth;" and in both he concludes by saying that he has "many things to write," but that, looking forward to an early interview "face to face," he will not commit these further thoughts to "paper and ink." It is argued that "none but a chancery clerk could have chung so closely to his epistolary formulae" in two private letters written at different times and put in different forms. But the force of this argument largely vanishes when we look at the formulae in question. If a modern writer may conclude hundreds of friendly letters by subscribing himself "yours sincerely," or the like, so why may not something equally has dispatched two letters to the church also (ver 9); but evidently he has little hope that it will be effectual in overcoming the headstrong opposition of Diotrephes; for he promises that he will speedily pay a personal visit to the church, when he will depose Diotrephes from his pride of place and bring him to account for his sordid "prating" and overbearing conduct (ver 10). So far as appears, the cause of friction was purely personal or administrative. There is no hint of heretical tendency in Diotrephes and his party. Pride of place and own importance and a violent jealousy for what he regarded as his own prerogative, which he was afraid to identify with the autonomy of the local church.

The Second Epistle.—The letter is addressed to 'the elect lady' (better, to "the lady Electa"). Its tone throughout is peculiarly affectionate; there is a warm rush of emotion, esp. in the opening verses, than is characteristic of St. John's usual reserve. But in these verses the keynote of the Ep. is struck—truth. The writer testifies love for his correspondent and his children "in truth;" this love is shared by all who "know the truth" (ver 1), and it is "for the truth's sake which abideth in us, and shall be with us for ever" (ver 2). What follows (vs 4—9) is in effect an epitome of the 1st Ep. After declaring his joy at finding certain of her children "walking in truth," he proceeds to expound, quite in the style of the 1st Ep., what "walking in truth" is. It is to love one another (ver 5; cf 1 Jn 2 7—11); but this love is manifested in keeping God's commandments (ver 6; cf 1 Jn 5 2,3); and no less in steadfast adherence to the genuine doctrine of the Gospel (cf 1 Jn 3 12—15). But besides these duties, he adds, there is a world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh" (ver 7; cf 1 Jn 4 1—3). Then follows an exhortation to stedfastness (ver 8), and a warning that whoever in the name of progress departs from it, departs from the faith of the simple (vs 10,11); and the Ep. closes with the hope of a speedy and joyful meeting "face to face" of the writer and his correspondent, to whom he conveys greetings from the children of her "elect sister."

Whether the "elect lady," or "lady Electa" of his letter is a real person or the personification of a church is a point which has been debated from ancient times and is still unsolved. The solution has been found, it is true, if we can accept the hypothesis (put forward by Zahn and Schmiedel and adopted by Findlay) that this is the letter referred to in 3 Jn ver 9. It is urged on behalf of this supposition that the two Ep. are curiously identical in phraseology. In both the writer begins by describing his correspondent as one whom "I love and desire to come to you both because of his fruit (eschärmen lian). 2 Jn ver 4, "I rejoice greatly," not found elsewhere in the NT to declare his joy at finding "thy [my] children walking in the truth;"
dispense hospitality, and of wide influence, one believed of "all them that know the truth," whose words would be listened to and whose example would be followed. In view of the ominous spreading of the leaven of Antichrist, it is not difficult to suppose that the Presbyter should write to such a person in such a strain. Nor does there seem to be anything esp. odd in the fact of the children of a private family sending their respects to their master through the apostle John ( Ibid.). If he was intimate with that family, and in their immediate vicinity at the time of writing, it appears a natural thing for them to have done. Possibly Dr. Harris' "explained" "prehistoric countess of Huntington" is not so far astray as a modern equivalent of the lady Electa.
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I. Introductory.—The Fourth Gospel has a form peculiar to itself, as well as a characteristic style and attitude, which mark it as a unique document among the books of the NT.

1. Scope of Gospel

2. The Presentation of Jesus in the Gospel

1. Alleged Absence of Development in Character of Jesus

2. Alleged "Autonomy" of Jesus

3. "Inconceivability" of Logos-Presentation

4. Growth of Faith and Development of Unbelief

5. Early Confessions

6. Growth of Faith in the Disciples

7. Gradual Disclosure of Messiahship: Growth of Unbelief

II. External Evidence for the Fourth Gospel.

Only an outline of the external evidence for the Fourth Gospel, which concerns both date and authorship, can be given in this article. Fuller information may be sought in the Intros to the Commentaries on the Gospel, by Godet, Westcott, Luthardt, Meyer; in鑫Abb’s The Fourth Gospel and Its Authorship; in M’Clinton’s Intro to the NT, III; in Sanday’s The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel; in Drummond’s The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. All these and many others defend the Johannine authorship. On the other side, reference may be made to the author of Supernatural Religion, of which many editions have appeared. Among recent works, Moffatt’s Intro to the NT, and B. W. Bacon’s Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, may be mentioned as denying the Johannine authorship.

The external evidence is as follows. At the end of the 2d cent., the Christian church was in possession of four Gospels, which were used as sacred books, read in churches of 2d Cent. in public worship, held in honor as authoritative, and seen as a part of a Canon of Scripture (see Gospels). One of these
was the Fourth Gospel, universally ascribed to the apostle John as its author. We have the evidence on this point of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, of Clement of Alexandria, a little later of Origen. Clement is witness for the belief and practice of the church in Egypt and Phrygia; Tertullian for the church in Africa; and Irenaeus, who was brought up in Asia Minor, was a teacher at Rome, and was bishop of Lyons in Gaul, for the churches in those lands. The belief was so unquestioned, that Irenaeus could give reasons for it which would of themselves have convinced no one who had not already had the conviction which the reasons were meant to sustain. To discount the evidence of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement on the ground of the desire to find apostolic authorship for their sacred books, is not argument but mere assertion. There may have been such a tendency, but in the case of the four Gospels there is no proof that there was necessity for this at the end of the 2d cent. For there is evidence of the belief in the apostolic authorship of two Gospels by apostles, and of two by companions of the apostles, as an existing fact in the churches long before the end of the 2d cent.

The importance of the testimony of Irenaeus is measured by the efforts which have been made to discredit it. There are many links of connection between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. There is specially his connection with Polycarp. He himself describes that relationship in his letter to Florinus, a fellow-disciple of Polycarp, who had lapsed into Gnosticism, in which he says, "On these things the length of time is more clearly than that of recent years. For what boys learn, growing with their mind, becomes joined with it; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat, as he discoursed, and his going out and coming in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord" (Euseb., HE, V, 20: McGiffert, Iren., II, p. 166). The time of the death of Irenaeus at that time, but he was of sufficient age to receive the impressions which, after many years, he recorded. Polycarp was martyred in 155 AD, and he had been a Christian for 60 years when he was martyred. This is also a link between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. Another link was constituted by his association with Pothinus, his predecessor in Lyons. Pothinus was a very old man when he was martyred, and had in his possession the traditions of the church of Gaul. Thus, Irenaeus, through these and others, had the opportunity of knowing the belief of the churches, and what he records is not only his own personal testimony, but the universal tradition of the church.

With Irenaeus should be listed the apostolic witness of Theophilus (c 170), the earliest writer to mention St. John by name as the author of the Gospel. In prefacing a quotation from the commencement of the prologue, he says, "This is what we learn from the sacred writings, and from all men animated by the Spirit, among whom John says" (Ad Autol., ii,22). Theophilus is further stated by Jerome to have composed a Harmony of the four Gospels (De Viris Illust., 25).

From Irenaeus and Theophilus we ascend nearer to the end of the 2d cent., and here we encounter the Diatessaron of Tatian, on which much need not be said. The Diatessaron is likewise a Harmony of the four Gospels, and this Harmony dates not later than 170. It begins with the 1st ver of the Fourth Gospel, and ends with the last ver of the appendix to the Gospel. Tatian was a pupil of Justin Martyr, and that fact alone renders it probable that the "Memoirs of 2d Cent. of the Apostles," which Justin quotes with spirit, are those of Tatian. Tatian was afterward combined in the Diatessaron. That Justin knew the Fourth Gospel seems clear, though we cannot argue the question here. If he did, it follows that it was in existence about the year 130.

But there is evidence that helps us to trace the influence of the Fourth Gospel back to the year 110. "The first clear traces of the Fourth Gospel upon the thought and language etc of the church are found in the Epp. of Ignatius (c 110 AD). How unmistakable these traces are is shown by the fact that not infrequently this dependence of Ignatius upon John has been used as an argument against the genuineness of the Ignatian letters" (Zahn, Intro, III, 176). This argument may now be safely used since the Epp. have been vindicated as historical documents by Lightfoot and by Zahn. If the Ignatian Epp. are saturated with the tone and spirit of the Johannine writings, that goes to show that this mode of thought and expression was prevalent in the church of Asia at the beginning of the 2d cent., that distinctive mode of thought and speech which we call Johannine had an existence.

A further line of evidence in favor of the Gospel, which need only be referred to, lies in the use made of it by the Gnostics. That the Gospel was used by the Valentinians and Basilides has been shown by Dr. Drummond (op. cit., 265-343).

To estimate aright the force of the above evidence, it is to be remembered that it is already observed, there were many disciples of John the the John of Ephesus, to whom the Presbyter harni...
Tatian. It was quoted, commented on, and interpreted by the Gnostics. In truth the external evidence for the early date and Johannean authorship of the Fourth Gospel is as great both in extent and variety as that of any book of the NT, and far greater than any that we possess for any work of classical antiquity.

The history of the controversy on the Johannean authorship is not here entered into. Apart from the objections of the Agnostics (who attributed the Gospel to Corinthus) in the 2d cent., no voice was heard in challenge of its authenticity by the Hellenists, of whom the 17th cent., and serious assault did not begin till the 19th.

(Bretschneider, 1820, Strauss, 1835, Wellse, 1838, Blessing, 1841, Olshausen, 1844 and 1854, and others.) The attacks were vigorously repelled by other scholars (Griesbach, Luthardt, critical scholars, etc. Some adopted, in various forms and degrees, the hypothesis of an apostolic basis for the Gospel, regarded as the work of a later hand (Westzicker, Renan, etc.) From this point the controversy has proceeded with an increasing degree of acuteness and the consciousness of genuineness and trustworthiness of the Gospel, but not less firmness on the part of its defenders. The present state of opinion is indicated in the text.

III. Characteristics of the Gospel: Internal Evidence.—The external evidence for the Fourth Gospel is criticized, but it is chiefly on 1. General internal grounds that the opposition to the Johannean authorship and history of the Gospel is based. Stress is laid on the broad contrast which admittedly exists in style, character and plan, between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics; its supposed philosophic and mystical character; the number and importance of the parables; the absence of the name of Christ in the discourse of the author of the Gospel; the references to individual events; the considerable agreement of the Synoptics; the alleged erasures and contradictions; and the absence of progress in the narrative, etc. The defence of the Gospel is usually conducted by pointing out the different aims of the Gospel, rebutting exaggerations in the above objections, and showing that in a multitude of ways the author of the Gospel reveals his identity with the apostle John. He was, e.g., a Jew, a Palestinian Jew, one familiar with the topography of Jesus, etc., an apostle, an eyewitness, the disciple whom Jesus loved (13:23; 20:2; 21:7, 20). The attestation in 21:24 of those who knew the author in his lifetime is of the greatest weight in this connection. Instead of following these familiar lines of argument (for which see Godet, Luthardt, Westcott, Ex. Abbot, Drummond, etc., in works cited), a consideration is here sought on the lines of a fresh comprehensive study.

The study of the Johannean writings in general, and of the Fourth Gospel in particular, has been approached in many ways and from various points of view. One of the most common of these was the comparison of its contents with those of the Synoptics, which assumes that here we have the product of Christian reflection on the facts discemible in the Synoptics. These facts have been modified by the experience of the church, and the consciousness of the church at the end of the 1st cent. or the beginning of the 2d. By this time, it is assumed, the church, now mainly a gentile church, has been greatly influenced by Gr-Rom culture, that she has been reflecting on the wonder of her own history, and has so modified the original tradition as to assimilate it to the new environment. In the Fourth Gospel, it is said, we have the highest and most elaborate presentation of the outcome of the process. Starting with St. John's infancy, John, if we may accept his word, traces for us the whole process until a school of theologians at Ephesus produced the Johannean writings, and the consciousness of the church was satisfied with the completeness of the new presentation of Christianity (cf. John Research & Deluge, etc.).

Heb. ideas in Heb. form, the facts of the Gospel so transformed as to be acceptable to the Hellenistic mind—this is the nature of the Synoptics, etc. Others again come to the Gospel with the presupposition that the writer intended to present to the reader a complete view of the life of Jesus, and that it is intended to supplement and to correct the statements of the Synoptics and to meet the new needs of the church at the beginning of the 2d cent. Others find a polemical aim in the Gospel. Weizsäcker e.g. finds a strong polemical aim against the Jews. He says, "There are the objections raised by the Jews against the church after its succession has been so established, and after the development of the person of its Christ has passed through its most essential stages. It is not a controversy of the school carried back into the history of the life" (Apostolic Age, II, 222). One would have expected a statement so forcibly buttressed by some evidence; that we might have some historical evidence regarding a controversy in the church beyond what we have in the Fourth Gospel itself. But nothing is offered by Weizsäcker except the dictum that it is a polemical aim. The case may be, however, that these arguments were put forward by Justin, mainly regarded the interpretation of the OT, and are not those which are discussed in the Fourth Gospel.

Perhaps the most surprising of all the presuppositions with regard to the Fourth Gospel is that which lays great stress on the supposition that the book was largely intended to vindicate a Christian doctrine and the sacraments which flourished at the beginning of the 2d cent. According to this presupposition, the Fourth Gospel set forth a doctrine of the sacraments which placed them in a unique position as a means of salvation. While scarcely contending that the doctrine of the sacraments held by the church of the 2d cent. had reached that stage of development which meets us in the mediaeval church, it is, according to this hypothesis, toward that goal afterward reached. We do not dwell on this view, for the exegesis that finds sacramentarianism in the Fourth Gospel alone, and we do not put the sacraments in the place of Christ. Finally, when we do not find the contention here, we can only say that the Fourth Gospel was written with a view of making the gospel of Jesus more acceptable to the Gentiles any more satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, the Gospel which was most acceptable to the Gentiles was the Gospel according to Mark. It is more frequently quoted by any other. In the writings of the early church, it is quoted as often as all the other Gospels put together. When John is written in the 2d cent., the Fourth Gospel did not contain a dogma which was common in the Christian church until the rise of the Christological controversies in the 3d cent.

When, after dwelling on these ways of approaching the Fourth Gospel, and results already made on the Gospel by those who 3. Real aim approach it with these presuppositions of Gospel—and demands, we turn to the Gospel itself, and ask regarding its aim and purpose, we find a simple answer. The writer of it expresses says: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that faith in his name give life in his name" (20 30.31). Pursuing this clue, and putting away all the presuppositions which bulk so largely in introductions, exegeses, histories of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages, one meets with many sure indications.

(1) Relation to Synoptics.—In relation to the Synoptics, the differences are great, but more surprising is the fact that the points of contact between these Gospels and the Fourth Gospel are so few. The critics to whom reference has been made are unanimous that the writer or the school which compiled the Johannean writings was indebted to the Synoptics for almost all the facts embodied in the Fourth Gospel. Apart, however; from the Passion Week, only two points of contact are found so obvious that they cannot be doubted, viz., the feeding of the 5,000, and the walking on the sea (6:4-21).

The healing of the child of the royal officer (4:46-53) can scarcely be identified with the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt, Lk); but even if the identification were allowed, this is all we have in the Fourth Gospel. Fourth Gospel is not in Galilee. There is a ministry in Galilee, but the earlier ministry in Judaea and in Galilee began before John was cast into prison (3:24), and it has no parallel in the Synoptics. In fact, the Fourth Gospel assumes the existence of the other three, and does not anew convey the knowledge which can be
gathered from them. It takes its own way, makes its own selections, and sets these forth from its own point of view. It has its own principle of selection: that plainly indicated in the passage already quoted. The scenes depicted, the works done, the words spoken, are the reflections of those who deal with it as a writer, and all directed toward the aim of enabling the readers to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. In the writer’s view this would issue in their obtaining life in His name.

The Time occupied in the Gospel.—Accepting this principle for our guidance, we turn to the Gospel, and the first thing that strikes the reader is the small amount of the real time filled up, or occupied, by the scenes described in the Gospel. We take the night of the betrayal, and the day of the crucifixion. The things done and the words spoken on that day, from one sunset to another, occupy no fewer than 7 chs of the Gospel (chs 13–19). Apart from the supplementary ch (21), there are 20 chs in the Gospel, containing 697 vs, and these 7 chs have 257 vs. More than one-third of the whole given to the ministry is thus occupied with the events of one day.

Again, according to Acts 1 3, there was a ministry of the risen Lord which lasted for 40 days, and of all that happened during these days John records only on the day of the resurrection, and on another day 8 days after (ch 20). The incidents recorded in the other Gospels fall into the background, are taken for granted, and only the signs done on these two days are recorded here. They are recorded because they are of significance for the purpose he has in hand, of inducing belief in the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. If we continue to follow the clues thus afforded, we shall be surprised at the fewness of the days on which anything was transacted. As we read the story of the Fourth Gospel, there are many indications of the passing of time, and many precise statements of date. We learn from the Gospel that the ministry of Jesus probably lasted for 3 years. We gather this from the number of the feasts which He attended at Jerusalem. We have notes of time spent in journeys, but no account of anything that happened during them. The days on which anything was done or anything said are very few. We are told that “six days Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was” (12 1 ff), and with regard to these 6 days we are told only of the supper and the anointing of the feet of Jesus by Mary, of the entry into Jerusalem, the visit of the Queen of Sheba, and of the meals of the Pharisees. But in which of these meals was Jesus? We have also the reflections of the evangelist on the unbelief of the Jews, but nothing further. We know that many other things did happen on these days, but they are not recorded in this Gospel. Apart from the two days during which Jesus dwelt in the place where He was, of which days nothing is recorded, the time occupied with the raising of Lazarus is the story of one day (ch 11). So it is also with the healing of the blind man. The healing is done one day, and the significance of that healing is all that is recorded of another day (ch 9). What is recorded in ch 10 is the story of two days. The story of the 7th and 8th chs, interrupted by the episode of the woman taken in adultery, which does not belong to the story of the ministry of not more than two days. The story of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the subsequent discourse (ch 6) is the story of two days. It is not necessary to enter into fuller detail. Yet the writer, as remarked, is very exact in his notes. He notes the number of days, the number of days on which anything was done, or when anything was said. We make these remarks, which will be obvious to every reader who attends to them, mainly for the purpose of showing that the Gospel on the face of it does not intend to, at least does not, set forth a complete account of the life and work of Jesus. It gives at the utmost an account of 20 days out of the 1,000 days of Our Lord’s ministry. This is of itself sufficient to set aside the idea of the 40 days in which the writer of the Gospel meant to set aside, to supplement, or to correct, the accounts in the Synoptics. Plainly it was not written with that purpose.

(3) A personal record.—Obviously the book professes to be reminiscences of one who had personal experience of the ministry which he describes. The personal note is in evidence all through the book. It is present even in the prologue, for in that in which he describes the great fact of the incarnation he uses the personal note. “We beheld his glory” (1 14). This might be taken as the keynote of the Gospel. In all the scenes set forth in the Gospel the writer believes that in them Jesus manifested forth His glory and deepened the faith of His disciples. If we were to ask him, when did he behold the glory of the incarnate Word, the answer would be, in all these scenes which are described in the Gospel. If we read the Gospel from this point of view, we find that the writer had a different conception of the glory of the incarnate Word from that which his critics ascribe to him. He does not see the glory of the Word in the fact that He was weared with His journey (4 6), that He made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay (9 6), that He wept at the grave of Lazarus (11 35), that He groaned in the spirit and was troubled (ver 38), and that He could sorrow with a sorrow unspeakable, as He did after the interview with the Greeks (12 27). For he records all these things, and evidently thinks them quite consistent with the glory of the incarnate Word. From the reminiscences does not explain these things away, but must take them as of the essence of the manifested glory of the Word.

The Gospel then is professedly reminiscences of an eyewitness, of one who was personally present at all the scenes which he describes. No doubt the reminiscences often pass into reflections on the meaning and significance of what he describes. He often pauses to remark that the disciples, and he himself among them, did not at the time the meaning of some saying, or the significance of some deed, of Jesus (2 22; 12 16, etc). At other times we can hardly distinguish between the words of the Master and the reflections of the disciple. We must allow that the same phenomenon. In the Ep. to the Gal., e.g., Paul writes what he had said to Peter at Antioch: “If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” (Gal 2 14). Shortly after, he passes into reflections on the situation, and it is impossible to ascertain where the direct speech ends and the reflections begin. It is in the Fourth Gospel. It is impossible in many instances to say where the saying begins and the reflections of the writer begin. So it is, e.g., with his record of the witness of the Baptist in ch 3. The record of the Baptist’s words may end with the sentence, “He must increase, but I must decrease” (ver 30), and the rest may be the reflections of the writer on the situation.

(4) Reminiscences of an eyewitness.—The phenomena of the Gospel are thus, apparently at least, reminiscences of an eyewitness, with his reflections on the meaning of what he has heard. He was present at the scenes which he describes. He was present on the night on which the Master was betrayed; he was present in the hall of the high priest; he was present at the cross, and bears testimony to the reality of the death of Jesus (18 15);
19 35).—As we read the Gospel we note the stress he lays on witness. The term occurs \(30 \times\) in the Gospels with it. \(12: 19; 3: 13, 33; 12: 18, 21, 24, 43; \) and is used to set forth the verified facts of experience. In these testimonies we have an unusual combination of elevated thought and minute observation. At one time the evangelist soars aloft to a spiritual world, and moves with ease among the richest and highest elements of spiritual experience. Using common words, he yet reads into them the deepest meanings regarding man, the world, and God which have ever entered into the mind of man. Subtle mysteries and of profound import meet in his wonderful writings. Above all, we are impressed with his sense of the supreme value of the historical. All his spiritual meanings have a historical basis. This is as apparent in the 1st Ep. as it is in the Gospel, and in the Gospel it is conspicuous. While his main interest is to focus the minds of his readers on Jesus, His work and His word, yet unconsciously he has written his own spiritual biography. We gradually become aware, as we read, that we are sympathetically inside the spirit of the Gospel, that we are following the line of a great spiritual awakening, and are tracing the growth of faith and love in the life of the writer, until they become the overmastering tone of his whole life. On the other hand, the book, the biography, the revelation of a unique life, the story of the self-revelation of the Son of God, of the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ, moving onward to its consummation through the contrasted development of his own life, and of them on whom he has received Him, and on the part of them who received Him not. On the other hand, it has a subjective unity in the heart of the writer, as it tells of how faith began, of how faith made progress, until he came to full assurance of faith. We can enter into the various crises through which he passed, through which, as they successively passed, he won the assurance which he so calmly expresses; and these supply him with the key by means of which he is able to unlock the mystery of the relations of Jesus to the world. The victory of faith which he sets forth was first won in his own soul. This also is included in the significant phrase, "We beheld his glory" (1: 14).

The remembrance illustrated.—The Gospel receives powerful confirmation from reflection on the nature of remembrance generally. A law of remembrance is that, when we recall anything, or any occurrence, we recall it in its wholeness, with all the accessories of the moment. We have to make a selection of that only which is needful to convey our meaning. Inartistic natures do not make a selection; they pour out everything that arises in the memory (cf. Dame Quickly in Shakespeare). The finer qualities of remembrance are abundantly illustrated in the Fourth Gospel, and furnish an independent proof that it is from the pen of an eyewitness. It is possible within reasonable limits to give only a few examples. Observe first the exact notices of time in ch. 1 and the special notes of character in each of the 6 disciples whom Jesus met on the first 4 days of His ministry. Mark the peculiar graphic note that Nathanael was under the fig tree (ver. 50). Pass on to notice the 6 waterpots of stone set at Cana after the manner of the Jews' purifying (2: 6). We might refer in this connection to the geographical remarks frequently made in the course of the narrative, indicative of an intimate knowledge of Galilee, and to the numerous allusions both in law, custom, and ceremonies, usually admitted now to be accurate, and illustrative of familiar knowledge on the part of the writer. Our main object, however, is to call attention to those incidental things which have no symbolical significance, but are set down because, as the main happening was recounted, these arise as "factual" with the 5 barley loaves and 2 fishes (6: 9); remembers that Mary sat still in the house, when the active Martha went forth to meet the Lord as He approached Bethany (11: 20); recalls the appearance of Lazarus, he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes (ver. 44). He has a vivid picture before him as he recalls the washing of the disciples' feet (13: 1-15), and the various attitudes and remarks of the disciples during the whole of that eventful night. He still sees the careful folding of the linen cloths, and where they were placed in the empty tomb (20: 4-8). These are only some of those vivid touches due to remembrance which none but an eyewitness could safely make. Looking back on the past, the evangelist recalls the various scenes and words of the Lord in their wholeness as they happened, and he chooses those living touches which bear the mark of reality to all readers.

(6) Conclusions.—These touches of vivid reality warrant the corded object of the Fourth Gospel, in the sense that the Fourth Gospel is depicting scenes in a real life, and is not drawing on his imagination. Looking back on his own spiritual history, he remembered with special vividness those words and works of Christ which determined his own life, and of which he has received Him, and on the part of them who received Him not. On the other hand, it has a subjective unity in the heart of the writer, as it tells of how faith began, of how faith made progress, until he came to full assurance of faith. While he progressed from this point of view, it does not seem to us that it can be understood from any other, without ignoring all the phenomena of the kind now of God. The Gospel can be understood from this point of view: it does not seem to us that it can be understood from any other, without ignoring all the phenomena of the kind now of God. When he progressed from this point of view, he can afford to neglect many of the elaborate discussions which have arisen regarding the possible displacement of certain facts (Spitta, etc.). Much, however, has been made of the sudden transference of the scene from Galilee to Judea as we pass from ch. 4 to ch. 5, and the equally sudden transference back to Galilee (6: 1). Many suggestions have been made, but they all proceed on the supposition that the remembrance was made too late, and so is not the case. While it is very likely that there is a sequence in the writer's thought, yet this need not compel us to think of displacements. Taken as they are in the Fourth Gospel, the set of them together is the only possible reconciliation of the evidence, in Judea or in Galilee, in all instances indicate progress. They illustrate the manifested glory of Jesus, on the one hand, and the growth of faith and the development of unbelief on the other. This, however, opens up a separate line of objection and inquiry to which attention must now be given.

IV. Progress and Development in the Gospel.—It is an object often urged against the view of the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel that in it there is no progress, no development, no crisis, nothing, e.g., to correspond with the significance of the confession of St. Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 16: 13-17). This is held to be true alike of the character of Jesus, which, under the influence of the Logos-doctrine of the prologue, exhibits no development from first to last, and of the attitude of the disciples, whose faith in Jesus as the Christ is likewise represented as complete from the beginning to the end. In reality, the reverse is the case. The course of the Gospel, as already said, the glory of the Lord is ever more completely manifested, and the disciples attain to a deeper faith, while the unbelief of those who reject Him becomes more fixed,
until it is absolute. This will appear clearly upon nearer examination.

The objection from the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel takes different forms, which it is desirable to consider separately.


(1) Alleged absence of development. It is affirmed, and Jesus in the first, that there is no development in the Gospel character of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, none of those indications such as we have in the Synoptics of widening horizons, no recognition of the fact that the meaning, purpose and issue of His calling became clearer to Him as the days passed by. To this assertion there are two answers. First, that in a series of scenes from the activity of Jesus, selected for the definite purpose set forth in the Gospel, there is no need to demand a continuous history of His ministry. Selection is made precisely of those scenes which set forth His insight into human character and motive, His power of sympathetic healing, His command over Nature, and His supreme authority over man and the world. The other remark is that, even in the Fourth Gospel there are hints of a crisis in the ministry of Our Lord, during which He came to a clearer recognition of the fuller meaning of His mission. The existence of the Fourth Gospel, therefore, in its prologue. The reply is that there is no essential difference between the attitude of Jesus in these respects in the Synoptics and in Jn. In all alike He maintains an attitude of authority. In the Synoptics He can say, "I say unto you" (Mt 5:22-28,32, etc.). In them also He claims to be the teacher of absolute truth, the Saviour, the Ruler, the Judge, of men. In this regard there is no claim made in the Fourth Gospel: "No one cometh unto the Father, but he that is called" (Jn 14:6). He then adds: "Come unto me... and I will give you rest" (Mt 11:28). A claim to authority over men is thus common to all the Gospels. In all of them, too, in the Fourth no less than in the others, there is on the part of Jesus, a directness of assertion, a correspondence to the Father. In fact this is more conspicuous in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics: "The Father is greater than I" (Jn 14:28). The words He says are the Father's words; the works He does are the Father's (5:19-20, 7:16, 18, etc.). "This commandment received I from my Father" (10:18). In all the Gospels it is one consistent, gracious figure who appears.

(3) "Inconceivability" of Logos-presentation. — A further objection, which aims at showing that this Gospel could not be the work of "a primitive apostle," may be noticed, partly from the eminence of him who makes it, and partly from the interest of the objection itself. In his work on The Apo
tolic Age, Weissäcker says, "It is a puzzle that the beloved disciple of the Gospel, he who reclined at table next to Jesus, should have come to regard and represent his whole former experience as a life with the incarnate Logos of God. It is impossible to imagine any power of faith and philosophy so great as to lose hold of a real life and substitute for it this marvelous picture of a Divine being. We can understand that Paul, who had not known Jesus, who had not come into contact with the man, should have been opposed to the tradition of the eyewitnesses, the idea of the heavenly man, and that he should have substituted the Christ who was spirit for His earthly manifestation, pronouncing the latter to be positively a stage above which faith must rise. For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable. The question is decided here and finally here" (II, 5.11). It is easy to say, "For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable," yet we know that a primitive apostle believed that Jesus rose from the dead, that He was exalted a Prince and Saviour, that He was seated at the right hand of God, that He was Lord of all (Acts 2:22-36). If we grant that the primitive church believed these things, it cannot be fairly said that the further step taken in the Fourth Gospel is inconceivable. In truth, the objection of Weissäcker is not taken against the Fourth Gospel; it is equally effective against Christianity in general. If Jesus be what He is said to be in the Synoptic Gospels, and if He be what the primitive church held Him to be, the leading conception of the Fourth Gospel is credible and conceivable. If Christianity is credible, the Fourth Gospel adds nothing to the difficulty of faith; rather it gives an additional ground for a rational faith.

It is proper at this point that a little more should be said on the Logos of the Greeks, etc. In order better to understand the presentation of Christ in this fourth Gospel we must examine the philosophical and historical aspects of the doctrine, see Logos-Doctrine (Logos). Obviously the great interest of the Prologue and reflections in the Fourth Gospel is in the personal life of the Master whom he had known so intimately. To him this real historical life was everything. On it he brooded, and it he meditated, and, he growed in the significance of it ever more real to himself first, and to others afterward. How shall he make the reality of that life apparent to all? What were the relationships of that person to God, to man, and to the world? What Jesus really was, and what were His relations to God, to man, and to the world, John endeavors to make known in the prologue. This real person whom he had known, revered, loved, was something more than was apparent to the eyes of an ordinary man (14:6). He was a manson, exalting the glory of the person. The Logos-doctrine does not descend on the historic person as a garment from without; it is an endeavor to describe what John had grown to recognize as the essential meaning of the person of Jesus. It is not a speculative theory we have here, not an endeavor to think out a theory of the world or of God; it is an attempt to find suitable language for what the writer recognizes to be a great fact. We need not therefore, seek an explanation of John's Logos-doctrine in the speculations of Heracleitus, in the theories of the Stoics, even in the eclecticism of Philo. The interests of these men are far removed from the atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel. They desired a theory of the universe; John sought to set forth the significance of a personal historical life. In the prologue he set forth that life, and he chose a word which he filled up with concreter meaning, a meaning which included the deepest teaching of the OT, and the highest thought of his contemporaries. The teaching of St. Paul, esp. in the ep. of the captivity, approaches very closely to that of the Fourth Gospel. Thus it is not a right method to bring the Logos-doctrine to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and to look at all the phenomena
of the Gospel as mere illustrations of that doctrine. The right method is the reverse. The Logos-doctrine has no concreteness, no living reality, taken apart from the personal life which was manifested to the apostles. In the Prologue, "believe-eth" represents what John had come to see as to the meaning of the personality he had historically known. He sets it forth once for all in the prologue, and never once in the Gospel does he refer to it again. We can understand of that Logos-doctrine when we look at it in the light of those manifestations recorded in the Gospel, manifestations which enabled St. John to behold His glory; we cannot understand the manifestations if we look at them merely as illustrations of an abstract philosophical theorem.

In brief, the Fourth Gospel contains, not abstract; it is not the evolution or the demonstration of a theory, but the attempt to set forth a concrete personality, and to find fitting words to express the significance of that personality as St. John had grasped it.

As it is with the character of Jesus, so it is with the alleged absence of development in the faith of the disciples. Careful inquiry shows that objection to be unfounded.

3. Growth of Faith and Development of Unbelief

(a) Early Confessions.—Here again, it is said, we see the end from the beginning. In ch 1 Jesus is twice greeted as the Messiah (vs 41, 46), and twice called the Lamb of God (vs 27, 36, 49). The Baptist at this early stage points to Him as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (ver 29). Reference is made to the case of Nicodemus (3 1 ff), to the Samaritans (4 41 ff), and other incidents of the same kind, with the view of proving that at this early stage of the ministry of Our Lord such confessions are unlikely, and even impossible. It is to be noticed, however, that the confessions in these cases are represented as the outcome of spiritual manifestations on the part of Jesus to the persons who make them. And the manifestations are such as to justify the psychological possibility of the confession. It is so in the case of Nathanael. Nor is the objection to the testimony of John the Baptist of a kind which admits of no answer. For the Baptist, according to the Synoptics, had found his own credentials in Isa 40. There he found himself and his mission, and described himself, as we find it in the Fourth Gospel, "I am the voice of one cry- ing in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said Isaiah the prophet" (1 23; cf Mt 3 3; Mk 1 2 3). We find also that when John "heard in the prison the works of the Christ," and "sent by his disciples and said unto him, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" (Mt 11 2), the answer of Jesus was a reference to a passage in Isa 61. According to Jesus these were the true signs of the Messianic kingdom. Is there any reason why we should not say, as John found his own credentials in Isa 40, he would also have found the character and signs of the Coming One in the description of the suffering servant in ch 53? If he did so, what more simple than that he should describe the Coming One as the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world? In His answer to John, Jesus simply asks him to read farther on in that prophesy which had already meant so much for him.

(b) Growth of faith in the disciples.—Apart from what may be made of these early confessions, it might be noted that there are signs of growth of faith on the part of the disciples. Carrying with us the fact that each of these confessions had its ground in a particular manifestation of the glory of Christ, we go on to passages which prove how imperfect was the faith of the disciples. It is to be remembered also that John has only one word to describe all the phases of faith, from the slightest impression up to whole-hearted conviction and thorough surrender. We may refer to the careful and exhaustive treatment of the meanings of the Greek word, "believe," taken mainly in the Johannine Vocabulary. In the Fourth Gospel the vb. is always used, and never the noun. As the word is used, it denotes their impression made, whether that impression is slight and transient, or deep and enduring. Successive stages of acceptance are seen as the disciples advance to complete and absolute faith.

As we read the Gospel, we perceive that Jesus did test and try the faith of His disciples, and made His deeds and His words both tests of faith, and means for its growth. As the result of the words on the bread of life, we find that many of His disciples said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (6 60), and on account of the difficulty of His words, "Many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him" (ver 66). On His appeal to those who did not go away it is found that the difficulty became really an opportunity to them for a larger faith (vs 68, 69). The incidents and events of the night of Gethseman, and the facts on that night, prove how incomplete were the faith and confidence of the disciples; how far they were from a full understanding of the Master's purpose. Nor is it until after the resurrection, and the gladness of seeing the Lord in the upper room, that faith obtained a complete victory, and attained to full possession of itself.

(3) Gradual disclosure of Messiahship: Growth of unbelief.—On the other side, there is as manifestly an evolution of faith, from the passing of the moment on to the complete disbelief in Jesus, and utter rejection of Him.

It is only fair here to the Gospel to observe that the confessions to which we have already referred are on the part of individuals who came into special relationship with Jesus. Such is the case with regard to Nathanael, Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria and the Samaritan people, and the writer places the reader in that close relationship so that he who reads may believe. But such close relationship to Jesus is only a lot of a few in this Gospel. It is not true, as already remarked, that in this Gospel Jesus is represented as definitely proclaiming Himself as the Messiah. There is something of the mystery of the Synoptics. He did not assert His claim; He left it to be believed. His brethren hint that He ought to put His claims really to the test (7 31). An account of the doubts and speculations regarding Him is given in ch 7. The people hesitate, and inquire, and speculate. Is He a good man, or a deceiver? (ver 12) Had He really a mission from God? (vs 14 ff) —all of which goes to prove that only certain individuals had such intimate knowledge of Him as to lead to acceptance. In ch 10 we read, "And it was the feast of the dedication at Jesus: It was winter; and Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon's porch. The Jews therefore came round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (10 22-24). "It is very clear," as Dr. Sanday says, "that no sharply defined issue was set before the people. They are left to draw their own conclusions; and they draw them as well as they can by the help of such criteria as they have. But there is no enticement...or any signs of Messiah—peremptorily propounded by Jesus Himself" (The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 164). The sum of the matter as regards the development of unbelief is given by the evangelist in the words: "Though he had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on him (2 37) On the
other hand, the culmination of faith is seen in the word of the Lord to Thomas: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." (20: 29)

LITERATURE.—Besides Comms, and other works mentioned in the art., with valuableState works, on the Gospel in D. and E. The following may be consulted: M. Dode, comm. on "Fourth Gospel" in Expositor's Gr. Test.; Jullicher, Einleitung in das N. (1906, BT); E. A. Abbott, Johannine, Johvita (1905); and Johvita Grammar (1906); H. J. Holtzmann, Evangelium, Brüche und Offenbarungen (1905, 2nd ed.); Bauer (1900); Essays on Some Bib. Questions of the Day by Members of the University of Cambridge, edited by Dr. Swete (1909); Commentary on the Historical Theology of the Fourth Gospel;" by W. H. Inge, and Essay X. "The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel," by C. E. Brooke; Schmiechel, The Johannite Writings (ET, 1908); J. Arthurage Robinson, The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel (1906); —J. Keel, The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel, edited by J. H. Thayer (1901); Lowrie, The Doctrine of St. John (1899).

JAMES IVERACH

JOHN, THE REVELATION OF. See Reveal-

ation of John.

JOIADA, jo'ı-da (יְיוֹדָה, yōyādāh, "Jeh knows"); cf Jehoiada:
(1) A repairer of the Jerusalem (Neh 3 6); AV "Jehoiada."
(2) Son of Eliashib the high priest (Neh 12 10.
11 22; 13 28).

JOLAKIM, jo'ı-kim (יוֹלַקִים, yōlāḵēm, "Jeh raises up"); cf Jehoiakim; Jokim: Son of Joshua and father of Eliashib, the high priest (12 10.
12 26).

JOLARIB, jo'ı-rib (יוֹלָרִיב, yōlārib, "Jeh pleads" or "contends"); cf Jehoiakim:
(1) A "teacher" of Ezra's time (Ezr 8 16).
(2) A Judahite (Neh 11 5).
(3) In Neh 11 10; 12 6 10 = Jehoiarib (q.v.).

JOIN; join: Of the NT words, kollō, lit. "glue," "weld together," and its compounds, designate the closest form of personal union, as in Lk 15 15; 1 Cor 6 16; Eph 5 31. In the words of institution of marriage, suzēginum is used (Mt 19 6; Mk 10 9; lit. "yoke together"); cf Gen 2 24).

JOKDEAM, jok'dē-am (יוֹקְדֵאָם, yōk'dē'am): An unidentified city of Judah, named with Maon, Carmel and Ziph (Josh 15 56). It probably lay to the S. of Hebron.

JOKIM, jōk'ım (יוֹקִיָּם, yōkīm, "Jeh raises up"); cf Jehoiakim; Jokim: A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (1 Ch 4 22).

JOKMEAM, jok'mē-am (יוֹקְמֵאָם, yōk'mē'am): A town in Mt. Ephraim assigned to the Kohathite Levites (1 Ch 6 68), named along with Gezer and Horite. Its place is taken by Kibzaim in Josh 21 22 (in LXX here the name is omitted). It is mentioned again in 1 K 4 12 (AV wrongly "Jokneam"), where it seems to indicate some position to the E. of Ephraim. So far no identification is possible.

JOKNEAM, jok'nē-am (יוֹקְנֵאָם, yōk'nē'am): A small town of the Canaanites taken by Joshua and described as "in Carmel" (Josh 12 22), in the territory of Zebulon, and allotted to the Merarite Levites (31 24). The border of Zebulon "reached to the brook that is before Jokneam" (19 11). In 1 K 4 12 the name appears in AV where, with RV, we should read "Jokmeam." Onom places it 6 Rom miles from Lejjo (Lejffān) on the way to Ptolemais (Acre). This points to Tel Kasbeh, a striking mound on the eastern slope of Mt. Carmel. To the E. of it runs the "torment bed" of the Kishon. It stands about 300 ft. above the valley to the N. of it, and the sides are steep. It is crowned by the ruins of an 18th-cent. fortress. A little lower down are the remains of a small chapel. There are fine springs at the foot (PEFM, II, 60 f). In Jib 7 3 it appears as "Cyamon." (Kvāwār, Kuamôn). It is the "Mons Cajus" of the Middle Ages. "In the Sam Book of Jcs it is noticed as the scene of a conflict between the Hebrews and the Giants; and Joshua is said to have been shut up here in magic walls of brass, till on sending a dove to the Heb king of Gilead, he was rescued" (Conder, HDB, s.v.).

W. Ewing

JOKSHAN, jok'shan (יוֹקָשָׁן, yōkshan), meaning unknown: Son of Abraham and Keturah (Gen 25 23 1 Ch 1 32). Such suggested that yōkshan = yōkshan (Gen 10 25 29); see HDB, s.v.; Skinner, Gen, 350.

JOKTAN, jok'tàn (יוֹקְתָן, yōkētān, meaning unknown: "Son" of Eber, and "father" of 13 tribes (Gen 10 25.26 29; 1 Ch 1 20.20).32)

JOKTHEEL, jok'thē-əl (יוֹקְתֶל, yōkēth
thēl):
(1) A city in the Shephelah of Judah named be-
tween Mizpah and Lachish (Josh 15 38); unidentified.
(2) A city in Edom formerly called Sela, taken by Amaziah after the battle in the Valley of Salt, and by him called Joktheel (2 K 14 7). See Sela.

JONA, jō'na. See Jonah; Jonas.

JONADAB, jōn'ə-dab. See Jehonadab.

JONAH, jō'na (יוֹנָה, yōnah, "dove"); Ionás.

JONAH, the book bearing his name, Jonah the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher, a prophet and servant of Jeh, predicted the restoration of the land of Israel to its ancient boundaries through the efforts of Jeroboam II. The prophet lived and labored either in the early part of the reign of Jeroboam (790–750 BC), or during the preceding generation. He may with great probability be placed at 800–750 BC. His early ministry must have been popular in Israel; for he prophesied of victory and expansion of territory. His native village of Gath-hepher was located in the territory of Zebulon (Josh 19 15).

(2) According to the book bearing his name, Jonah the son of Amittai received a command to preach to Nineveh; but he fled in the opposite direction to escape from the task of proclaiming Jeh's message to the great heathen city; was arrested by a storm, and at his own request was hurled into the sea, where he was swallowed by a great fish, remaining alive in the belly of the fish for three days. When on his release from the body of the fish the command to go to Nineveh was renewed, J. obeyed and announced the overthrow of the wicked city. When the men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of the prophet, God repented of the evil He had threatened to bring upon them. J. was grieved that the oppressing city should be spared, and waited in the vicinity to see what would be the final outcome. An intense prayer for the destruction of the people that threatened to swallow up Israel. He thought that Jeh was too merciful to the heathen oppressors. By the lesson
of the gourd he was taught the value of the heathen in the sight of Jeh.

It is the fashion now in scholarly circles to treat the Book of Jonah as fiction. The story is said to be an allegory or a parable or a symbolic narrative. Why then did the author fasten upon a true and worthy prophet of Jeh the stigma of rebellion and narrowness? On the theory that the narrative is an allegory, J. Kennedy well says that “the man who wrote it was guilty of a gratuitous insult to the memory of a prophet, and could not have been inspired by the prophet’s Master thus to dishonor a faithful servant.”

(3) Our Lord referred on two different occasions to the sign of Jonah the prophet (Mt 12 38–41; Lk 11 29–32; Mt 16 4). He speaks of J’s experience in the belly of the fish as parallel with His own approaching entombment for three days, and cites the repentance of the Ninevites as a rebuke to the unbelieving men of His own generation. Our Lord thus speaks both of the physical miracle of the preservation of Jonah in the body of the fish and of the moral miracle of the repentance of the Ninevites, and without the slightest hint that He regarded the story as an allegory.

JONAH, THE BOOK OF: This little roll of four short chapters has given rise to almost as much discussion and difference of opinion as the first four chapters of Gen. It would be presumption to think that one could, in a brief article, speak the first word on the question of the book’s place to be given it. Perhaps it is well to begin with a statement of the contents of the book.

I. Contents of the Book.—The story is too well known to need retelling. Moreover, it would be difficult to give the events in fewer words than the author employs in his classic narrative. One event grows out of another, so that the interest of the reader never flags.

When the call came to Jonah to preach in Nineveh, he fled in the opposite direction, hoping thus to escape from his unpleasant task. He was afraid that the merciful God would forgive the oppressing heathen, if it should repent at his preaching. Jonah was a narrow-minded patriot, who feared that Assyria would one day swallow up his own rivals. He thus said nothing that might lead to the preservation of wicked Nineveh. Jonah was willing to prophesy to Israel; he at first failed to refuse to become a foreign missionary.

The vessel in which the prophet had taken passage was arrested by a great storm. The heathen sailors inferred that some god must be

2. Jonah Punished, 1:1–4:16

When the lot fell upon Jonah, he made a complete confession, and brazenly suggested that they cast him overboard. The heathen mariners rowed desperately to get back to land, but made no progress against the storm. They then prayed Jeh not to bring innocent blood upon them, and cast Jonah into the sea. As the storm progressively subsided, the heathen sailors offered a sacrifice to Jeh and made vows. In this part of the story the mariners give an example of the capacity of the Gentiles to perform noble deeds and to offer acceptable worship to Jeh.

Jeh prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah and to bear him in his body for three days and nights. Surprised to find himself alive and conscious in the body of the fish, the prophet praised God. Already by faith he speaks of his danger as a past experience. The God who had saved him from drowning in the depths of the sea will yet permit him once more to worship with loud thanksgiving. At the command of Jeh the fish vomits out Jonah upon the dry land. The almost inevitable grotesqueness of this part of the story is one of the strongest arguments against the view that the Book of Jon is literal history and not a work of the imagination.

Upon the renewal of the command to Nineveh, Jonah obeyed, and marching through the streets of the great city, he cried, “Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!” His message was so brief that he may well have spoken it in good Assyrian. If the story of his delivery from the sea preceded him, or was made known through the prophet himself, the effect of the prophetic message was thereby greatly heightened.

The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, the entire city uniting in fasting and prayer. So great was the anxiety of the people that even the lower animals were clothed in sackcloth. The men of Nineveh turned from deeds of violence (“their evil way”) to seek the forgiveness of an angry God. Jeh decided to spare the city.

Jonah breaks out into loud and bitter complaint when he learns that Nineveh is to be spared. He decides to encamp near the city to see what will become of it. He hopes it will now repent. A Narrow Prophet may yet be overthrown. Through a gourd vine Jeh teaches the prophet a Merciful lesson. If such a mean and perishable plant can have real value in the eyes of the sullen prophet, what estimate ought to be put on the lives of the thousands of innocent children and helpless cattle in the great city of Nineveh? These were dearer to the God of heaven than Jonah’s protecting vine could possibly be to him.

II. The Aim of the Book.—The main purpose of the writer was to enlarge the sympathies of Israel and lead the chosen people to undertake the great missionary task of proclaiming the truth to the heathen world. Other lessons may be learned from the subordinate parts of the narrative, but this is the central truth of the Book of Jon. Kent well expresses the author’s main message: “In the person of the wonderful picture he wished to do nothing that might lead to the preservation of wicked Nineveh. Jonah was willing to prophesy to Israel; he at first failed to refuse to become a foreign missionary. The vessel in which the prophet had taken passage was arrested by a great storm. The heathen sailors inferred that some god must be

1. Jonah Disobedient, 1:1–3

... should repent at his preaching. Jonah was a narrow-minded patriot, who feared that Assyria would one day swallow up his own rivals. He thus said nothing that might lead to the preservation of wicked Nineveh. Jonah was willing to prophesy to Israel; he at first failed to refuse to become a foreign missionary. The vessel in which the prophet had taken passage was arrested by a great storm. The heathen sailors inferred that some god must be

2. Jonah Punished, 1:1–4:16

When the lot fell upon Jonah, he made a complete confession, and brazenly suggested that they cast him overboard. The heathen mariners rowed desperately to get back to land, but made no progress against the storm. They then prayed Jeh not to bring innocent blood upon them, and cast Jonah into the sea. As the storm progressively subsided, the heathen sailors offered a sacrifice to Jeh and made vows. In this part of the story the mariners give an example of the capacity of the Gentiles to perform noble deeds and to offer acceptable worship to Jeh.

Jeh prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah and to bear him in his body for three days and nights. Surprised to find himself alive and conscious in the body of the fish, the prophet praised God. Already by faith he speaks of his danger as a past experience. The God who had saved him from drowning in the depths of the sea will yet permit him once more to worship with loud thanksgiving. At the command of Jeh the fish vomits out Jonah upon the dry land. The almost inevitable grotesqueness of this part of the story is one of the strongest arguments against the view that the Book of Jon is literal history and not a work of the imagination.

Upon the renewal of the command to Nineveh, Jonah obeyed, and marching through the streets of the great city, he cried, “Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!” His message was so brief that he may well have spoken it in good Assyrian. If the story of his delivery from the sea preceded him, or was made known through the prophet himself, the effect of the prophetic message was thereby greatly heightened.

The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, the entire city uniting in fasting and prayer. So great was the anxiety of the people that even the lower animals were clothed in sackcloth. The men of Nineveh turned from deeds of violence (“their evil way”) to seek the forgiveness of an angry God. Jeh decided to spare the city.

Jonah breaks out into loud and bitter complaint when he learns that Nineveh is to be spared. He decides to encamp near the city to see what will become of it. He hopes it will now repent. A Narrow Prophet may yet be overthrown. Through a gourd vine Jeh teaches the prophet a Merciful lesson. If such a mean and perishable plant can have real value in the eyes of the sullen prophet, what estimate ought to be put on the lives of the thousands of innocent children and helpless cattle in the great city of Nineveh? These were dearer to the God of heaven than Jonah’s protecting vine could possibly be to him.

III. Is the Book History?—Most of the early interpreters so understood it, and some excellent scholars still hold this view. If Jesus...
"Christ is using an illustration: It matters not whether that illustration be drawn from the realms of fact or of poetry (BTP, II, 308). In a footnote Dr. Smith says, "it is for us to decide whether the fish's belly will be the fate of the man who buried his talent, is it not to commit us to the belief that the personages of Christ's parables actually existed? Or take the fortuitous use of Shakespeare's drama—as Macbeth did,—or did he commit us to the historical reality of Macbeth or Hamlet? Any preacher among us would resent being bound by such an inference. And if we resolve this for ourselves, why should we be about to seek to bind our Lord by it?"

Notwithstanding Principal Smith's skillful presentation of his case, we still think that our Lord regarded the miracle of the fish and the repentance of the Ninevites as actual events. Keil put the matter judiciously: "It is not, indeed, proved with conclusive necessity that, if the resurrection of Jesus was a physical fact, Jonah's abode in the fish's belly must also be just as historical. On this point also the saying, 'A greater than Jonah is here,' holds good. But, on the other hand, how arbitrary it is to assert, with Reuss, that Jesus regarded Jonah's history as a parable! On the contrary, Jesus saw in it a sign, a powerful evidence of the same Divine power which condemned (6:5) and inquired (15:1-3) to live again and triumph in the world. Whoever, therefore, feels the religious greatness of the book, and accepts as authoritative the attitude taken to its historical import by the Son of God Himself, will also accept a greater than Jesus, which brings down to Hades and brings up again, as an actual experience of Jonah in his flight from his Lord" (The Twelve Minor Prophets, 172, 3).

Most modern critical scholars since Kleinert (1868) and Blech (1875) have regarded the Book of Jon as a work of the imagination.

2. Modern. Some prefer to call it an allegory, Critical Views others a parable, others a prose poem, others a didactic story, others a midrash, others a symbolic book. Keil, Pusey, Delsitcz, Orelli, J. Kennedy and others have contended for the historical character of the narrative. A few treat it as a legend containing a kernel of fact. Cheyne and a few other scholars assert that in the symbolic narrative are imbedded mythical elements. The trend of critical opinion, even in evangelical circles, has of late been toward the symbolic interpretation. Radical critics boldly set aside the teaching of Jesus as erroneous, when they use the Evangelical text for the purpose of the doctrine of the Kenosis (Phil 2:5-8), or in the principle of accommodation. The last explanation might commend itself to the devout student, viz. that Jesus did not think it worth while to correct the views of his contemporaries, had our Lord not spoken more than once of the sign of Jonah, and in such detail as to indicate His acceptance of the entire narrative with its two great miracles.

IV. Authorship and Date. The old view that Jonah was the author is still held by some scholars, though most moderns place the book in the late exilic or post-exilic times. A few Aram. words occur in the Heb. text. The question in debate is whether the language of Israel in the days of Jeroboam II had taken over words from the Aramaic. There had certainly been a century of close political and commercial contact between Israel and the Aramaeans of Damascus, so that it would not be surprising to meet with Aram. words in a prophet of Samaria. Hosea, in the generation following Israel, betrays little evidence of Aram. influence in his style and vocabulary. Of course, the personal equation is a factor that ought not to be overlooked. If the author was a Jew, we should probably have to think of the post-exilic period, when Aram. began to displace Hebrew as the vernacular of the Jews. The Book of Jon is anonymous, and we really do not know who the author was or when he lived. The view that Jonah wrote the story of his own disobedience and his debate with the merciful God has not been made clear. But if this be the case, it will be the fate of the man who buried his talent, is it not to commit us to the belief that the personages of Christ's parables actually existed? Or take the fortuitous use of Shakespeare's drama—as Macbeth did,—or did he commit us to the historical reality of Macbeth or Hamlet? Any preacher among us would resent being bound by such an inference. And if we resolve this for ourselves, why should we be about to seek to bind our Lord by it?

V. The Unity of the Book. Nachtigal (1799) contended that there were three different authors of widely different periods. Kleinert (1868) held that two parallel narratives had been woven together in chs 3 and 4. Kaufmann Kohler (1879) contended that there were a considerable number of glosses and interpolations besides some transpositions of material. W. Böhme, in 1887, advanced the most radical theory of the composition of the roll. He partitioned the story among two authors, and two or three reactors or supplementers. A few additional glosses were charged to later hands. Even radical critics treat Böhme's theory as one of the curiosities of criticism. Winckler (AOEr, II, 206 f) tried to improve the story by a few transpositions. Hans Schmidt (1905) subjects the roll of Jon to a searching criticism, and concludes that a good many changes have been made from religious motives. Buidel follows Winckler and Schmidt both in transposing and in omitting some material. Sievers that Jon could not be taken as a parable in the Book of Jon a poem; but they do not agree as to the meter. Sievers regards the roll as a unit, while Erbdt contends for two main sources besides the prayer in ch 2. Brewer, in ICC (1912), is far more conservative in both the results of his search and organizing but few glosses in our present text and arguing for the unity of the story apart from the insertion of the ps in ch 2. Nearly all recent critics assign Jonah's prayer to a writer other than the author of the narrative. If the authors of the two versions vary as widely as to the manner in which the psalm found its way into the Book of Jon. Brewer holds that it was probably put on the margin by a reader and afterward crept into the text, the copyist inserting it after ver 2, though it would more naturally follow ver 11. Brewer remarks: "The literary connections with various post-exilic ps are for a post-exilic date of the ps. But how early or how late in the post-exilic period it belongs we cannot tell. The Heb is pure and no Aram. influence is apparent. It is evident, then, that the presence or absence of Aram. influence does not alone settle the question of the date of the document. Geography and the personal equation may be more important than the one or other specific verse. The question whether the ps in Jon is not a mere cento of quotations from the Ps. "The phrases it has in common with other ps," writes Professor Brewer, "were the common property of the religious language of the author's day" (p. 24). Those who still believe that David wrote many of the pss find no difficulty in believing that a prophet of 780 BC could have drawn upon his knowledge of the Psalter in a prayer of thanksgiving to Jehovah.

LITERATURE—Among comms. covering the twelve Minor Prophets, see esp. Pusey (1861), Keil (ET, 1880), von Orelli (ET, 1893), Wellhausen (1898), G. A. Smith (1886). Among special comms. on Jon, consult Kleinert, in Lange (ET, 1875); Perowne, in Cambridge Bible (1897); Bewer in ICC (1912). See also Wright, Biblical Essays (1886); H. C. Trumpbull, "Jonah in Nineveh," JBL, XI (1892); J. Kennedy, Book of Jon (1895); Konig in DB, Cheyne in EB. For more elaborate bibliography see Bewer in ICC, 25-27.

JOHN RICHARD SAMPEY

JONAH, Jōnâ (Joná, Joná, WH; Τούνα, Ιωνᾶ, TE; AV Jonah): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk's genealogy (3:30).

JONAH, Jōnâ. See Jonah.

JONAS, Jōnâs (Tovâs, Ιωνᾶς; AV Jonas):
(1) Son of Eliasib (1 Esd 9 1).
(2) Corresponds in 1 Esd 9 23 to "Elizer" in Ezra 10 23.
(3) The prophet Jonah (2 Esd 1 39; Tob 14 48).

JONAS, JONAS, JONATHAN, JONATHAN:
(1) The name given in Mt 12: 39-41; 16: 4; Lk 11: 29-32 AV to the OT prophet Jonah (RV renders "Jonah"). See JONAH.
(2) In 1 Esd 6: 42.
(3) The name given in Jn 21: 16 AV to the father of the apostle Simon Peter. Nothing further is known of him, except the different forms of his name. In Jn 1: 42 AV he is called Jona (cf also Mt 16: 17 AV). In Jn 1: 42; 21: 15, 16 RV he is called John, with the marginal note "Or Joannes." In Mt: 16: 17 RV Simon Peter is called Simon Bar-Jonah.

Jonas may be a contraction for Jonaeus (Keim). It has also been suggested that the father of Simon may have had a double name, Jona-Johannes (cf F. Chase in HDB, art. "John, father of Simon Peter").

JONATH ELEH BEHEKIM, JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHON:
(1) (Heb y'hônâthan): The young "Levite" of Jgs 17: 18 referred to by name in 18: 30, who is called "the son of Geraham," the son of Moses, and where AV has "Manasseh" for Moses, following the MT in which the letter nun of Manasseh is "suspended.

Rashi states the reason thus: "Because of the honor of Moses was the nun written so as to alter the name. The original word was Moses, but it was thought undesirable that a descendant of his should have anything to do with images; and so J. was made to have affinity (metaphorically) with Manasseh. See GB, Intro, 335-338.

J. was a Levitical Judahite of Beth-lehem-judah, who came to the house of Micah, in the hill country of Ephraim, and hired himself as a priest in Micah's house (17: 11-13). The Danites sent 5 men north to spy for new territory, and on their way the spies came to the house of Micah, where they found J. and consulted the oracle through him (18: 1-5). Having received a favorable answer, they set out and came to Laish, and on their return south they advised that an expedition be sent therewith (18: 6-10). Their clansmen accordingly sent out a band of warriors who on their way passed by Micah's house. The spies informed their comrades of the images and teraphim and images there, and they seized them, inducing J. at the same time to accompany them as their priest (vs 11-20). At Laish he founded a priesthood which was thus descended from Moses (ver 30).

It has been held that there are two sources in the narrative (Jgs 17, 18 (see G. Moore, Jgs 360-72). The section is important because of the light it throws on life and religion in ancient Palestine. (1) The Levites were not all of one tribe (see Moore, op. cit., 383-84); there were priests who claimed descent from Moses as well as Aaronite priests; and images were common in early Heb worship (cf Gen 31: 30 ff; Jgs 8: 27; 1: 8 19: 13).

(2) Son of King Saul. See separate art.

(3) (Heb y'hônâthan, y'hônâthân, JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHON):
(1) One of David's mighty men. See JARH.
(2) (Heb y'hônâthan, 1 Ch 2: 32: 33): A Jerahmeelite.
(3) (Heb y'hônâthan, and so 1 Ch 27: 25 AV): Son of Uzziah, and one of David's treasurers.
(4) (Heb y'hônâthân, 1 Ch 11: 34): One of David's mighty men. See JAREH.
(5) (2 S 3 32, Heb y'hônâthân = 1 Ch 11: 34, JONATHAN): Son of Shimeel, Shimee, David's brother; he is said to be the slayer of Goliath. See JEHOVADAB (1).
(6) (2 S 23: 32, Heb y'hônâthân = 1 Ch 11: 34, JONATHAN): Son of Uzziah, and one of David's treasurers.
(7) (Heb y'hônâthân, and so 1 Ch 27: 25 AV): Son of Uzziah, and one of David's treasurers.
(8) (Heb y'hônâthân, 1 Ch 27: 32): A doth of David, RV "uncle," RVm "brother's son"; if he was David's nephew, he will be the same as (4) above. He was "a counselor to David, and a man of understanding, and a scribe."
(9) (Heb yônâthân, 1 Esd 3: 15; 1 Esd 9: 14): A priest of the family of the Levites.

One who either supported (RV) or opposed (RVm, AV) Ezra in the matter of foreign marriage; see JEBH.
(11) (Heb yônâthân, Neh 12: 11): A priest, descendant of Joshua (Joshua) = "Johan" (12: 22-23); see JERHAN.
(13) (Heb yônâthân, Neh 12: 35): A priest, father of Zechariah.
(14) (Heb y'hônâthân, Jer 37: 15: 20; 38: 26): A scribe in whose house Jeremiah was imprisoned.
(15) (Heb yônâthân, Jer 40: 8): Son of Ikarab; a Judahite captain who joined Gedaliah after the fall of Jerus.
(16) ("Jothâb, Jonâdâth, 1 Macc 2: 5; 9: 13; and 16: 10, 13): Two of the sons of Mattathias; sons of Absalom.
(17) (Son of Absalom (1 Macc 13: 11): He was sent by Simon the Maccabees to capture Joppa (cf 11: 70, where there is mentioned a Mattathias, son of Absalom).

JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHAN, JONATHON, JONATHAN, JONATHON:
(1) The eldest son of Saul, the first king of Israel (1 Sam 16: 10). See separate art. 1. Three periods of his life: (a) of Saul; (b) of David; (c) of Absalom.

I. Three periods of life: (a) of Saul; (b) of David; (c) of Absalom.

I. Three periods of his life: (a) of Saul; (b) of David; (c) of Absalom.

Periods of his life: (a) of Saul; (b) of David; (c) of Absalom.

The life of J. as far as we are told about him, falls naturally into 3 periods.

(1) First period.—He comes on the scene as the right hand and lieutenant of his father in his early struggles to beat off the hostile tribes, esp. the Ammonites (1 S 11), who beset the territory of Israel on all sides. As soon as Saul had gained his first decisive victory, the people rallied to him in great numbers, so that he was able to count upon 3,000 men whenever they took the field. These were divided into two small armies, Saul retaining 2,000 and making Michmash his headquarters, the rest being stationed at Gibeah under J., some 5 miles distant as the crow flies. J. thus commanded the base, while his father led the fighting force. This position of comparative inactivity does not appear to have been much to the taste of J. Midway between the two camps was a Philistine outpost at Geba, facing Michmash across the pass of that name, a valley with steep sides, now the Wadi Suweinit. Saul does not seem to have felt himself strong enough to commence hostilities against the Philis, and took means to increase the forces at his disposal. The Philis no sooner heard that the Israelites had cast off their yoke (1 S 13: 5 for "let the Hebrews hear," read "The Hebrews have revolted," after LXX), than they came out in great
numbers (13:5). They seem to have compelled Saul to evacuate Michmash, which they occupied, Saul falling back on Gibeah (13:16) and Gilgal with a greatly reduced following (13:3.4). As a summary anticipation, in Heb style, of the events detailed in ch 14. In spite of this, J., accompanied only by his armor-bearer, surprised the Phil. outpost at Geba (14:5). "Gibeah" should be "Geba," which was killed to a man. This feat precipitated a general engagement, in which the Israelites, whose only weapons appear to have been their farming implements (13:20), Saul and J. alone being armed with iron swords and spears, routed their enemies. Thus the independence and capacity for the superstitious action of Saul in refusing to allow the people to eat until the day was over (14:24). As this order was unwittingly broken by J., Saul wished to have him executed; but this the people refused to allow, as they clearly recognized that the credit of the victory was due to the energetic action of J. in striking before the enemy had time to concentrate. (In the Heb text there is some confusion between Gibeah and Giba; cf 10:5 in and 13:5.)

2. His Character. His character is, as far as our knowledge goes, nearly perfect. He was athletic and brave (1 S 14:13; 2 S 1:22-23). He could keep his plans secret when secrecy was necessary in order to carry them out (14:1), and could decide on what course of action to follow and act upon it on the instant. His attack upon the Phil. garrison at Geba (or Gibeah, if we adopt the reading of the LXX and with Tg. cf 10:5) was delivered at the right moment, and was as wise as it was daring. If he had a fault, from a military point of view, it may have been an inability to follow up an advantage. The pursuit of the Philis on the occasion referred to ended in failure. In this respect, however, he perhaps cannot be censured with justice, as he never had an entirely free hand.

J.'s independence and capacity for acting on his own responsibility were combined with devotion to his father. While holding his own opinion and taking his own course, he never deserted his father and his friend is above criticism. Only on one occasion did his anger get the better of him (20:24) under gross provocation, Saul having impugned the honor of J.'s mother (20:30 LXX) Ahinoam (14:50), and attempted his life. The estrangement was momentary; Saul and Jonathan were undivided in life and in death (2 S 1:23 to be so read).

But it is as the befriend of David that J. will always be remembered. He is the type of the very perfect friend, as well as of the chivalrous knight, for all time. His devotion to his master was absolute, and it has been dictated by a superstitious belief in David's destiny as the future ruler of his people (23:17), that belief would have been shared by Saul, which was not the case (20:31). In disinterestedness and self-sacrifice his own claims and give up his own titles the conduct of J. is unsurpassed, and presents a pleasing contrast to some of the characters with whom we meet in the Bible. In this respect he resembles All, the cousin of David and of Jonathan. J.'s brave and the bravest of the brave, save when fighting in his own cause, and who had no ambition to fill the highest posts. So J. preferred to serve rather than to command (1 S 23:17). J. and David stand for the highest ideal of Heb friendship, as do Damon and Pythias in Gr lit.

We may be sure that J. won the affection of the people. His kites were ready to follow him anywhere (14:7). J. had devoted himself to David's service.

6. Affection. Although he unfortunately coincided with his own self-interest, J. appears to have inspired as great an affection as he himself felt (1 S 20:1; 2 S 1:26). He squared with his father was largely due to the solicitude of the latter for his son's interests (1 S 18:29; 20:31).

Jonathan's sons were, in common with his brother's, killed in the wars. One alone—Meribaal (Mephibosheth)—survived. J.'s descendants through him lasted several generations. A table of them is given in 1 Ch 8:33 ff; 9:40 ff (cf 2 S 9:12). They were famous soldiers and were, like their ancestors, distinguished in the use of the bow (1 Ch 8:40).

 THOMAS HUNTER WEIS.

JONATHAS, jon-a-thas (Swete reads Ṭabūv, Ṭāḇūn, in B; Naabā, Nāthān, in N): The Lat form of the common name "Jonathan" (Tob 8:13). See JATHAN. It is sometimes represented as Nathan.

JOPPA, jop' a (יוֹפָּא; yōphā, נוֹפָה; yōphā; Ḫoppō, Ḫoppē): In Josh 19:46 AV called "Japho," a city in the territory allotted to Dan; but there is nothing to show that in pre-exilic times it ever passed into Israel- itish hands. "The gate of Joppa" is mentioned in the Am Tab (214, 32; cf 178, 20),

Jonas
as guarded by an Egyptian officer for Amenhotep IV. It was conquered by Thothmes III, and old Egyptian records speak of the excellence of its gardens and fruit trees. Sennacherib claims to have taken J. after a siege (K B, 2, 93). To J., the Chronicler tells us, the cedars of Lebanon were brought in floats for transportation to Jerus by the workmen of the king of Tyre (2 Ch 2 16). The

2. Biblical city does not appear in the history as References Philistine, so we may, perhaps, infer that it was held by the Phcenicians, the great seamen of those days. It was doubtless a Phoen ship that Jonah found here, bound for Hyrcanus (A n, XIV, x, 6). It was among the cities given by Antony to Cleopatra (X V, iv, 1). Caesar added it to the kingdom of Herod (vii, 3; B J, I, xx, 3), and at his death it passed to Archelaus (A n, XVII, xi, 4, B J, II, vi, 3). At his deposition it was attached to the Rom province. The inhabitants were now zealous Jews, and in the Rom wars it suffered heavily. After a massacre by Cestius Gallus, in which 8,400 of the people perished, it was left desolate. Thus it became a resort of the enemies of Rome, who turned pirate, and preyed upon the shipping in the neighboring waters. The place was promptly captured and destroyed by Vespasian. The people took to their boats, but a terrific storm burst upon them, dashing their frail craft to pieces on the rocks, so that vast numbers perished (B J, III, ix, 2-4). At a later time it was the seat of a bishopric. During the Crusades it had a checked history, being taken, now by the Christians, now by the Moslems. It was captured by the French under Kleber in 1799. It was fortified by the English, and afterward extended by the Turks (Baedeker, Pal, 130).

The modern Jafa is built on a rocky mound 116 ft. high, at the edge of the sea. A reef of rocks runs parallel to the shore a short distance out. It may be rounded in calm weather by lighter vessels, and affords a certain amount of protection. There is a gap in the reef through which the boats pass that meet the steamer coming in. In time of storm the whole lagoon is closed. On one of these rocks Persius is said to have rescued the chained Andromeda from the dragon. J af a is a prosperous town, profiting much by the annual streams of pilgrims who pass through it on their way to visit the holy places in Pal. A good trade is done with Egypt, Syria and Constantinople. Soap, sesame, wheat and oranges are the chief exports. The cedars gardens and orange groves of Jaffa form one of the chief sights of interest. The Christians and the Moslems have rival traditions as to the site of the house of Simon the Tanner. The remains of the house of Tabitha are also pointed out. From Jaffa to Jerus the first railway in Pal was built.

W. Ewing

JORAH, jô'ra (יוֹרָה), yôrah, meaning uncertain, perhaps "harvest-born"? A family which returned with Zerubbabel (E x 2 18)="Hôrâpâh" of Neh 7 24="Arşûrûth" (AV "Arsephurth") of 1 Esd 5 16.

JORAI, jô'rai (יוֹרָא), yôraı̂, "whom Jeh teaches"? A Gadite chief, but possibly the name of a clan (1 Ch 5 13).

Joram, jô'ram (יוֹרָם), yôrâm, "Jeh is exalted"; cf Jehoram:
(1) Son of Tôi (or Tôn, according to LXX, B, and 1 Ch 18 9.10), sent by his father to greet David (2 S 8 10)="Hadarom" (1 Ch 18 9.10) a form preferred by commentators in 2 S also.
(2) Same as Jehoram, king of Judah (2 K 8 21-24; 11 2; 1 Ch 3 11; Mt 1 8 ["Tôpû, Tôrûm"]).
(3) Same as Jehoram, king of Northern Israel (2 K 8 29; cf 2 K 9 15 R Vm).
(4) (In form yôrâm; yôrâm; A: Levite (1 Ch 26 25).
(5) ["Tôpû, Tôrûm, 1 Esd 1 9] = "Josazar" (2 Ch 35 9); see Jozabad (4).

Jordan, jô'rdan (יוֹרְדָן), yôrdan, "flowing downward"; yôr'dâni, yôrdânî: The Jordan river proper begins at the junction of four

1. Source streams (the Barethôth, the Hâshôn, the Leddan, and the Bânias), in the upper part of the plain of Lake Hûlêh. The Bar eithôth receives its supply of water from the hills on the W., which separate the valley from the nearer Lîtân, and is the least important of the four. The Hâshôn is the longest of the four (40 miles), issuing from a great fountain at the western foot of Mt. Hermon near Hâshìyâ, 1,700 ft. above the sea,
and descends 1,500 ft. in its course to the plain. The Leordan is the largest of the four streams, issuing in several fountains at the foot of the mound Tell el-kedîy (Dan, or Laish) at an elevation of 505 ft. above the sea. The Bànias issues from a celebrated fountain near the town of Bànias, which is identified as the Caesarea Philippi associated with the transfiguration. The ancient name was Panias, originating from a grotto consecrated to the god Pan. At this place Herod erected a temple of white marble dedicated to Augustus Caesar. This is probably the Baal-gad of Josh 11 17 and 12 7. Its altitude is 1,200 ft. above tide, and the stream falls about 600 ft. in the 6 miles of its course to the head of the Jordan.

The valley of Lake Hálech, through which the Jordan wends its way, is about 20 miles long and 5 miles wide, bordered on either side by hills and mountains attaining elevations of 3,000 ft. After flowing 4 or 5 miles through a fertile plain, the Jordan enters a morass of marshy land which nearly fills the valley, with the exception of 1 or 2 miles between it and the base of the mountains upon the western side. This morass is almost impenetrable by reason of bushes and papyrus reeds, which in places also render navigation of the channel difficult even with a canoe. Lake Hálech, into which the river here enters, is about 3 miles long and is slowly contracting its size by reason of the accumulation of the decaying vegetation of the surrounding morass, and of the sediment brought in by the river and three tributary mountain torrents. Its continued existence is evidence of a limited period through which present conditions have been maintained. It will not be many thousand years before it will be entirely filled and the morass be changed into a fertile plain. When the spies visited the region, the lake must have been much larger than it is now.

At the southern end of Lake Hálech, the valley narrows up to a width of a few hundred yards, and the river begins its descent into levels below the Mediterranean. The river is here only about 60 ft. broad, and in less than 9 miles descends 689 ft. through a narrow rocky gorge, where it meets the delta which has deposited at the head of the Sea of Galilee, and slowly winds its way to meet its waters. Throughout this delta and river the Jordan is easily fordable during a great part of the year.

The Sea of Galilee occupies an expansion of the Jordan valley 12 miles long and from 3 to 6 miles wide. The hills, reaching in general, 1,200 or 1,500 ft. above the lake, come down close to its margin on every side. On the E. and S. they are mainly of volcanic origin, and to some extent of the same character on the N.W. side above Tiberias. In the time of Christ the mouth of the river may have been a half-mile or more farther up the delta than now. As all the sediment of the upper Jordan settles in the vicinity of the delta near Capernaum, a stream of pelagic water issues from the southern end of the lake, at the mouth of which the Jordan flows into the Dead Sea, however, it becomes overloaded with sediment. From Kerak the opening of the valley is grand in the extreme. A great plain on the E. stretches to the hills of Decapolis, and to the S., as far as the Hermon, which can reach, through the Ghôr which descends to the Dead Sea, bordered by mountain walls on either side. Four or five miles below, it is joined on the E. by the Yarmûk, the ancient Hierom, the largest of all its tributaries. The debris brought down by the stream has formed a fertile delta terrace 3 or 4 miles in diameter, which now, as in ancient times, is an attractive place for herdsmen and agriculturists. The valley of the Yarmûk and Jonathon furnished a natural grade for the Acre and Damascus Railroad, as it did for the caravan routes of early times. The town of Gadara lies upon an elevation just S. of the Yarmûk and 4 or 5 miles E. of the Jordan.

Ten miles below the lake, the river is joined on the W. by Wâdy el-Beirût, which descends from the vicinity of Nazareth, between Mt. Tabor and Endor, and furnishes a natural entrance from the Jordan to Central Galilee. An aqueduct here still furnishes the water of the town of el-Kaf. Wâdy el-Arab, with a small perennial stream, comes in here also from the E.

Twenty miles below Lake Galilee the river is joined by the important Wâdy el-Jâlût, which descends through the valley of Jezreel.

5. El-Ghôr between Mt. Gilboa and the range of the Little Hermon (the hill Morch of Jgs 7 1). This valley leads up from the Jordan to the valley of Esdraelon and thence to Nazareth, and furnished the usual route for Jews going from Jerusalem to Nazareth when they wished to avoid the Samaritans. This route naturally takes one past Betàsân (Bethshean), where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were exposed by the Philis, and past Shunem and Nain. There is a marked expansion of the Ghôr opposite Betàn, constituting an important agricultural district. The town of Pella, to which the Christians fled at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, lies upon the E. side of the Ghôr; while Jabesh-gilead, where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were cremated, is a little farther up the slope of Gilead. Twenty miles farther down, the Ghôr, on the E., is joined by Wâdy Zerka (the brook Jabok), the second largest tributary, separating Ammon from Gilead, its upper tributaries flowing past Ammon, Mizpeh, and Ramoth-gilead. It was down this valley that Jacob descended to Succoth.

A few miles below, the Wâdy Ferah, whose head is at Sycamore between Mt. Ebal and Gerizim, descends from the W., furnishing the natural route for Jacob's entrance to the promised land.

At Damèsheh (probably the Adam of Josh 3 16), the Ghôr is narrowed up by the projection, from the W., of the mountain ridge terminating in Kurn Sūtäbêh, which rises abruptly to a height of 2,000 ft. above the river. The section of the Ghôr between Damèsheh and the Dead Sea is of a pretty uniform width of 10 to 12 miles and is of a much more uniform level than the upper portions, but its fertility is interfered with by the lack of water and the difficulty of irrigation. From the vicinity of Jericho, an old Roman road follows up the Wâdy Nâcàstâmeh, which furnished Joshua a natural line of approach to Ai, while through the Wâdy el-Kelt is opened the natural road to Jersu. Both Ai and the Mount of Olives are visible from this point of the Ghôr.
In a direct line it is only 70 miles from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, and this is the total length of the lower plain (the Zor); but so numerous are the windings of the river across the flood plain from one bluff to the other that the length of the river is fully 200 miles. Col. Lynch reported the occurrence of 27 rapids, which wholly interrupted navigation, and many others which rendered it difficult. The major part of the descent below Lake Galilee takes place before reaching Damieh, 1,140 ft. below the Mediterranean. While the bluffs of the Ghôr, upon either side of the Zor, are nearly continuous and uniform below Damieh, above this point they are much dissected by the erosion of tributary streams. Still, nearly everywhere, an extended view brings to light the original uniform level of the sedimentary deposits formed when the valley was filled with water to a height of 650 ft. (see Arabic; Dead Sea). The river itself averages about 100 ft. in width when confined strictly within its channel, but in the early spring months the flood plain of the Zor is completely overflowed, bringing into its thickets a great amount of driftwood which increases the difficulty of penetrating it, and temporarily drives out ferocious animals to infest the neighboring country.

According to Conder, there are no less than 60 fording-places between Lake Galilee and the Dead Sea. For the most part it will be seen that these occur at rapids, or over bars deposited by the streams which descend from one side or the other, as, for example, below the mouths of the Yarmuk, Jabbok, Jâlûd and Kelt. These fords are, however, impassable during the high water of the winter and spring months. Until the occupation by the Romans, no bridges were built; but they and their successors erected them at various places, notably below the mouth of the Yarmuk, and the Jabbok, and nearly opposite Jericho.

Notwithstanding the great number of fords where it is possible to cross at low water, those which were so related to the lines of travel as to be of much avail were few. Beginning near the mouth of the J. and proceeding northward, there was a ford at el-Henu, leading directly from Jericho to the highlands N.E. of the Dead Sea. Two or three miles farther to the N. is the ford of the pilgrims, best known of all, at the mouth of Wady Kelt. A few miles farther up the river on the road leading from Jericho to es-Salt, near the mouth of the Wady Nimrin, there is now a bridge where the dependence was formerly upon the ford. Just below the mouth of the Wady Zerka (Jabbok) is the ford of Damieh, where the road from Shechem comes down to the river. A bridge was at one time built over the river at this point; but owing to a change in the course of the stream this is now over a dry water-course. The next important crossing-place is at the opening of the valley of Jezreel coming in from the W., probably the Bethabara of the NT should be located. Upon this ford a number of caravan routes from E. to W. converge. The next important crossing-place is at el-Mujamia, 2 or 3 miles below the mouth of the Yarmuk. Here, also, there was a Rom bridge. There are also some traces of an ancient bridge remaining just below the exit of the river from Lake Galilee, where there was a ford of special importance to the people residing on the shores of this lake who could not afford to cross in boats. Between Lake Galilee and Lake Hâlîk, an easy ford leads across the delta of the stream a little above its junction with the lake; while 2 or 3 miles below Lake Hâlekh is found “the bridge of Jacob’s daughters” on the line of one of the principal routes between Damascus and Galilee. Above Lake Hâlekh the various tributaries are easily crossed at several places, though a bridge is required to cross the Bareighit near its mouth, and another on the Hâshâbî on the main road from Caesarea Philippi to Sidon, at el-Ghager.

GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT
JORDAN VALLEY: As more fully detailed elsewhere (see Arabah; Dead Sea; Geography of Palestine), the Jordan valley in its channel depression in the earth’s surface, reaching to the Dead Sea, the surface of which is 1,300 ft., the bottom 2,600 ft. below tide level, the portion of the basin below the level of the sea being about 100 miles in length and from 10 to 15 miles in breadth at base, and from two to three times that distance between the lowest summits of the mountains and plateaus on either side. In the early prehistoric period, corresponding with the Glacial epoch, this depression was filled with water to a height of 1,400 ft. (see references above) which gradually disappeared by evaporation as present climatic conditions came on. At an elevation of approximately 650 ft. above the Dead Sea, very extensive sedimentary deposits were made, which, while appearing only in fragmentary remnants along the shores of the Dead Sea, are continuous over the bottom of the valley (the so-called ‘Ghôr’), farther N. These deposits are from 100 to 200 ft. thick, consisting of material which was brought down into the valley by the tributary mountain streams descending from each side, while the water stood at this higher level. Naturally these deposits slope gradually from the sides of the valley toward the center, the coarser material of the deposits being nearer to the sides, and the amount of sediment being much increased opposite the mouths of the larger streams. The deposits were at first continuous over the entire ‘Ghôr’, or valley, but has since been much dissected by the J. river and its tributaries. The J. itself has eroded a channel through the soft sediment, 100 ft. more or less deep, from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, a distance in a straight line of about 70 miles. At first this channel was narrow, but it has been constantly enlarged by the stream as it has meandered from side to side, undercutting the banks so that they caved into the river and are washed down to fill up the Dead Sea, a process which is esp. familiar to residents upon the banks of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers. This narrow gorge is called the Zôr, and will hereafter be referred to under this name. The Zôr at present averages about 1/2 mile wide, the most of which is occupied by a flood plain extending from the banks of the river to the foot of the sedimentary bluffs on either side. This flood plain is so overgrown with brush and reeds that it is practically impenetrable, except by wild beasts, which, according to Scriptural references, have infested it from earliest times, among which may be mentioned the lion, the tiger, the wild boar. During the spring months, when the snows are melting from Mt. Hermon and cloud-bursts are sending sudden torrents of water down the river courses from the plateau of Gilead and the mountains of Samaria, the J. “overflows all its banks,” i.e. covers this flood plain and drives out the beasts to infest the neighborhood for a short time.

The surface of this old lake bed has also been much dissected by the tributary streams which come in from either side, they having cut channels across the ‘Ghôr’ down to a depth corresponding to that of the Zôr. As a consequence the roads leading up the valley find it necessary to have the mountains on either side to avoid the abrupt descent into the channels of the tributary streams, which are deepest near their mouths. Another natural consequence of these physical peculiarities is that agriculture cannot be carried on except by the incursions of the nomadic tribes, who periodically come down from the desert regions on the E.

Two descriptions (the first from my own journal of the general view obtained of the J. valley from some elevated points) will give a vividness to our conceptions of these remarkable depressions.

"It was the middle of December when, after wading all day across the southern flanks of Mt. Hermon, through snow-knee-deep for our horses, we descended below the clouds and the snow to the brink of the eastern mountain wall overlooking the upper valley of the J. It was a sight ever to be remembered. Between the glittering peak of Mt. Hermon to curriague, and the jagged walls of the borders of Naphthali and Ephraim, where the W. horizon on the W., only a few miles away, while between and at our feet were the green fields of the upper J. valley, through the silver stream of snow, broadening out into the expanded waters of Lake Merom. Over the plain could dimly be seen the black tents of the Arabs, and the husbandmen plowing the fields for an early harvest. No wonder the spies were impressed with the attractiveness and fertility of the region." This of the upper J. valley.

Dr. Merrill gives the following description of the view of the lower J. valley from the summit of Kurn Sûr-tâbî, March 23: "Jobel esh Shams [Mt. Hermon] was covered, with snow, and so was the peak farther to the W. and N. Lake Merom and the volcanic peaks on the plain to the E. were distinctly seen, likewise the Sea of Galilee, the hills about Safad, the hills W. of Tiberias and the slope from their summit, which includes also Gamala and Gadara, all the range of Jobel Ajlûn and other hills of Gilead, Kûlat er Kamal, Kûlat er Osha, the mountains of Moah, and the Dead Sea. But the mere naming of different points that can be seen gives no adequate view of the difference of the prospect which one enjoys from the top of this strange landmark. Hills to the W. obstruct the view in that direction, and to the E. nothing can be seen beyond the highest part of the Moah and Gilead ranges, but it is the north and south sweep which makes the prospect a glorious one. No language can picture the J. valley, the winding stream, the jungles on its banks, the strange ‘Ghôr’, with its white, ragged sides, the vast plain of the valley, through and in the middle of which is the lower ‘Ghôr’. But a glimpse of the dense green oases formed here and there by some mountain, picturesque, and the still, the calm, and motionless as molten lead, lying far to the S., ending the great valley and touching the mountains on either side! This is an outline merely, but it can be said to my aid words which will describe it more accurately. The J. ‘Ghôr’ or ‘Ghûr’, in front of about 8 miles wide, and looks like a vast plain. The lower ‘Ghôr’ (Zôr) is the ragged channel cut down among the ranges of Moah, this distance is between the upper and lower ‘Ghôr’ by no means so strikingly defined above the mount of the Zôr as it is below that point, and all the way down to the Dead Sea."

Considered in detail the valley may be divided, as Conder suggests, into 8 sections. ‘First the portion between Bantás and the Hûleh, where it is some S. miles broad, with steep cliffs some 2,000 ft. high on either side and a broad marsh between. Secondly, from the Hûleh to the Sea of Galilee,
THE JORDAN VALLEY

The Jordan Valley is a geographical region in the Middle East, located in the northern part of the country of Israel. It is a narrow, elongated basin, approximately 60 km (37 miles) wide and 130 km (80 miles) long, that runs from north to south. The valley is bounded by mountains on all sides and is drained by the Jordan River, which flows through it for about 85 km (53 miles) before emptying into the Dead Sea.

The landscape of the Jordan Valley is characterized by flat areas interspersed with hills and mountains, with a variable climate ranging from Mediterranean to semi-arid. The valley is known for its rich biodiversity, with a variety of plants and animals. The region is also significant for its archaeological sites, including the Tell es-Sultan (Jericho) and the Tel Aviv (Tell es-Safa), which have yielded important evidence of early human settlement.

The Jordan Valley has been inhabited for thousands of years, and the valley played a crucial role in the development of the early civilizations of the Middle East. It was the route of the ancient trade routes and was an important water source for agriculture. Today, the valley is a region of economic importance, with a focus on agriculture and tourism.

The valley is also a region of political significance, with Israel and Jordan sharing the eastern bank of the Jordan River, and Jordan controlling the southern part of the valley. The valley is of great strategic importance due to its water resources and its role in regional politics.

The Jordan Valley is a region of great natural beauty, with its lush flora and fauna, and it remains a popular destination for both tourists and nature enthusiasts.

The Jordan Valley is a region of great historical and cultural significance, and it continues to be an area of interest for scholars and researchers.
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

Jordan Valley

1. THE Joseph Story: Literary Question.—This literary problem will be solved, if satisfactory answers may be found to two questions: Is it an independent original or an adaptation? Suitable material for such an adaptation as would produce a J. story has been sought at either end of the line of history: J.; the pre-exilic and J. of the Exilic. The only independent contestant for the claim of being an early original of which the J. story might be an adaptation is the nasty "Tale of Two Brothers" (Ry, series I, vol. II, 137–46). This story, however, retains its essential elements much resembles the J. story. But such events as it records are common: why not such stories?

What evidence does this "Tale of Two Brothers" afford that the J. story is not an independent original? Are we to suppose that because many French romances involve the demi-monde, there was therefore no Madame de Pompadour? Are court scandals so unheard of that ancient Egypt cannot afford two? And why impugn the genuineness of the J. story because the "Tale of Two Brothers" resembles it? Is anyone so ethereal in his passions as not to know by instinct that the essential elements of such scandal are always the same? The difference in the narrative is chiefly in the telling. At this latter point the J. story and the "Tale of Two Brothers" bear no resemblance whatever.

If the chaste beauty of the Bib. story be observed, and then one turn to the "Tale of Two Brothers" with sufficient knowledge of the Egypt tongue to perceive the coarseness and the stench of it, there can be no question that the J. story is independent of any such literary source. To those who believe both stories, the claim of the "Tale of Two Brothers" to be the original of the J. story cannot stand for a moment. If we turn from J. the progenitor to J. the tribe, still less will the claim that the story is an adaptation bear careful examination. The perfect naturalness of the story, the utter absence from its multitudinous details of any hint of figurative language, such as personification always furnishes, and the absolutely accurate reflection in the story of the Egypt of J.'s day, as revealed by the many discoveries of which people of 700–800 years later could not know, mark this theory of the reflection of tribal history and characteristics as pure speculation. And besides, where in all the history of literature has it been proven that a tribe has been thus successfully thrown back upon the screen of antiquity in the "individual form"? Similar mistakes concerning Menes and Minos and the heroes of Troy are a warning to us. Speculation is legitimate, so long as it does not cut loose from known facts, but gives no one the right to suppose the existence in unknown history of something never certainly found in known history. So much for the first question.

Is it a monograph or a compilation? The author of a monograph may make large use of literary materials, and the editor of a compilation may introduce much editorial comment. Thus, superficially, these different kinds of composition may match each other, yet they are, in essential character, very different the one from the other. A compilation is an artificial body, an automatism; a monograph is a natural body with a living soul in it. This story is the oriental part of the narrative literature in the world. If it stood alone or belonged to some later portion of Scripture, it may well be doubted that it would ever have been touched by the scalpel of the literary dissector. But it belongs to the Pent. There are manifest evidences all over the Pent of the use by the author of material, either documentary or of that paradoxical unwritten lit., which the ancients handed down almost without

2. A Monograph or a Compilation? Thus, superficially, these different kinds of Composition may match each other, yet they are, in essential character, very different the one from the other. A compilation is an artificial body, an automatism; a monograph is a natural body with a living soul in it. This story is the oriental part of the narrative literature in the world. If it stood alone or belonged to some later portion of Scripture, it may well be doubted that it would ever have been touched by the scalpel of the literary dissector. But it belongs to the Pent. There are manifest evidences all over the Pent of the use by the author of material, either documentary or of that paradoxical unwritten lit., which the ancients handed down almost without
the change of a word for centuries. (1) An analytical theory has been applied to the Pent as a whole, to resolve it into a mere compilation. Once the principles of this theory are acknowledged, and allowed sway there, the J. story cannot be left untouched, but becomes a necessary sacrifice to the system. The weight of the literary evidence of the living, moving J. story which the analysis leaves behind (of EB, art. "Joseph") proclaims that analysis to have been murder. There was life in the story which has been ruthlessly taken, and that life should not be marked the narrative as a whole. (2) Where else is to be found such a compilation? Here is one of the most brilliant pieces of literature in the world, a narrative full of gems: (a) the account of the presentation of the brothers in the presence of J. when he was obliged to go out to woot (Gen 44 1-13), (b) Judah's speech (Gen 44 18-34), (c) the touching close of the revelation of J. to his brothers at last (Gen 45 1-15). The soul of this whole life story hangs on these. Where in all literature, ancient or modern, is to be found a mere compilation that is a great piece of literature? So far removed is this story from the characteristics of a compilation, that we may concede this whole world of literature to produce another monograph in narrative literature that surpasses it. (3) Then the dates of Egypt and events in this narrative strongly favor its origin so early as to be out of the reach of the compilers. That attempts at identification in Egypt of names written in Heb, presenting as they do the peculiar difficulties of two alphabets of imperfectly known phonetic values and uncertain equivalency of one in terms of the other, should give rise to differences of opinion as to be expected. The Egypt equivalents of Zaphenath-paneh and Asenath have been diligently sought, and several identifications have been suggested (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 1857; Lieblein, *Egypt*, V, 126-35). That which is most exact phonetically and yields the most suitable and natural meaning for Zaphenath-paneh is by Lieblein (*PSBA*, 1898, 204-8). It is formed like four of the names of Hyksos kings before J. and means "the one who furnishes the nourishment of life," i.e. the steward of the realm. The name Asenath is found from the Xith Dynasty on to the XVIIIth. Potiphar is mentioned as an Egyptian. Why not of course an Egyptian? The narrative also points distinctly to conditions obtaining under the Hyksos kings. When the people were like to perish for want of food they promised J. in return for help that they would be "servants of Pharaoh" (Gen 47 18-25). This suggests a previous antagonism to the government, such as the Hyksos kings had long to contend with in Egypt. But the revolution which drove out the Hyksos labored so effectually to eradicate every trace of the hated foreigners that it is with the utmost difficulty that modern Egyptological research has wrestled from the past some small items of information concerning them. Is it credible that the editor of scraps, which were themselves not written down until some 700-800 years later, should have been able to produce such a life-story fitting into the peculiar conditions of the times of the Hyksos? Considered as an independent literary problem on its own merits, aside from any entangling necessities of the analytical theory of the Pent, the J. story must certainly stand as a monograph from some time within distinct memory of the events it records. If the J. story be an independent original and a monograph, then there is in reality to be considered the story of J.

II. The Story of Joseph.—It is unnecessary to recount here all the events of the life of J., a story so incomparably told in the Bib. narrative. It will be sufficient to touch only the salient points where controversy has raged, or at which archaeology has furnished special illumination. The story of J. begins the tenth and last natural division of Gen, and these are the weighty and ghastly fragments of the living, moving J. story which the analysis leaves behind (of EB, art. "Joseph") proclaims that analysis to have been murder. There was life in the story which has been ruthlessly taken, and that life should not be marked the narrative as a whole. (2) Where else is to be found such a compilation? Here is one of the most brilliant pieces of literature in the world, a narrative full of gems: (a) the account of the presentation of the brothers in the presence of J. when he was obliged to go out to woot (Gen 44 1-13), (b) Judah's speech (Gen 44 18-34), (c) the touching close of the revelation of J. to his brothers at last (Gen 45 1-15). The soul of this whole life story hangs on these. Where in all literature, ancient or modern, is to be found a mere compilation that is a great piece of literature? So far removed is this story from the characteristics of a compilation, that we may concede this whole world of literature to produce another monograph in narrative literature that surpasses it. (3) Then the dates of Egypt and events in this narrative strongly favor its origin so early as to be out of the reach of the compilers. That attempts at identification in Egypt of names written in Heb, presenting as they do the peculiar difficulties of two alphabets of imperfectly known phonetic values and uncertain equivalency of one in terms of the other, should give rise to differences of opinion as to be expected. The Egypt equivalents of Zaphenath-paneh and Asenath have been diligently sought, and several identifications have been suggested (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 1857; Lieblein, *Egypt*, V, 126-35). That which is most exact phonetically and yields the most suitable and natural meaning for Zaphenath-paneh is by Lieblein (*PSBA*, 1898, 204-8). It is formed like four of the names of Hyksos kings before J. and means "the one who furnishes the nourishment of life," i.e. the steward of the realm. The name Asenath is found from the Xith Dynasty on to the XVIIIth. Potiphar is mentioned as an Egyptian. Why not of course an Egyptian? The narrative also points distinctly to conditions obtaining under the Hyksos kings. When the people were like to perish for want of food they promised J. in return for help that they would be "servants of Pharaoh" (Gen 47 18-25). This suggests a previous antagonism to the government, such as the Hyksos kings had long to contend with in Egypt. But the revolution which drove out the Hyksos labored so effectually to eradicate every trace of the hated foreigners that it is with the utmost difficulty that modern Egyptological research has wrestled from the past some small items of information concerning them. Is it credible that the editor of scraps, which were themselves not written down until some 700-800 years later, should have been able to produce such a life-story fitting into the peculiar conditions of the times of the Hyksos? Considered as an independent literary problem on its own merits, aside from any entangling necessities of the analytical theory of the Pent, the J. story must certainly stand as a monograph from some time within distinct memory of the events it records. If the J. story be an independent original and a monograph, then there is in reality to be considered the story of J.

1. A Bedouin Prince in Canaan. The patriarchal era was a time when all sheiks or princes of these semi-nomadic rovers who by the peculiar social and civil customs of that land were tolerated then as they are to this day under the Turkish government. All the farms and canaan settled land tenure. Jacob favored Rachel and her children. He put them hidermost at the dangerous meeting with Esau, and now he puts J. a coat of many colors (Gen 37 2). The appearance of such a coat a little earlier in the decoration of the tombs of Beni hassan among Palestinian ambassadors to Egypt probably indicates that this garment was in some sense ceremonial, a token of rank. In any case J., the son of Jacob, was a Bedouin prince, and by this coat indicate his intention to give him the precedence and the succession as chieftain of the tribe? It is difficult otherwise to account for the insane jealousy of the older brethren (Gen 37 4). According to the critical partisanship of the peoples and dreams may be explained away as mere reflections or adaptations of the later history of J. (cf Penta- tarch). In a real biography the striking providential significance of the dreams appears at once. They cannot be real without in some sense being prophetic. On the other hand they cannot be other than real without vitiating the whole story as a truthful narrative, for they led immediately to the great tragedy; a Bedouin prince of Canaan becomes a Bedouin slave in Egypt. The plot to put J. out of the way, the substitution of slavery for death, and the ghastly device for deceiving Jacob (Gen 37 18-36) are

2. A Bedouin Slave of crime when once the brothers had in Egypt Jacob was upon it. The counterplot of Reuben to deliver J. referred equally his own goodness and the dangerous character of the other brothers to whom he did not dare make a direct protest. Critical discussion of "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" and "Midianites" presents some interesting things and many clever speculations which may well be considered on their own merits by those interested in ethnology and
etymologies. Many opinions advanced may prove to be correct. But let it be noted that they are for the most part pure speculation. Almost nothing is known of the interrelation of the Trans-Jordanic tribes in that age or of the few hints in the Bible. And who can say what manner of persons mich was found in a caravan which had wandered about no one knows where, or how long, to be assassinated before it turned into northern caravan route? Until archaeology supplies more facts it is folly to attach much importance to such speculations (Kyle, The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Bib. Criticism, 221).

In the slave market in Egypt, J. was bought by Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, "an Egyptian." The significant mention of this fact fits exactly into a problem and the recovered hints of the historical times, which make the court then to be not Egypt at all, but composed of foreigners, the dynasty of Hyksos kings among whom an "Egyptian" was so unexpected as to have his nationality mentioned.

J.'s native syndrome of character, the pious training he had received in his father's house, and the favor of God with him gave him such prosperity that his master intrusted all the affairs of his household to him, and when the greatest of temptations assails him he comes off victorious (ch 39). There is no need for the suspicion that Potiphar did not fully believe the accusation of his wife against J. The fact that J. was not immediately put to death is very significant. Potiphar could hardly do less than shut him up for the sake of appearances, and perhaps to take temptation away from his wife without seeming to suspect her. It is noticeable also that J.'s character soon triumphed in prison. Then the same Providence that superintended his dreams is leading as so to bring him before the king (chs 40, 41).

The events of the immediately preceding history prepared J.'s day: the Hyksos kings on the throne, those Bedouin princes, "shepherd kings" (Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities), the enmity of the Egyptians against this foreign dynasty so that they accounted every shepherd an "abomination" (46 34), the friendly relation thus created between Palestinian tribes and Egypt, the princely character of J., for among princes a prince is a prince however small his principality, and last of all the manifest favor of God toward J., and the evident understanding by the Pharaohs of Egypt, that it was perhaps to be deferred (40 1-24, 1-24). The events of the immediately preceding history prepared J.'s day: the Hyksos kings on the throne, those Bedouin princes, "shepherd kings" (Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities), the enmity of the Egyptians against this foreign dynasty so that they accounted every shepherd an "abomination" (46 34), the friendly relation thus created between Palestinian tribes and Egypt, the princely character of J., for among princes a prince is a prince however small his principality, and last of all the manifest favor of God toward J., and the evident understanding by the Pharaohs of Egypt, that it was perhaps to be deferred (40 1-24, 1-24). All these constitute one of the most majestic, Godlike movements of Providence revealed to us in the word of God, or evident anywhere in history. The same Providence that presided over the boy prince in his father's house came again to the slave prince in the Egyptian prison. The interpretation of the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker of Pharaoh (40—41 1-24) brought him at last through much delay and selfish forgetfulness to the notice of the king, and another dream in which the same cunning hand of Providence is plainly seen (ch 41) is the means of bringing J. to stand in the royal presence. The staff that dreams are made of interests scarely less than the secret Providence was super- imposed over them. As the harvest fields of the semi-nomadic Bedouin in Pal, and the household routine of Egypt in the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker, so now the industrial interests and the religious forms of the chief of the Nile devoted to the service of the "king's house." The "seven kine" of the goddess Hathor supplies the number of the cows, and the doubling of the symbolism in the cattle and the grain points to the two great sources of Egypt's welfare. The Providence that had shaped and guided the whole course of J. from the Palestinian home was consummated when, with the words, "Inasmuch as thou art a man in whom is the spirit of God," Pharaoh lifted up the Bedouin slave to be again the Bedouin prince and made him the prime minister.

The history of 'kings' favorites' is too well known for the elevation of J. to be in itself incredible. Such things are esp. likely to take place among the unlimited monarchies of the Orient. The late empress of China had been a Chinese slave girl. The investiture of J. was truly Egyptian, the "collar," the signet "ring," the "chariot" and the outrunners who cried before him "Abrech." The exact meaning of this word has never been certainly ascertained, but its general import may be seen illustrated to this day wherever in the East royalty rides out. The policy adopted by the prime minister was far-reaching, wise, even adroit (Gen 41 25—36). It is impossible to say whether or not it was wholly just, for we cannot know whether the corn of the years of plenty which the government laid up was bought or taken as a tax levy. The policy involved some despotic power, but J. proved a magnanimous despot. The deep and subtle statesmanship in J.'s plan does not fully appear until the outcome. It was probably the policy of J., the prime minister, that the Hyksos finally gained the power over the people and the mastery of the land.

Great famines have not been common in Egypt, but are not unknown. The only one which corresponds with to the Bible account is that one recorded in the inscription of Bafa at el Kab, 1st by Brugsch. Some scarcely justifiable attempts have been made to discredit Brugsch in his account of that inscription. The monument still remains and is easily visited, but the inscription is so mutilated that it presents many difficulties. The severity of the famine, the length of its duration, the preparation by the government, the distribution to the people, the success of the efforts for relief and even the time of the famine, as far as it corresponds with the inscription, correspond well to the Bible account (Brugsch, Egypt under the Pharaohs, ch vi). The way in which such famines in Egypt come about has been explained by a movement of the sudd, a sedgellite growth in the Nile, so as to clog the upper river (Wright, Scientific Confirmations, 79—79).

J.'s brethren came "with those that came," i.e. with the food caravans. The account does not imply that the prime minister presided in person at the selling of grain, but only that he knew of the coming of his brethren and met them at the market place. The watchfulness of the government against "spies," by these wandering troops, shows that knowledge of the land, may well have furnished him with such information. Once possessed with it, all the rest of the story of the interviews follows naturally (cf traditions of J., Jews Eng). The long testing of the brethren with the attendant delay in the relief of the father Jacob and the family (chs 42—45) has been the subject of much discussion, and most ingenious arguments for the justification of J. All this seems unnecessary. J. was not perfect, the king and another dream in which the same cunning hand of Providence is plainly seen (ch 41) is the means of bringing J. to stand in the royal presence. The staff that dreams are made of interests scarely less than the secret Providence was super-imposed over them. As the harvest fields of the semi-nomadic Bedouin in Pal, and the household routine of Egypt in the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker, so now the industrial interests and the religious forms of the chief of the Nile devoted to the service of the "king's house." The "seven kine" of the goddess Hathor supplies the number of the cows, and the doubling of the symbolism in the cattle and the grain points to the two great sources of Egypt's welfare. The Providence that had shaped and guided the whole course of J. from the Palestinian home was consummated when, with the words,
sent in a most recent identification of J. much evidence to which one would like to give full credence (C. H. Roberts, "Historical Essays" 45.48.61). It was the case of a legal document and, aside from the fact that he claims two exod, two Js, two Aarons, two lawgivers called Moses, and two givings of the law, a case of critical doublets more astounding than any heretofore claimed in the Pent. The evidence itself which he adduces is very far from conclusive. It is doubtful if the texts will bear the translation he gives them, esp. the proper names. The claims of Rameses II, that he built Pithom, compared with the stelae of 400 years, which he says he constructed in 400th year of King Nebi, seems to put J. about the time of the Hyksos king. This is the most that can be said now. The burial of Jacob is in exact accord with Egyptian customs. The wealth of the Israelites who retained their possessions and were fed by the crown, in contrast with the poverty of the Egyptians, is a clear yardstick that prepares the way for the wonderful growth and influence of Israel, and the fear which the Egyptians at last had of them. "And J. died, being 110 years old," is a clear old age in the Egyptian mind. The reputed burial place of J. at Shechem still awaits examination.

Joseph stands out among the patriarchs in some respects with preeminence. His nobility of character, his purity of heart and life, his sagacity and wisdom, and the way he makes him, more than any other of the Hebrew patriarchs, illustrate the kind of man which Christ was to give to the world in perfection. J. is not in the list of persons distinctively referred to in Scripture by the name Joseph but Mr. Ramsay in the only perfectly safe criterion—but none more fully illustrates the life and work of the Saviour. He wrought salvation for those who betrayed and rejected him, he went down into humiliation as the way to his exaltation, he forgave those who, at least in spirit, put him to death, and to him as to the Saviour, all must come for relief, or perish.


M. G. KYLE

JOSEPH BARNABAS. See Barnabas.

JOSEPH BARSABBAS, bār-sā'bās (Bārōsβās, Barōsβas, Barōsβab; AV Barabas, bār'as-bas; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see general articles on Joseph Barsabba; Joseph Barsabba was surname of Justus (Acts 23). Barabbas was probably a patronymic, i.e. son of Saba or Seba. Other interpretations given are "son of an oath," "son of an old man," "son of conversion," "son of quiet." It is likely that the "Judas called Barabbas" of Acts 16 22 was his brother. Ewald considers that both names refer to the same person, but this is improbable.

J. was one of those who accompanied the apostles "all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us" (Acts 1 21). At the meeting of the brethren under the presidency of Peter in Jerusalem shortly after the crucifixion, he was, therefore, proposed along with Matthias as a deacon to replace the place in the apostleship left vacant by the treachery and death of Judas Iscariot; but was unsuccessful (Acts 1 15-26).

According to Eusebius (HE, I, 12), J. was one of the 70 (Lk 10 1), and Papias records the oral tradition that he drank a cup of poison without harm (cf. Mk 16 18). The Acts of St. Paul, a work belonging to the 2d cent. and first mentioned by Origen, relates that Barsabba, Justus the Flatfoot and others were imprisoned by Nero for protesting their faith in Christ, but that upon a vision of the newly martyred Paul appearing to the emperor, he ordered their immediate release. C. M. KERR

JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY (for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see Joseph). Joseph, the carpenter (Mt 12 55), was a "just man" (Mt 1 Refer—1 19 AV), who belonged to Nazareth in NT (Lk 2 4). He was of Davidic descent (Mt 1 20; Lk 2 4), the son of Heli (Lk 2 33) and Jacob (Mt 1 16), the husband of Mary (Mt 1 26) and the supposed father of Jesus (Mt 13 55; Lk 3 23; 4 22; Jn 1 45; 6 42).

(1) Before the Nativity.—The Gospels of Mt and Mk alone give any detailed reference to J. and the birth of Jesus, and their accounts vary in part. Lk begins with the Annunciation to Mary at Nazareth (Lk 1 26-38). Overwhelmed with the tidings, Mary departed "with haste" "into the hill country, into a city of Judah," to seek communion with Elisabeth, with whom she had been coupled in the Annunciation by the angel Gabriel (Lk 1 39-55). After abiding with her about three months she returned "unto her own house" (Lk 1 56 AV). The events recorded in Mt 1 18-24 probably took place in the interval between this return and the birth of Jesus. During Mary's visit to Elisabeth, J. had likely remained in Nazareth. The abrupt and probably unexplained departure of his espoused wife for Judah (cf. the phrase "with haste"), and her condition on her return, had caused him great mental distress (Mt 1 20, 21). But the emotion was tempered with mercy, he was minded to put her away "privily," but the visitation of the angel in his sleep relieved him from his dilemma, and he was reconciled to his wife (Mt 1 24). The narrative is then continued by St. Luke. While J. and Mary still abode in Nazareth, "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled" (Lk 2 1). "And all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city" (Lk 2 3). Being of the house and lineage of David, J. went up with Mary, who was "great with child," from Galilee, "out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem" (Lk 2 4,5), and there Jesus was born (Lk 2 7; cf Mt 2 1).

(2) After the Nativity.—(a) St. Luke's account: The two accounts now diverge considerably. According to Lk, the Holy Family remained for a time at Bethlehem and were there visited by the shepherds (Lk 2 8-20). After a short stay, the purification (cf Lk 2 21.22; Lev 12), J. departed with his wife for Jesus "to present" the infant Jesus "to the Lord" and "to offer up sacrifice according to the ancient law" (Lk 2 24). There he was present at the prophesying of Simeon and Anna concerning Jesus, and received the blessing of the former (Lk 2 34). After that they accomplished all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth (Lk 2 39). Every year, at the Passover, they made this journey to Jesus (Lk 2 41). The care and solicitude of J. and Mary for the boy Jesus and their grief at His temporary loss are also recorded (Lk 2 45-48.51). There is evidence that, though Mary "kept all these things in her heart," J. at least had no understanding of the Divine nature of the charge committed to his care (Lk 2 50).

(b) St. Matthew's account: But according to Mt it was from the Wise Men of the East that Jesus received homage; Joseph then went to Bethlehem. There is no further mention of the dedicatory journey to Jesus, or of the return to Nazareth.
Instead, it is stated that on the departure of the Wise Men from Bethlehem, J. was warned in a dream of the impending murder of Herod, and escaped with his wife and the infant Jesus into Egypt (Mt. 2 13-14). Upon the death of Herod, an angel appeared to J., and he returned to the land of Israel (Mt. 2 19-21). His original intention was to settle once more in Judaea, but on learning that Archelaus, the son of Herod, was ruler there, he “ withdrew into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth” (Mt. 2 22-23).

(c) The proper sequence of the two narratives: The reportative manner of Mt. would thus imply that the Holy Family had no connexion with Nazareth previous to their return from Egypt. It has, however, been suggested by Ramsay that Mt. merely reports what was common knowledge, and that Lk. “Whereas he might consider this, supplemented it in his Gospel with details known only to the Holy Family, and in part to the mother alone” (cf. Sir W. Ramsay. Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 78-79). A comparison of the two Gospel narratives makes it clear that the visitation of the Wise Men fell on a later date than that of the shepherds. The latter took place immediately after the Nativity (cf. Lk. 2 11. 15. 16, “Isa born . . . this day,” “Let us now go,” “And they came with haste”). On the other hand, when the Wise Men came to J., Christ was about one year old (Mt. 2 11). The infant Jesus, therefore, on this journey to Jerusalem and the consultation of Herod by the chief priests (Mt. 2 4), and during this interval the events recorded in Lk. 2 5-8 had taken place. That there was sufficient time for this is attested also by the fact that the decree was directed against children up to two years of age (Mt. 2 16). Thus it was after the return of the Holy Family to Nazareth, and on a further visit to Bethlehem, implied by Mt. but not recorded by Lk. that the infant Jesus received the adoration of the Wise Men. Jesus being born in 6 BC, this took place in 5 BC, and as Herod died in 4 BC, J. may have missed only one of the Passovers (cf. Lk. 2 41) by his flight into Egypt. (For a full discussion, cf. Ramsay, op. cit.) As no mention is made of J. in the later parts of the Gospels where the Holy Family is referred to (cf. Mt. 12 46; Lk. 8 19), it is commonly supposed that he died before the commencement of the public ministry of Christ.

If a type was to be sought in the person of J., it is that of a simple, honest, hard-working, God-fearing man, who was possessed of large sympathies and a warm heart. Strict in the observance of Jewish law and custom, he was yet ready when occasion arose to make these subservient to the greater law of the Spirit. Too practical to possess any deep insight into the Divine mysteries or eternal significance of events which came within his knowledge (cf. Lk. 2 50), he was, perhaps, to some extent, the direct answer to what he perceived to be the direct call of God (cf. Mt. 1 24). Originally a “just man” (AV), the naturallemancy within his heart prevailed over mere justice, and by the promptings of the Holy Spirit thatlemancy was transferred into a strong and enduring love (of Mt. 1 24). J. is known to us only as a dim figure in the background of the Gospel narratives, yet his whole-hearted reconciliation to Mary, even in the face of possible slanders by his neighbors, his complete submission, when he left all and fled into Egypt to save the infant Jesus, are indicative that he was not unworthy to fulfill the great trust which was imposed upon him by the Eternal Father.

The Gospel of the Infancy according to St. James, a work composed originally in the 2nd cent., but with later additions, gives a detailed account of the marriage of their journey to Bethlehem, and of the birth of Jesus. A similar gospel, reputed to be by Thomas the philosopher, of later origin and gnostic tendency (cf. Hennecken, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 57-74), is more historical, miraculous happenings in the domestic life of the Holy Family, and the dealings of Joseph with the Magi, the angelic visits, and the entreaties of Mary to Christ to save him. Its aim was to show forth Christ as the Saviour, even at the last hour, and the rightful manner of his birth, when he had received a high place in the Calendar of the Roman Catholic Saints, his feast being celebrated on March 19.

C. M. KERN

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA (Ἀριμαθαῖος, ap6 Arimathaios; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see gen. art. on Joseph): Joseph of Arimathea—a place the locality of which is doubtful, but lying probably on the N.W. of Jermus—was a “rich man” (Mt. 27 57), “a councillor of honorable estate,” or member of the Sanhedrin (Mk. 15 43; Lk. 23 50), “a good and righteous man . . . who was looking for the kingdom of God” (Lk. 23 50; Mt. 16 21), and “himself was just and disposed to do good” (Lk. 23 48). Although he kept his discipleship secret “for fear of the Jews” (Jn. 19 38), he was yet faithful to his allegiance in that he absented himself from the meeting which found Jesus guilty of death (Lk. 23 51), but went to Pilate “after the death of his Lord awakened the courage and revealed the true faith of J. On the evening after the crucifixion he "went boldly to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. There is a fine touch in that he himself took down the body from the cross with the assistance of Nicodemus he wound it in fine linen with spices (cf. Mt. 27 57, J. was a “rich man”) and brought it to the new sepulcher in the garden near the place of His crucifixion. There they “laid him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain” and “rolled a stone against the door of the tomb” (cf. Mt. 27 57-60; Mk. 15 43-46; Lk. 23 50-53; Jn. 19 38-42). In this was held to be the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa. 53 9.

The Gospel of St. Peter, written probably in Syria about the middle of the 2nd cent., gives a slightly different account. According to this J., “the friend of Pilate and the Lord,” was present at the crucifixion and immediately upon its conclusion besought of Pilate that he might have the body. A character of ancient usage, J. was later, after the crucifixion the Jews handed the body over to J. (cf. Hennecken, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 27-39). Legends of a later origin record that J., father of Theyson, was called by Philip from Gaul to Britain along with 11 other disciples to 63 A.D. and built an oratory at Colchester (following Tertullian, in Apol.), that he brought the Holy Grail to England, and that he fled Ireland from snakes.

C. M. KERN

JOSEPH, PRAYER OF: An OT pseudopigraph, no. 3 in the Stichometry of Niceneus (Westcott, Canon of the NT, 571), with the length given as 1,100 lines, and no. 5 in the List of Sixty Books (Westcott, 568). The work is lost, and the only quotations are in Origen (In Jos., I. 25, in Ante- Nicene Fathers, IX, 341; In Gen., iii 9, 12). Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are said to have been created before every work, but Jacob-Israel is the greatest, "the firstborn of every living creature," the "first minister in God's presence," greater than the angels whom he wrestled. The purport may be anti-Christian, the patriarchs exalted in place of Christ; cf., perhaps, En. 71 (but not so in Charles's 1216 text), but Origen's favorable opinion of the book proves that the polemic could not have been very direct.

LITERATURE.—JGJ, 4th ed. 11, 359-60; Dillmann in PFE, 2d ed. XII, 362; cf. Beer In. ed. XVI, 256; Fabricius, Codex pseudep. Vetus Test., I. 61-71. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

JOSEPH'S DREAM: See Astronomy, II, 6; Joseph.
JOSEPHUS, THE CARPENTER, GOSPEL OF. See Apocryphal Gospels.

JOSEPHUS, ᾿Iωσήφος (Ἰωσήφος), B reads Ἰσαΐα, Πρωτευς: In 1 Esd 9:34, corresponding to "Joseph" in Ezr 10:42.

JOSEPHUS, ᾿Ιωσήφος, FLAVIUS, Ἐρωτεύσεις: Was born at Jerus 37-38 AD, and died at Rome early in the 2nd cent., when is not known precisely. His father and mother belonged to families of the priestly aristocracy; consequently he received an excellent education, becoming familiar, not only with Jewish, but with Hellenistic, culture. When 16 years old he resorted to one Banus, an Essene (q.v.), in the desert of Engedi, with whom he remained for 3 years, absorbing occult lore, and practising the ascetic life. It might have been expected from his social position that, on his return to Jerus, he would join the SADDUCEES (q.v.); but, his Essene experience having indoctrinated him with ceremonialism, he preferred to become a PHARISEE (q.v.). He evidently believed, too, that the Pharisees were akin to the Stoics, who were then influential in the Hellenistic world. During his absence in the desert, the misgovernment of the Rom procurators at Jerus had grown apace. And the ineptitudes and injustices of Felix, Albannus and Florus were succeeded by sacrifice under Annas, the high priest (622). Accordingly, the Zealots (q.v.) plotted against Rom rule. Rebellion simmered, and many of the distressed were transported to Rome to be dealt with there. Among these were several priests, whom Jos knew. About the year 64, he went to Rome to plead for them, shipwreck on the voyage, was rescued with a few survivors and was brought to port at Puteoli. Here he met Altyrus, a Jewish actor, who happened to be in the good graces of Poppaea, Nero’s consort. The empress, a Jewish proselyte, espoused his cause at Rome, and showed him many favors. At the capital, he also discerned the power of the Romans and, in all probability, grew convinced of the hopelessness of armed resistance, so he returned to Jerus to set upon insurrection, and was forced, possibly against his better judgment, to make common cause with them. The first part of his public career is concerned with the great struggle that now began.

When war was put out, Josephus fled to Galilee, the province where the Rom attack would first fall. He had no military fitness for command, but the influence of his friends and the exigencies of politics thrust the office upon him. The Zealots soon found that he did not carry out the necessary preparations with thoroughness, and they tried to compass his removal. But he was too influential, too good a politician also, to be undermined. Sounded by enemies among his own folk, who even attempted to assassinate him, he encountered several dangerous experiences, and, at length, flying from the Romans, was becalmed with his army in Jotapata, near the Lake of Gennesaret, in May, 67. The Jews withstood the siege for 47 days with splendid courage, till Titus, assaulting under cover of a mist, stormed the stronghold and massacred the weary defenders. Jos escaped to a cave where, with his usual adroitness, he saved himself from death at the hands of his companions. The Romans soon uncovered his hiding-place, and hailed him before Vespasian, the commander-in-chief. Jos worked upon the superstitions of the general, and so ingratiated himself that Vespasian took him to Alexandria in his train. Having been liberated by his captor, he adopted the family name of the Flavians, according to Rom custom. Returning to Pal with Titus, he proceeded to mediate between the Romans and the Jews, earning the suspicion of the former, the hatred of the latter. His wonted diplomacy preserved him from anything more serious than a wound, and he was a witness of the terrible events that marked the last days of Jerus. Then he accompanied Titus to Rome for the TRIUMPH (q.v.). Here he lived the remainder of his days, in high favor with the ruling house, and was relieved from another worry by a lavish imperial patronage. He was thus enabled to devote himself to literary pursuits.

The works of Jos render him one of the most valuable authorities for the student of NT times.

They are as follows: (1) Concerning the Jewish War, written before 79; we have the Gr tr of this history by the author; there are 7 books: I, the period from Antiochus Epiphanes (175 BC) to Herod the Great (4 BC); II, from 4 BC to 66 AD, covering the early events of the War; III, occurrences in Galilee in 67 AD; IV, the course of the War till the siege of Jerus; V and VI, the investment and fall of Jerus; VII, the aftermath of the rebellion. While this work is not written in the objectivity and scientific history, it is credible on the whole, except where it concerns the rôle played by the author. (2) The Antiquities of the Jews, written not later than 94 AD. In this Jos purports to relate the entire history of the Jews from the beginning till the War of 66 AD. The 20 books fall naturally into 5 divisions, thus: (a) I–X, from prehistoric times till the Captivity, in other words, the period related in the OT substantially; (b) XI, the age of Cyrus; (c) XII–XIV, the beginnings and the period, from Alexander the Great, including the Maccabean revolt, till the accession of Herod the Great; (d) XV–XVII, the reign of Herod; (e) XVIII–XX, from Herod’s death till the War of 66. While it cannot be called an apology for the Jews, this work betrays the author’s consciousness of the disfavor with which his people were viewed throughout the Rom Empire. Jos does what he can to disabuse the Gr-Rom educated classes, although he shows curious odd habits of his period, of the HEB religion. All in all, the work is disappointing; but it contains many details and sidelights of first importance to investigators. (3) The treatise called, since Jerome, Against Apion, is Josephus’ most inspiring periphrastic account of the JEWS; it is full of the High Antiquity of the Jews, tells us what it contains—a defence of Heb religion against the libels of heathendom. It is in two books. The vituperation with which Jos visits Apion is important in comparison with the defence of Mosaic religion and the criticism of paganism. Here the author’s character is seen at its best; the air of Woldly Wiseman has been dropped, and he approaches enthusiasm. (4) His last work is the Vita or Autobiography, a misleading title. It is an echo of old days in Galilee, directed against the traductions of an associate, Justus of Tiberias. We have Jos at his worst here. He so colors the narrative as to convey a totally wrong impression of the part he played during the great crisis. In external, it may be said that his relations with the imperial court rendered it difficult, perhaps impossible, for him to pursue another course.


R. M. WENSLEY
JOSEJS, jō<std> (Iosēj, lōstå):
(1) One of the brethren of Jesus (Mt 6:3; in Mt 13:55 the Gr is “Joseph,” and RV so renders).
(2) A son of Mary, perhaps identical with (1) (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40.47). See BRETHEN OF THE LORD.
(3) A name of Barnabas (Acts 4:36 AV, where again Gr and RV have “Joseph”). See BARNABAS.

JOSAH, jō<std> (yôșâh, “Jeh’s gift”):
A descendant of Simeon, chief in his family (1 Ch 4:34.35).

JOSHPHAT, josh-a-fat (yôșāphāt, “Jeh has judged”;
fec JOSHPHAT):
(1) One of David’s mighty men (1 Ch 11:43), a “Mithnite,” but not included in the list of 2 S 23.
(2) A priest and trumpeter of David’s time (1 Ch 15:24), AV “Jehoshaphat.”

JOSHAVIAH, josh-a-vî’a (yôșāwîyāh, yôșâwûghâh, “son of Heman; 1 Ch 25:4.24):
The last 8 or 9 names in verse 4 are taken by commentators to be not names but the words of a prayer. See OT JC, 145, n.; Curtis, Chron, 275, 280; SBOT.

JOSHER-BASHEBETH, josh-ba-shê’beth (yôșhîr ba-shêbeh, ’beth):
This proper name in RV 5 14.18 (placed in 1 Ch 11:46) is “that sat in the seat” in AV (2 S 23:8). The phrase so rendered is meaningless. The text has evidently suffered corruption. There can be no doubt that a proper name is intended. This, according to the LXX passage in 1 Ch 11:11, should be Jashobeam. Some scholars think that this also is a corruption, and by a process of emendation arrive at “Eshbaal” as the correct name (Driver, Heb Text of S; SBOT, ad loc.).

JOSHIBIAH, josh-i-bî’a (yôșîbîyâh, yôșihîbîyâh, “Jeh sets,” or “causes to dwell”;
AV Josibiah): A Simeonite (1 Ch 4:35).

JOSHUA, josh-'û-a (a) yôșâhâv, [b] yôșâhâv, [c] yôšhâhâv, “Jeh is deliverance” or “opulence”;
cf JOSUA; Ἰσαάς, Ἰσαάς):
(1) Joshua the son of Nun; the name has the Heb form (a) above in Dt 3:21; Jgs 2:7; elsewhere the form (b), except in Neh 8:17, where it is of the form yôśhâh (See JOSUA); of also Nu 13:8.16; Dt 32:44. See following article.
(2) In 1 S 6:14.18 (form [b]), the Bethshemite in whose field stood the stone that brought the ark from the Philistines.
(3) In 2 K 23:8 (form [b]), governor of Judah in the time of Josiah.
(4) The high priest at Jerusalem after the return. See separate article. S. F. HUNTER.

JOSUA:
I. FORM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NAME
II. HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF JOSHUA
1. First Appearance
2. First Minister of Moses
3. One of the Spies
4. The Head of the People
   (1) His First Act—Becoming of the Spies
   (2) Crossing of the Jordan
   (3) Capture of Jericho
   (4) Conquest of Ai and Bethel
   (5) Reading of the Law on Mt. Ebal
(6) The Gibeonites
(7) Conquest of the South
(8) Northern Conquests
(9) Allotment of Territory
(10) Cities of Refuge
(11) Final Address and Death
III. SOURCES OF HISTORY
IV. CHARACTER AND WORK OF JOSHUA

I. FORM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NAME.—The name Joshua, a contracted form of Jehoshua (יהושע, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ), which also appears in the form Jeshua (יהוסף, נָשִׂיא), signifies “Jeh is deliverance” or “salvation,” and is formed on the analogy of many Israelite names, as Jehoiakim (יהוֹיָקִים, יְהוֹיָקִים), “Jeh exalted,” Jehohanan (יהוֹנַן, y'hônân), “Jeh is gracious,” Elishua or Elisha (יהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶלֶישָׁה, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶלֶישָׁה), “God is deliverance,” Elizur (יהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶלֶישָׁה, יְהוֹשֻׁשָׁה), “God is a rock,” etc. In the narrative of the mission of the spies in Nu 13, the name is given as Joshuas (יהושוע, yôshôshâh, vs 8.16; cf of Dt 32:44), which is changed by Moses to Joshua (ver 16). In the passage in Dt, however, the earlier form of the name is regarded by Dr. Driver (Comm. in loc.) as an erroneous reading.
The Gr form of the name is Jesus (Ἰησοῦς, Ἰσαάς 7:45; He 4:8, RV “Joshua,” but AV “Jesu” in both passages), and this form appears even in the passages cited above from Neh and Dt. In Nu 13:8.16, however, LXX has Ἰωσία, Ἰωσία. The name occurs in later Jewish history, e.g. as that of the owner of the field in which the ark rested after its return from the land of the Philis (1 S 6:14.18), and appears to have become esp. frequent after the exile (Ezr 2:40; Zec 9:1, etc). It is also found (Joshua) with a local significance, as in the name of one of the “villages” in Southern Judaea, where the repatriated Jews dwelt after their return from Babylon (Neh 11:20).

II. HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF JOSHUA.—The narrative of the life of Joshua, the son of Nun, is naturally divided into two parts, in which he held entirely different positions with regard to the people of Israel, and discharged different duties. In the earlier period he is the servant and minister of Moses, loyal to his leader, and one of his most trusted and valiant captains. After the death of Moses he himself succeeds to the leadership of the Israelite host, and conducts them to a settlement in the Promised Land. The service of the earlier years of his life is a preparation and equipment for the office and responsibility that devolved upon him in the later period.
The first appearance of J. in the history is at Rephidim, on the way from the wilderness of Sin to Horeb. Neither the exact site of
1. First Rephidim nor the meaning of the name Appearance can be determined; the Israelites, however, apparently came to Rephi-
dim before they approached the rich oasis of Perián, for at that former place “there was no water for the people to drink” (Ex 17:1). The fact that the host encamped there seems to assume the existence of wells; either, therefore, these were found to be dry, or they failed before the wants of the great host were supplied. The Amalekites, wandering desert tribes, satisfied the ownership of the wells, and, resenting the Israelite intrusion, swooped down upon them to drive them away and to enrich themselves with the spoil of their possessions. Under the command of J., the Israelites in a complete victory, a battle that seems to have been pro-
longed until sunset; the fortunes of the battle varying with the uplifting or falling of Moses’ hands, which were accordingly supported by Aaron and Hur throughout the day (vs 11 ff). A curse
and sentence of extermination pronounced against Amalek were formally written down and communicated to J, apparently that, as the future leader of Israel, he might have it in charge to provide for the fulfillment.

It is evident also that at this period J. was no young and untried warrior. Although no indication of his previous history is given, his name is introduced into the narrative as of a man well known, who is sufficiently in the confidence of Moses to be given the choice that in the first conflict in which the Israelites had been engaged since leaving Egypt. The result justified the choice. And if, during the march, he had held the position of military commander and organizer under Moses, his advice was in the first instance the remarkable change, by which within the brief space of a month the undispatched crowd of serfs who had fled from Egypt became a force sufficiently resolute and competent to repair and exhortation.

In all the arrangements for the erection and service of the tabernacle, J. the warrior naturally has no place. He is briefly named (Ex 24:13) as the minister of Moses, accompanying his foot of the mountain of God, but remaining behind with the elders and Aaron and Hur, when Moses commenced the ascent. A similar brief mention is in Josh 7:7, where has rejoiced Moses under the return of the last from the mountain with the two tables of the testimony, and is unaware of the outbreak of the people and their idolatrous worship of the molten calf in the camp; of Josh 14:1, where evidently he is found in the closest attendance upon his leader and chief. No further reference is made to J. during the stay of the Israelites at Sinai, or their subsequent journeys, until they found themselves at Kadesh-barnes on the southern border of the Promised Land (Nu 13). His name is once mentioned, however, in an earlier ch of the same book (Nu 11:28), when the tidings are brought to Moses that two men in the camp of Israel, Eldad and Medad, had been inspired to prophecy. Hence he is described in harmony with the previous statements of his position, as Moses' minister from his youth. Jealous of his leader's prerogative and honor, he would have the irregular prophesying stopped, but is himself chosen, who rejoiced in the spirit of God should rest thus upon any of the Lord's people.

Of the 12 men, one from each tribe, sent forward by Moses from Kadesh to ascertain the character of the people and land before him, only Hoshea the Ephraimites, the Spies whose name is significantly changed to Joshua (13:8), and Caleb the Judahite, bring back a report encouraging the Israelites to proceed. The account of the mission of the spies is repeated in his own language (13:1 ff.). There, however, the suggestion that spies should be commissioned to examine and report upon the land comes in the first instance from the people themselves. In the record of Nu they are chosen and sent by Moses under Divine direction (13:1 ff.). The two representations are not incompatible, still less contradictory. The former describes in an altogether natural manner the human initiative, probable enough in the circumstances in which the Israelites found themselves; the latter is the Divine control and direction, behind and above the affairs of men. The instructions given to the spies (vs 17 ff.) evidently contemplated a hasty survey of the entire region of the Negeb or southern borderland of Pal up to an hour on the edge of the hills of Judaea; the time allowed, 40 days (yer 25), was too brief to accomplish more, hardly long enough for this purpose alone. They were, moreover, not only to ascertain the character of the towns and their inhabitants, the quality and products of the soil, but to bring back with them specimens of the fruits (ver 20). An indication of the year is given in the added clause that "the time was the time of first-ripe grapes." The usual months of the vintage are September and October (cf Lev 23:39); in the warm and sheltered valleys, however, in the neighborhood of Hebron, grapes may sometimes be gathered in August or even as early as July. The valley from which the fruits, grapes, figs and pomegranates were brought was known as the valley of Eschol, or the 'cluster' (Nu 13:23; 32:9; Dt 1:24).

No hesitating or doubtful account is given by all the spies of the fertility and attractiveness of the country; but in view of the strength of its cities and inhabitants only J. and Caleb are confident of the ability of the Israelites to take possession of it. Their reports were submitted, however, overborne by the timidity and dissuasion of the others, who so entirely alarm the people that they refuse to essay the conquest of the land, desiring to return into Egypt (vs 14:30) and attempt to some of J. and Caleb (14:10). These two alone, therefore, were exempted from the sentence of exclusion from the Promised Land (vs 24:30:38; 26:65; 32:12; Dt 1:25 ff.). The remainder of the spies perished at once by a special doom. The people were condemned to a 40-year exile in the wilderness, a year for each day that the spies had been in Pal, until all the men of that generation from twenty years old and upward were dead (14:29; 32:11 f.), and [the season of] the Exodus; the people were to enter into the land in defiance of the prohibition of Jeh, and ended in failure and disastrous defeat (vs 40f.; Dt 1:41 ff.; of 21:1-3).

Upon the events of the next 38 or 40 years in the life of Israel an almost unbroken silence falls. The wanderers in the wilderness have no history. Some few events, however, that are recorded without note of time, the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and the breaking out of the plague because of the people's murmuring against Moses, are recorded (Nu 16:1 ff.; 17:1 ff.). When the census is taken the spirit of God should rest thus upon any of the Lord's people. In none of them does J. take an active part, nor is his name mentioned in connection with the campaigns against Sihon and Og on the E. of the Jordan, and the people is the name of the tribe, or of Moab opposite Jericho, and Caleb with Moses himself are found to be the only survivors of the host that 40 years previously came out of Egypt (36:83 ff.). As the time of the death of the great leader and lawgiver drew near, he was commissioned formally to appoint J. as his successor and to hand over to him and to Eleazar the priest the duty of finallyapportioning the conquered territory among the several tribes (27:18 ff.; 32:28; 34:17; cf Dt 34:4 ff.; 32:28; 32:31; 34:1, 40). Some of the passages anticipate the direct Divine commission and encouragement recorded in Josh (1:5 ff.) and given to him after the death of Moses.

The history of J. in his new capacity as supreme head and leader of the people in several instances recapitulates as it were the history of his greater forerunner. It was not the Head of the unnatural that he should be so; and People the similarity of recorded events affords no real ground for doubt with regard to the reliability of the tradition. The position in which Israel now found itself on the E. of the Jordan was in some respects not unlike that which confronted Moses at Kadesh-barnes or before the crossing of the Red Sea. J., however, was faced with a problem much more difficult, and in the war-tried and disciplined host at
his command he possessed an instrument immensely more suitable and powerful for carrying out his purpose.

(1) Sending of the spies.—His first act was to send spies from Shittim to ascertain the character of the country immediately opposite on the W. of the Jordan, and esp. the position and strength of Jericho, which was the fortified city which first stands in the way of an invader from the E. who proposes to cross the river by the fords near its mouth (Josh 2:2). In Jericho the spies owed their lives to the quick inventiveness of Rahab (cf. He 11:31), who pretended that the river had been dammed up, when the emissaries of the king; and returning to J, they reported the prospects of an easy victory and conquest (vs 23f).

There were doubtless special reasons which induced J. to send spies, for the crossing-place led directly into Central Pal., a district in which apparently his advance would not have been obstructed by fortified cities such as confronted him farther south; whereas Jericho therefore would seem to offer the advantages of an open and ready entrance into the heart of the country. His decision was probably influenced by the possession by Israel of a fortified base at Jericho, and in the neighboring cities. The favorable report of the spies also proved that there would be no great difficulty in carrying out this plan.

(2) Crossing of the Jordan.—The actual crossing of the river is narrated in chs 3, 4. The city of Jericho was built in a plain from 12 to 14 miles wide formed by the recession of the hills that border the valley of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, and stood at the mouth of the valley of Achor (7:24; 15:7). The modern village of Erthā is built at a short distance, E. of the ancient site, andGilgal lay half-way to the river. At the latter place a camp was established after the taking of Jericho, and Gilgal formed for some considerable time the base of operations, where the women and children remained in safety while the men were absent on their warlike expeditions. There also the tabernacle was erected, as the symbol and center of national life, and there apparently it remained until the time came for the removal to Shiloh (18:1).

Within the plain the stream has excavated a torrent-bed to a depth of 200 ft., below the surface, varying from an eighth of a mile to a mile in breadth. In ordinary seasons the waters are confined to a small portion of the channel, which is then crossed opposite Jericho by two fords where the depth does not exceed 3 ft. When the torrent rises it may be crossed elsewhere. In times of flood, however, the water rises and fills the entire channel from bank to bank, so that the fords become impracticable. It is expressly stated that it was at such a time of flood that the Israelites approached the river, at the "time of harvest," or in the early spring (3:15). The priests were directed to carry the ark to the brink of the river, the waters of which, as soon as their feet touched them, would be cut off, and a dry passage afforded. The narrative is perhaps to be understood as though it indicated that a wall of water stood on the right and left of the people as they crossed; the entire breadth of the river bed was exposed by the failure of the waters from above. See JORDAN.

An interesting parallel to the crossing up of the Jordan is recorded by an Arab, historian of the Middle Ages, who writes to explain a natural but extraordinary occurrence: the sudden thought of the miraculous character of the passage of the river with any apparent knowledge of the passage of the Israelites.

During the years 1260-67 AD, a Masmademian sufi named Masrour was engaged in building a bridge over the Jordan near Damlîkh, a place which some have identified with the city Adam (Josh 3:16); but before the workmen had carried away and destroyed his work. On one night, however, in December of the latter year, the river rose entirely to flow. The opportunity was seized, and an army of workmen so strengthened the bridge that it resisted the flood which came down upon it the next day, and stood firm. It was found that at some distance up the river, where the valley was narrower, the banks had been undermined, the water had fallen in, thus damming back the stream. It seems not improbable that it was by force of this character that a passage of the river was made over the Israelites; even as 40 years earlier a "strong east wind" had been employed to drive back the waters of the Red Sea before Moses.

At the command of J., under Divine direction, the safe crossing of the Jordan was commemorated by the erection at Gilgal of 12 stones (4:3-9:20 ff.), one for each of the tribes of Israel, taken from the fords of the river. It is stated that 12 oxen were set up in the midst of the river. The statement is probably a misunderstanding, and a mere confusion of the tradition. It is not likely that there would be a double commemoration, or an erection of stones in a place where there would never be seen. At Gilgal also the supply of manna ceased, when the natural resources of the country became available (5:12). The date of the passage is given as the 10th day of the 1st month (4:19); and on the 14th day the Passover was kept there in the plains of Jericho (5:10). For the 2d time, also, at the crisis of the first entrance into the land, J. was encouraged for his work by a vision and Divine promise of assistance and direction (6:1-5).

(3) Capture of Jericho.—The account of the taking of Jericho, illustrates, as would naturally be expected in the case of a city so situated, the effeminate and warlike character of its inhabitants. There was apparently little or no fighting, while for a whole week soldiers and people paraded before the walls. A brief reference (6:1) seems to indicate that the citizens were quickly driven to take refuge behind their fortifications. Twice seven times the city was compassed, with the ark of the covenant borne in solemn procession, and at the 7th circuit on the 7th day, while the people shouted, the wall of the city fell "in its place" (6:20 m.), and Jericho was taken by assault. Only Rahab and her household were spared. All the treasure was devoted to the service of the Lord, but the city itself was burnt, and a solemn curse pronounced upon the site and upon the man who should venture to rebuild its walls (6:26). The curse was braved, whether deliberately or not, by the inhabitants of the walled city of Jericho, and the disasters foretold fell upon him in the loss of his children (1 K 16:34). Thenceforward Jericho appears to have been continuously inhabited. There was a settlement of the name on the hill 3 miles to the E. of Elijah's day (2 K 2:5.15). The natural fertility of the site won for it the name of the city of palm trees (Dt 34:3; Jgs 1:16; 3:13).

From the plains of Jericho two valleys lead up into the central hill country in directions N.W. and S.W. respectively. These form the two entrances or passes, by which the higher land is approached from the E. Along these lines, therefore, the invasion of the land was planned and carried out. The main advances were made by the northeastern of the valleys, while the immediate southern invasion was intrusted to Caleb and the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, the supreme control remaining always in the hands of J. (cf. Josh 14, 16; Jgs 1). This seems on the whole to be the better way of explaining the narratives in general, which in detail present many difficulties.

(4) Conquest of Ai and Bethel.—At the head of the northern pass stood the city of Luz or Bethel (Gen 25:19; Josh 10:18; Jgs 1:29). Ai lay close at hand, and was engaged in building a bridge over the Jordan near Damlîkh, a place which some have identified with the city Adam (Josh 3:16); but before the workmen had carried away and destroyed his work. On one night, however, in December of the latter year, the river rose entirely to flow. The opportunity was seized, and an army of workmen so strengthened the
that overtook the other. Before Ai, the advance guard of the Israelites, a small party detached on the advice of the spies sent forward by Jeph of Jericho, suffered defeat and were driven back in confusion. The city, however, failed to obey the command to "devote" the whole spoil of Jericho, and to the theft by one of the people of treasure which belonged rightfully to Jeph (7.11). When the culprit Achan had been discovered and punished, a renewed attempt upon Ai, made with larger forces and more skilful dispositions, was crowned with success. The city was taken by a stratagem and destroyed by fire, its king being hanged outside the city gate (8.28 f.). Unlike Jericho, it seems never to have been restored. Bethel also was captured, through the treachery apparently of one of its own citizens, and its inhabitants were put to the sword (Jgs 1.24 f.).

(5) Reading of the law on Mt. Ebal.—Of further campaigns undertaken by Jeph, for the subjugation of Canaan thenceforth it has been preserved. It is possible, therefore, that the conquest of this part of the country was accomplished without further fighting (see JOSHUA, BOOK OF). In the list of the cities (Josh 12.7–24) whose fall is mentioned by name there are no towns of towns that can be certainly identified as situated here; the greater part evidently belong to the north or south. The only record remaining is that of the formal erection of a well at Ebal (Josh 8.30). Ebal was the center of the people and the solemn reading of the law in their hearing (8.30–35). It is expressly noted that all this was done in accordance with the directions of Moses (cf Deut 11.29; 27.2–8.11 f.). It would further appear probable that the ceremony really took place at the close of the conquest, when all the land was subdued, and is narrated here by anticipation.

(6) The Gibeonites.—The immediate effect of the Israelite victories under Jeph was very great. Especially were the Hivite inhabitants of Gibeon struck with fear (9.3 f.) lest the same fate should overtake them that had come upon the peoples of Jericho and Ai. With Gibeon, 3 other cities were confederate, viz. Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjath-jearim, or the "city of strangers" (17).* Gibeon, however, was the chief, and acted in the name of the others. It is usually identified with the modern village or township of el-Jib, 7 or 8 miles N. by W. of Jericho; and all four lay clustered around the head of a long and narrow valley of Ajalon extending from the plateau westward to the foothills of the Shephelah, toward the plain and the sea. Gibeon held therefore a position of natural strength and importance, the key to one of the few practicable routes from the west into the highlands of Judaea, equally essential to be occupied as a defensive position against the incursions of the dwellers in the plains, and as affording to an army from the east a safe and protected road down from the mountains.

By a stratagem, probably in the time of Joshua, to which their ruler on their guard, representing themselves as jaded and wayworn travelers from a distance, the Gibeonites succeeded in making a compact with Israel, which assured their own lives and safety. They affirmed that they had heard of the Israelite victories beyond Jordan, and also of the gift to them by Jeph of the whole land (9.9 f.24). Jeph and the princes were deceived and entered too readily into covenant with them, a covenant and promise that was scrupulously observed when on the 3d day of traveling the Israelites reached their cities and found them to be close at hand (vs 16 ff). While, however, their lives were preserved, the men of Gibeon were reduced to the position of menial servitude, first of wood and drawers of water (12.1); and the writer adds, it is thus "unto this day" (vs 21.27). See GIBEON.

The treaty of peace with the Gibeonites and the indignation thereby aroused among the neighboring kings, who naturally regarded the independent action of the men of Gibeon as treachery toward themselves, gave rise to the most formidable coalitions and one of the most dramatic incidents of the whole war. The king of Jerus, Adoni-zedek ("the Lord of righteousness") or "the Lord is righteouseness," 10.1; cf Melchisedek, "the king of righteousness," Gen 14.18; in Jgs 1.5 the name appears as Adoni-bezek, and so LXX reads here), with the 4 kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon (10.3), formed a plan to destroy Gibeon in revenge, and the Gibeonites sent hastily for assistance to Jeph, who had returned with his army to Gilgal. The Israelites made a forced march from Gilgal, came upon the allied kings near Gibeon, and attacked and defeated them with great slaughter. The routed army fled westward "by the way of the ascent to Beth-horon" (ver 10), and in the pass was overtaken by a violent hailstorm, by which more perished than had fallen beneath the swords of the Israelites (ver 11). The 5 kings were shut up in a cave at Makkedah, in which they had taken refuge, and were subsequently routed and put to death. The actual pursuit, however, was not stayed until the remnant had found temporary security behind the walls of their fortified cities (10.16 f.). The victory of Israel was celebrated by Jeph, at the expense of all the people and the solemn reading of the law in their hearing (8.30–35). It is expressly noted that all this was done in accordance with the directions of Moses (cf Deut 11.29; 27.2–8.11 f.). It would further appear probable that the ceremony really took place at the close of the conquest, when all the land was subdued, and is narrated here by anticipation.

(7) Conquest of the south.—With almost severe simplicity it is further recorded how the confederate cities in turn were taken in the course of the war. (10.1–28). The conquerors are not mentioned by name, and the details of the capture are merely stated. The only account given is that of the capture of Eglon (10.9–24). Eglon, who was apparently king, was defeated and put to death, and the rest of the city was destroyed (10.25–30). And the account is closed by a summary statement of the conquest of the entire country from Kadesh-barnea in the extreme south as far as Gibeon, after which the people returned to their camp at Gilgal (10.40–43).

(8) Northern conquests.—A hostile coalition of northern rulers had finally to be met and defeated before the occupation and pacification of the land could be said to be complete. Jabin, king of Hazor, the "fort," was at the head of an alliance of northern kings who gathered together to oppose Israel in the neighborhood of the waters of Merom (11.1 f.). Hazor has been doubtfully identified with the modern Jebel Hadir, some 5 miles W. of the lake, and it is of interest to note that no account has been given of the details of the military operations. The victory, however, of the Israelites was decisive, although chariots and horses were employed against them apparently for the first time on Can. soil. The pursuit was maintained as far as Sidon, and Beth-shan, perhaps the "boiling" or "tumults of the waters," the later Zarephath on the coast S. of the former city (11.8; cf 13.6); and the valley of Mizpeh must have been one of the many wadis leading down to the Phoen. coast land. The cities were taken, their inhabitants put to the sword; but Hazor alone appears to have been burnt to the ground (11.11 f.). That the royal city recovered itself later is clear from the fact that a king of Hazor was among the oppressors of Israel in the days of the Judges (Jgs 4). For the time being, however, the fruit of these victories was a widespread and much-needed peace. "The land had rest from war" (11.23).

(9) Allotment of territory.—Thus the work of conquest, as far as the 3d day of traveling under Jeph's command, was now ended; but much yet remained to be done that was left over for future generations. The ideal limits of Israel's possession, as set forth by Jeph in promise to Moses, from the Shihor or Brook of Egypt (cf 1.3 CANTER); and the writer adds, it is thus "unto this day" (vs 21.27). See GIBEON.
For the 7 tribes that were yet without defined inheritance a rough survey of the land appears to have been made, and the unallotted districts were divided into 7 portions, for which lots were then cast at Shiloh in the presence of the assembled tribes (chs 18, 19). The express mention of Shiloh here (18.31) suggests that the lot of the priestly division was carried out at some other place, and if so, probably at Gilgal, the earlier resting-place of the ark and the tabernacle. No definite statement, however, to that effect is made. Benjamin’s portion was assigned between the territories of Judah and the children of Joseph (18.11). Simeon received his inheritance out of the land given to Judah, a part on the south being taken away on the ground that the whole was too great for a single tribe (19:1-9). Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali were established in the north (19.10–39). And Dan was settled on the seacoast by Joppa, with additional territory in the extreme north, of which they apparently look independent and forcible possession, beyond the inheritance of the other tribes (19.40–48; cf Jgs 18 27–29).

(10) Cities of refuge.—Finally the 6 cities of refuge were appointed, 3 on each side of the Jordan, and the 48 cities of the Levites taken out of the territory of the 20, 21; cf Nu 35; Dt 4 41–43). The two and a half tribes whose inheritance lay in Eastern Pal were then dismissed, their promise of assistance to their brethren having been fulfilled (ch 22); and an altar was erected by the tribes of the Jordan whose purpose is explained to be serve as a standing witness to the common origin of all the tribes, and to frustrate any future attempt to cut off those on the E. from the brotherhood of Israel.

(11) Final address and death.—In a closing assembly of the Israelites at Shechem, J. delivered to the people his final charge, as Moses had done before his death, reminding them of their own wonderful history, and of the promises and claims of God, and exhorting them to faithful and loyal obedience in His service (23, 24). A stone also was set up under the oak in the sacred precinct of Jah, to be a memorial of the renewed covenant between God and His people (24 20, 21). Then at the age of 110 the second great leader of Israel died, and was laid to his rest within his own inheritance in Timnath-serah (vs 29.30; in Jgs 2 9, Timnath-heres), in the hill country of Ephraim. The site of his grave is unknown. Tradition has placed it at Kefar-satir, in S. Samaria, but the localising by tradition of the burying-place of a hero or saint is often little more than accidental, nor can any reliance be placed upon it in this instance.

III. Sources of History.—That the narratives concerning the life and work of J. rest in the main upon a basis of tradition can hardly be doubted. How far the details have been modified, or a different coloring imposed upon the course of events, is at present impossible to determine. There is a remarkable similarity or parallelism between many of the leading events of J.'s career as ruler and captain of Israel and those of his predecessor Moses, which, apart from any literary criticism, suggests that the narratives were derived from the same general source, and subjected to the same conditions of environment and transmission. Thus both are called to and strengthened for their work by a special Divine revelation, Moses at Horæb in the burning bush, J. at Jericho. Both lead the people across the bed of waters miraculously driven back to afford them passage. And both at no long interval after the passage win a victory ascribed in each case to direct Divine intervention on their behalf, although in different ways. Each at the close of their lives thanks God and J. deliver stirring addresses of appeal and warning to the assembled Israelites; and both lie in famous graves. These all, however, are occurrences perfectly natural and indeed inevitable in the position in which each found himself. Nor do the narratives suggest that a successor to take up his unfinished work and to carry it to completion.

IV. Character and Work of Joshua.—As to the personal character of J., there is little to be inferred from the narrative of his campaigns. In this respect indeed they are singularly colorless. In early life his loyalty to Moses was conspicuous and unswerving. As his successor, he seems to have faithfully reacted upon his predecessor’s principles. Some of the Israelite campaigns to have proved himself a brave and competent general, as wise in counsel as he was strong in fight. The putting to death of captives and the burning of cities, which the historian so often records as the consequence of his victories, must evidently be judged by the customs of the times, and have perhaps lost nothing in the narration. They do not in any case indicate the participation of Joshua in an especially inhuman disposition, or a delight in slaughter for its own sake. After the death of Moses he would appear to have been reluctant to undertake the onerous position and great duty assigned to him by God. His marked ability and lack of self-confidence, and needed more than once to be encouraged in his work and assured of Divine support. In the language of his closing discourse there is apparent a foresight and appreciation of the character and tendencies of the people who had followed him, which is hardly inferior to that of Moses himself.

In a real sense also his work was left unfinished at his death. The settlement of Canaan by the tribes of Israel within the appointed and promised limits was never more than partly accomplished. The colonists failed to enjoy that absolute and undisturbed possession of the land to which they had looked forward; witness the unrest of the period of the Judges, prolonged and perpetuated through monarchical times. For this all, however, blame cannot justly be laid to J. Many causes undoubtedly concurred to an issue which was fatal to the future unity and happiness and prosperity of Israel. The chief cause, as J. warned them would be the case, was the persistent idolatry of the people themselves, their neglect of duty, and disregard of the commands and claims of their God.

A. S. GEDEN
Joshua, Book of

JOSHUA: Son of Jehozadak (Hag 1 1.12.14; 2 2.4; Zec 3 1.3.6.8.9; 6 11 form [6]) and high priest in Jerusalem, called "Joshua" in Ear-Neh. His father was among the captives taken in 586 BC, and also his grand father Seraiah, who was put to death at Riblah (2 K 25 18 ff; 1 Ch 6 15).

Joshua appears in Ex 3 2 with Zerubbabel at the head of the returned exiles and as leader in the work of building an altar and reestablishing sacrificial worship (558 or 537 BC). Ex 3 8 tells of their laying the foundation of the temple, and in 4 1 ff the two heads of the community refuse to allow the Samaritans to participate in the building operations, with the result that the would-be helpers became active opponents of the work. Building then ceased until Haggai and Zechariah in 520 (Ezr 5; Hag 1 1–11) exhort the community to restart work, and the two leaders take the lead (Hag 1 12–15). The following are, in chronological order, the prophetic utterances in which J. is spoken of:

1. The Vision of Zec 3:1–10 pears in later Jewish writings; he is only the officer of justice whose business is to see that the case against criminals is properly presented in the heavenly court of justice (H. F. Steiner, T. History, 336); while others regard him as the enemy of God's people (cf. Orelli, Minor Prophets, ET, 327). We are not told what the charge against J. is: some hold him to be tried as in some way a representative of the people or the priesthood, and his filthy garments as symbolical of sin; while others explain the garments as put on to excite the court's pity. The adversary is rebuked by "the angel of Jeh" (read at beginning of ver 2, and the angel of Jeh said, etc), and J. is acquitted. He is then ordered to be stripped of his old clothes and to be arrayed in "rich apparel" (ver 4), while a "clean turban" (ARVm) is to be put on his head. Conditional upon his walking in God's ways, he is promised the government of the temple and access to God, being placed among the servants of the "angel of Jeh," J. and his companions "are men that are a sign" (ver 8), i.e. a guaranty of the coming of the Messiah; there is set before J. a stone which is to be inscribed upon, and the iniquity of the land will be removed, an event to be followed by peace and plenty (va 9 f).

In vs 4ff Nowack and Wellhausen (with the LXX mostly) read, "And he answered and spoke unto those that stood before him (i.e. his servants) thus: Take the filthy garments from him, and clothe him with rich apparel, and set a clean turban upon his head. So they set a clean turban upon his head and clothed him with clean garments. And the angel of Jeh stood up, [6] and the angel expostulated J. He also took off his robe and put white raiment; and they also omit the first "for" in ver 8 as a ditography.

Different interpretations are given of the vision:

(1) Some claim to see here a contest between the civil and religious powers as represented by Zerubbabel and J. respectively (6 15), and that Zechariah sides with J. in the supremacy of the latter. The Messiah-King is indeed in Jerusalem in the person of Zerubbabel, though as yet uncrowned; but J. is to be supreme (see G. A. Smith, Jerus, II, 303; H. P. Smith, Of T. History, 396 f). This explanation is due to a large extent to 6 9–15, and is not supported by 3 8. It is difficult to explain 6 2 on this view, for Zerubbabel could also be described as "a brand plucked out of the fire." What the vision says is that the vindication of J. is a sign for the coming of Jeh's "servant, the Branch," a title that is not given to J. (cf ver 7).

(2) Others maintain that the garments are symbolical of the sins of the predecessors of J., who is tried for their offenses and himself regarded as being unworthy of the office because he had been brought up in a foreign and heathen land (so Keil, Orelli).

(3) Hitig, followed by Nowack (Kleine Propheten, 325), holds that the idea which lies at the basis of the vision is that Satan is responsible for theills which the community had suffered (cf Job 1, 2). The people had begun to think that their offerings were not accepted by God, and that God have pity upon them. There was a feeling among the most pious ones that God's righteousness would not allow of their restoration to their former glory. This conflict between righteousness and mercy is decided by silencing the accuser and vindicating J.

It is difficult to decide which view, if any, is correct. "The brand plucked out of the fire" seems to point to God's recognizing that the community, or perhaps the priestly succession, had almost been exterminated by the exile. It reminds us of the oak of which, after its falling, the stump remained to be made the axis of all power. The "garments, a guaranty, of the coming of the Messiah-King. The ritualistic tone of Mal will then follow naturally after the high place is given to J. It is noteworthy that the promise of 3 7 is conditional.

One more point remains, viz. the meaning of the stone in 3 9. It has been differently explained as a jewel in the new king's crown (Nowack); a foundation stone of the temple, which, however, was already laid (Hitigz); the chief stone of 4 7 (Ewald, Steiner); the Messiah Himself (Keil); the stone in the high priest's breastplate (Bredenkamp), and the stone which served as an altar (Orelli). Commentators tend to regard the words "upon one stone are seven eyes" as a parenthetical addition characteristic of the author of Zec 9 ff.

The utterance of Zec 6 9–15 presents to us some more exiles coming from Babylon with silver and gold apparently for the temple.

2. Joshua's According to the present text, Zechariah is commanded to see that this is used to make a crown for J. who is to be a priest-king. This means that he is to be given the crown of a king which had been meant for Zerubbabel. But commentators hold that the text has been altered; that the context demands the crowning of Zerubbabel—the Branch of David's descent. This is supported by ver 13, "And the counsel of peace shall be between them both"; and therefore the last clause of ver 11 is omitted. Wellhausen keeps vs 9 and 10, and then reads: [11] Yes, take of them silver and gold and make a crown, [12] and say to them: Thus saith Jeh of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, from whose root there will be a sprout, [13] and he will build the Temple of Jeh, and he will obtain glory and sit and rule upon his throne. And Joshua will be a priest on his right hand, and there will be friendly peace between them both. [14] The crown shall be, etc; ver 15 is incomplete.

It will be objected that this does away with the idea of a priest-king, an idea found also in Ps 110. But it seems fairly certain that Ps 110 refers to J., the point there being that the king referred to was a priest, although not descended from Aaron, being a priest after the order of Melchizedek, while the point is, if the present text is correct, that Zerubbabel is crowned king. What became of Zerubbabel after this is not known. See Ed. Meyer, Der Papyrus-
fund von Elephantine², 70 ff, 86 ff. J. is called Jesus in Sir 49 12. See Zerubbabel; Haggai; Zechariah. David Francis Roberts

Joshua, Book of:

I. Title and Authorship

The name Joshua signifies "Jeh is deliverance" or "salvation" (see Joshua). The Gr form of the name is Jesus (Ἰησοῦς, Ισαίς, Acts 7:45; He 4:8). In later Jewish history the name appears to have become popular, and is even found with a local significance, as in the designation of the leader of the southern Pal (שָׁם, ובשָׁם, Neh 11:26). The use of the title by the Jews to denote the Book of Josh did not imply a belief that the book was actually written or dictated by him; or even that the narratives themselves were in substance derived from him, and that their authenticity and reliability lie to his sanction and control. In the earliest Jewish literature the association of a name with a book was not intended in any case to indicate authorship. And the Book of Josh is no exception to the rule that such early literary designations, esp. when their contents are of a historical nature, are usually anomalous. The title is intended to describe, not authorship, but theme; and to represent that the life and deeds of Joshua form the main subject with which the book is concerned.

II. Contents

With regard to the contents of Josh, it will be found to consist of two well-marked divisions, in the first of which (chs 1-12) are narrated the invasion and gradual conquest under the command and personal leadership of Joshua, while the 2d part describes in detail the allotment of the country to the several tribes with the boundaries of their territories, and concludes with a brief notice of the death and burial of J. himself.

Ch 1: Renewal of the Divine promise to J. and exhortation to J. and to the people, to take courage (vs 1-9); directions to the people to prepare for the passage of the river, and a reminder to the eastern tribes (Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh) of the condition under which they held their possession beyond Jordan; the renewal by these tribes of their pledge of loyalty to Moses’ successor (vs 10-18).

Ch 2: The sending of the two spies from Shittim and their escape from Jericho through the straits of Rahab.

Ch 3: The passage of Jordan by the people over against Jericho, and the taking into the dry bed of the river until all the people had crossed over.

Ch 4: Erection of 12 memorial stones on the other side of Jordan, where the people encamped after the passage of the river (vs 1-14); the priests with the Ark of the Covenant ascend in their turn from out of the river-bed, and the waters return into their wonted course (vs 15-24).

Ch 5: Alarm excited among the kings on the W. of Jordan, news of the miraculous crossing of the river (ver 1); circumcision of the people at Gilgal (vs 2-9); celebration of the Passover at Gilgal in the plains of Jericho; the completion of the supply of the manna (ver 12); appearance to J. of the captain of the Lord (vs 13-15).

Ch 6: Directions given to J. for the siege and taking of Jericho (vs 1-5); capture of the city, which is destroyed, and its walls and its citizens are set on fire (vs 6-25); a curse is pronounced on the man who rebuilds Jericho (ver 26).

Ch 7: The crime and punishment of Achan, who stole for himself part of the spoil of the captured city (vs 1-26); incidentally his sin is shown in the defeat before Ai (vs 2-12).

Ch 8: The taking of Ai by a stratagem, destruction of the city, and death of its king (vs 1-29); erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal, and reading of the Law before the assembled people (vs 30-35).

Ch 9: Gathering of the peoples of Pal to oppose J. (vs 1-2); a covenant of peace made between the two parties, the inhabitants of the hill country being represented as strangers from a far country (vs 3-26); they are, however, reduced to a condition of servitude (ver 27).

Ch 10: Combination of 5 kings of the Amorites to fight against the inhabitants of Giub-er, fortified their positions, and defeated and rout of the kings of the hill country at Beth-Horon (vs 1-14); return of the Israelites to Gilgal (ver 15); capture and death of the king of Ai (vs 16-27); taking and destruction of Makkedah (ver 28); Lisanah (vs 29-30); Lachish (vs 31-32); Gezer (vs 33); Edom (vs 34-35); Hebron (vs 36-37); Joshua (vs 38-39), and summarily all the land, as defined from Kadesh-Bnei unto Gaza, and as far N. as Gibeon (40-42); return to Gilgal (ver 43).

Ch 11: Defeat of Jablin, king of Hazor, and allied kings at the base of Mt. Carmel, and the conquest of Hazor (vs 10-15); reiterated summary of J.'s conquests (vs 16-22).

Ch 12: Final summary of the Israelite conquests in Canaan, of Sihon and Og on the E. of the Jordan under the leadership of Moses (vs 1-6); capture of 31 kings in the land of the Midianites, and the cities on the W. of the river under J. (vs 7-24).

Ch 13: Command to J. to score out for the W. of the Jordan, even that which was still unsubdued, to the nine and a half tribes (vs 1-7); recapitulation of the inheritance of the two tribes and a half on the E. of the river (vs 8-13:32); the border of Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh (vs 24-28), of the half-tribe of Manasseh (vs 29-31), the tribe of Levi alone received no portion (vs 32-33).

Ch 14: Renewed statement of the principle on which the conquests had been made (vs 1-5); Hebron given to Caleb for his inheritance (vs 6-15).

Ch 15: The inheritance of Judah, and the boundaries of his territory (vs 1-20), including that of Caleb (vs 13-18); enumeration of the cities of Judah (vs 21-34).

Ch 16: Inheritance of the sons of Joseph (vs 1-4); the border of Ephraim (vs 5). Ch 17: Inheritance of Manasseh and the border of the half-tribe of Manasseh on the W. of the Jordan (vs 1-13); complaint of the sons of Joseph of the inequality of the portion of Manasseh, and grant to them by J. of an extension of territory (vs 14-18).

Ch 18: The land yet unsubdued divided by lot into 7 portions for the remaining 7 tribes (vs 1-10); inheritance of the sons of Benjamin and the border of their portion (vs 11-20); enumeration of their cities (vs 21-28).

Ch 19: Inheritance of Simeon and his border (vs 1-9); of Gebal and his border (vs 10-16); of Issachar and his border (vs 17-23); of Asher and his border (vs 24-31); of Naphtali and his border (vs 32-35), and the border of his brother (vs 40-48); inheritance of Joshua (vs 49-50).

Ch 20: Cities of Refuge appointed, three on each side of the Jordan.

Ch 21: 48 cities with their suburbs given to the Levites out of the territories of the several tribes (vs 1-41); the people had rest in the land, their enemies being subdued, according to the Divine promises (vs 42-43).

Ch 22: Dismission of the eastern tribes to their inheritances, their duty to their brethren having been fulfilled (vs 1-9); the erection by them of a great altar by the side of the Jordan aroused the suspicion of the western tribes, who feared that they intended to separate themselves from the common cause (vs 10-20); their reply that the altar is to serve the purpose of a witness between themselves and their brethren (vs 21-34).

Ch 23: J.'s address of encouragement and warning to the people.

Ch 24: Second address of J., recalling to the people their history, exhorting them to seek the Divine ark, and standing in the dry bed of the river until all the people had crossed over.

Ch 25: Agreement of the Israelites to observe the ordinances of Moses, and to serve the Lord in accordance with the covenant he made with their ancestors (vs 1-31).

Ch 26: Relation of the men of Ephraim who brought back an evil report concerning the inhabitants of Ai (vs 1-26); the people's pledge of loyalty to the Lord, and formal covenant in Shechem (vs 27-28).

Ch 27: The law of God is committed to writing, and a stone is erected as a permanent memorial (vs 26-28); death and burial of J. (vs 29-31); burial in Shechem of the bones of Joseph, brought from Egypt (ver 32); death and burial of Eleazar, son of Aaron (vs 33).

III. Historical Character and Chronology

As a historical narrative, J. is incomplete and is marked by many omissions, and in some instances at least includes phrases or expressions which seem to imply the existence of parallel or divergent accounts of the same event, e.g. in the
passage of the Jordan and the erection of memorial stones (chs 3, 4), the summary of the conquests of Joshua (10:40-43; 11:16-25), or the references to Moses' visions over the Amorite kings on the E. of the Jordan.

This last fact suggests, what is in itself sufficiently probable, that the writer or compiler of the book made use of historical records not necessarily connected in any one, although closely relations, with the facts narrated in it, either directly or indirectly. In every instance, written, but probably also oral and traditional, upon which he relied and out of which means of enrichments or modifications and omissions, the resultant history is composed. The incomplete and detailed narrative of the book therefore, considered merely as a history of the conquest of Western Pal and its allotment among the new settlers, would seem to indicate perhaps available for the writer's use were fragmentary also in their nature, and did not present a complete or precise view either of the conquest itself or of the experiences of Israel while under his direction.

Within the limits of the book itself, moreover, notifications of chronological sequence, or of the length of time occupied in the various campaigns, are almost entirely wanting. Almost the only references, or that part of a period are the statements that Joshua himself was 110 years old at the time of his death (24:29), and that his wars lasted "a long time" (11:18; cf. 23:1). Caleb also, the son of Hebron as his inheritance (14:10; of 15:13 ff); the inference would be, assuming 40 years for the wanderings in the desert, that he had then elapsed since the passage of the Jordan "on the tenth day of the first month" (4:19). No indication, however, is given of the chronological relation of this event to the rest of the history; and 5 years would be too short a period for the conquest of Pal, if it is to be understood that the whole was carried out in consecutive campaigns under the immediate command of Joshua. On the other hand, "very much land" remained still unsubdued at his death (13:1).

Christian tradition seems to have assumed that was about the same age as Caleb, although no definite statement to that effect is made in the book itself; and that, therefore, a quarter of a century, more or less, elapsed between the settlement of the latter in the land (24:10; 14:29) and the former's. The entire period from the crossing of the Jordan would then be reckoned at from 28 to 30 years.

IV. Sources of the Written Narrative.—The attempt to disentangle these two narratives, if it now exists, is bound by the proverb himself a fertile field of investigation, and the problem of a fuller account of this which has been put forward or the present process, the composition which the sources should take. For the most part, therefore, the broad line of distinction between the various "sources" which have been utilized may easily be discerned on the ground of their characteristic traits, in style, vocabulary or general conception; in regard to details, however, the precise principle on which one "source" has been abandoned for another, or the writer himself has supplied deficiencies and bridged gaps, there is no rule or survey. But the evidence is insufficient to justify an absolute conclusion. The fusion of materials has been complete than in the 6 books of the law, perhaps because the latter were hedged about with a more reverential regard for the letter, and at all events the remaining fragments are substantially identical. No detailed analysis of the sources as they have been discovered is necessary, or one another by scholars themselves as to the precise form or limits of the use made of any given source, or at what point the dividing line should be drawn. It is only to be assumed, in the sense that in Josh esp. the literary theory of the use of "documents," as generally understood and as interpreted in the case of the Pentateuch, is well founded. In itself, such a theory is eminently reasonable, and is both in harmony with the usage and methods of ancient composition, and affords ground for additional confidence in the good faith and reliability of the transmission of the whole.

V. Relation to the Book of Jgs.—A comparison of the history recorded in Josh with that account in Jgs furnishes 1. Parallel ground for believing that a detailed or chronological narrative was not constructed by the writer of the former, but was derived from the latter himself. The introductory vs of Jgs (1-25) are in part a summary of incidents recorded in Josh, and in part supply new details or present a different view of the whole. The original notices which are added relate almost entirely to the invasion and conquest of Southern Pal by the united or allied tribes of Judah and Simeon and the destruction of Bethel by the "house of Joseph." The action of the remaining tribes is narrated in a few words, the brief record closing in each case with a reference to the condition of servitude to which the inhabitants of the land were reduced. And the general scheme of the invasion as there represented is apparently that of a series of disconnected raids undertaken by the several tribes independently, each having for its object the subjection of the territory assigned to the individual tribe. A general and comprehensive plan of conquest under the supreme leadership of Joshua appears to be entirely wanting. In other words, the only real inconsistency between the two narratives would appear to be that in Jgs (1:21) the failure to expel the Jebusites from Jerus is laid to the account of the Benjamites, while in Josh (15:63) it is charged against the children of Judah. The difficulties in the way of the formation of a clear conception of the incidents attending the capture of Jerus are perhaps insuperable upon any hypothesis; and the variation of tribal names in the two texts may be no more than a copyist's error.

A perhaps more striking omission in both narratives is the absence of any reference to the conquest of Central Pal. The narrative of the overthrow of Bethel and Ai (6:1-8) is followed by the record of the building of an altar on Mt. Ebol and the recitation of the Law before the people of Israel assembled in front of Mts. Ebol and Gerizim (8:30 ff). Joshua then turns to the defeat of the Amorites, in the Amorite kings, and completes the conquest of the southern country as far south as Kadesh-barnah (10:41).

Immediately thereafter he is engaged in overthrowing a confederacy in the far north (11:1-15), a work which clearly could not have been undertaken or successfully accomplished, unless the central region had been already subdued; but of its reduction no account is given. It has been supposed that the silence of the narrator is an indication that at the period of the invasion this district was in the occupation of tribes friendly or even related to the Israelite clans; and in support of the conjecture reference has been made to the mention of Israel on the stele of Merenptah, the Egypt ruler in whose reign, according to the most probable view, the exodus occurred. The record of the nation or a part thereof is regarded as already settled in Pal at a date earlier by half a century than their appearance under Moses and Joshua on the borders of the Promised Land. The statement, however, is to be explained hardly plausible. The defects of the historical record are irreparable at this distance of time, and it must be acknowl-
edged that with the available material no complete and consistent narrative of the events of the Israelite conquest of Canaan can be constructed.

VI. Place of Josh in the Heb Canon.—In the Heb Canon Joshua is the first in order of the prophetic books, and the first of the group of 4, viz., Josh, Jgs, S, K, which form the 'Earlier Prophets' (which we read in the LXX.) These books, the contents of which are history, not prophecy in the ordinary sense of the term, were assigned by the Jews to the 2d division of their sacred Canon, and found a place by the side of the great writings of the 'Later Prophets' (which we read in the MT.) This position was given to them in part perhaps because they were believed to have been written or composed by prophets, but mainly because Jewish history was regarded as in purpose and intent 'prophetic,' being directed and preserved over by Jehovah, and conveying direct spiritual instruction and example. The Canon of the Law, moreover, was already closed; and however patent and striking might be the resemblance of Joshua in style and method of composition to the books of the Pent., it cannot be said that it, or any of them, were admitted into the Canon, or to give place within the Torah, a group of writings which were regarded as of Mosaic authorship, to a narrative of events which occurred after Moses' death.

Later criticism reviewed and reversed the verdict as to the 'true character of Joshua.' In every Canon except the Heb, its historical nature was recognized, and the work was classified accordingly. Modern criticism has gone further, and, with increasing consciousness of its close literary relationship to the rest of the OT, it has united it with them in a Hexateuch, or even under the more comprehensive title of the Pentateuch combines together the books of Jgs and Ruth with the preceding six on the ground of similarity of origin and style.

VII. Greek and Other Ancient Versions.—In the ancient OT of Joshua there is not much that is of interest. The Gr text bears witness to a Heb original differing little from the MT. In their renderings, however, and general treatment of the Heb text, the translators seem to have felt themselves at liberty to take up a position of greater independence and freedom than in dealing with the 5 books of the Law. Probably also the rendering of Joshua into Gr. is not to be ascribed to the same authors as the tr. of the Pent. While faithful to the Heb, it is less constantly and exactly literal, and contains many slight variations, the most important of which are found in the last 6 chs.

Ch 19: The LXX transposes vs 47-48, and, omitting the first clause of ver 47, refers the whole to the sons of Judah, without mention of Din; it further adds vs 47a. 48a on the relation between the Amorites and Ephraim, and the Amorites and the Danites respectively. With ver 47f of ch 19, 10 and Jgs 1:29, and with ver 48a of ch 19 (Heb) and Jgs 1:34.

Ch 20: Vs 4-6 inclusive are omitted in B, except a clause from B, A, however, inserts them in full. In Dv. Dv. Dv. 127, 129, who, on the ground of their Deuteronomic tone, regards it as probable that the verses are an addition to P, and therefore did not form part of the original text as used by the Gr translators.

Ch 21: Vs 36, 37, which give the names of the Levitical cities in Judah, is omitted in the Heb printed text although found in many Heb MSS. Four vs also are added after ver 31, which repeat 19 50f., and to the last is a reminiscence of 5 3.

Ch 24: Vs 29f. which narrate the death and burial of J., are transposed from the last place by the Gr, after ver 31; and a verse is inserted after ver 30 that the stone knives used for the purposes of circumcision (5 2ff) were placed with Joshua in his tomb (ch 21 42). After ver 33 also two new verses appear, apparently a miscellany from chap. 14, with a statement of the death and burial of Phinehas, son and successor of Eleazar, of the idolatrous worship by the children of Israel of Ashtaroth and Asherah, and the oppression under King, king of Moab.

The other VSS, with the exception of Jerome's tr from the Heb, are secondary, derived meditatively through the LT. The Old Lat. is contained in a manuscript at Lyon, Cairo, Lake Kuztef. A Sam tr also is known, for parts of which at least an early origin and an independent derivation from the Heb have been claimed. The ancient character of the version, however, is contested, and it has been shown that the arguments on which reliance was placed to justify the conclusions drawn. The tr appears to be in reality of quite recent date, and to have been made originally from the Arab., perhaps in part compared with and corrected by the MT. The subject was fully and conclusively discussed by W. Yedua of Berdan, at the Oriental Congress in the summer of 1908, and in a separate pamphlet published under the title "The authorship of the version was still living, and his name was given. Dr. Gaster, the original discoverer of the Sam MS, in various articles and letters maintains his contention that the tr is really antique, and therefore of great value, but he has failed to convince scholars (see M. Gaster in JQR, 1908). The text of the MS was published by Dr. Gaster in JDQ, 1909, 209 ff., with Eng rendering and notes in FDAS, XXXI (1909), 113 f., 149 ff."

VIII. Religious Purpose and Teaching.—As a whole, then, Joshua is dominated by the same religious and hortatory purpose as the earlier writings of the Pent., and in this respect as well as in authorship and structure the classification which assigns it to the same side by the side of the rest of the OT is justified. The whole of this book is the Hexateuch, or even under the more comprehensive title of the OT, combines together the books of Jgs and Ruth with the preceding six on the ground of similarity of origin and style.

The Divine leading in history is the first thought with the writer. And the record of Israel's past presents itself as of interest to him, not because it is a record of events that actually happened, but because he sees in it the ever-present guidance and overruling determination of God, and would draw from it instruction and warning for the men of his own time and for those that come after him. Not the history itself, but the use that is made of it, and the value that history are of value. Its importance lies in the illustrations it affords of the controlling working of a Divine Ruler who is faithful to His promises, loving righteousness and hating iniquity, and swaying the destinies of men in truth. Thus the selection of materials, and the form and arrangement of the book are determined by a definite aim: to set forth and enforce moral lessons, and to exhibit Israel's past as the working out of a Divine purpose which has chosen the nation to be a channel of the Divine favor, and the instrument for the carrying forward of His purposes upon earth.


A. S. GEDEN

Josiah, Book of Josiah

Joshua, Book of Josiah

I. SOURCES FOR HIS LIFE AND TIMES

1. Annals of the Kings.

2. Prophetic History.

3. Memorial History.

4. The Prophetic Remains of Josiah.
II. Traits of His Reign

1. Situation at the Beginning

The name given 6 years before the death of his grandfather Manasseh resumes the Judaic custom, suspended in the case of that king and Amnon, of compounding royal names with that of Jeh; perhaps a hint of the time, when, according to the Chronicler, Manasseh rejected Jeh's claim on his realm (2 Ch 33:12,13). One of the most eminent of the kings of Judah; came to the throne at 8 years of age and reigned 637-608 BC.

2. Finding of the Law

(a) The earliest history (2 K 23:22) (34,35), written from the developed ecclesiastical point of view, is considerably idealized; the festal and ceremonial aspects of his reform are more fully detailed, and the story of his campaign and death is more sympathetically told in the sense of it as a great national calamity.

(b) The general atmosphere of his time and the prophetic consciousness of a day of wrath impending, the prophet Zephaniah is illustrative, e.g. for the first half of the reign. Jeremiah, born about the same time as J., began prophesying in the 13th year of the reign (Jer 1:2). His intimate connection with state affairs, however, belongs to succeeding reigns; but some propheticus of his, notably those revealing his attitude towards the festal and ceremonial aspects of his reform are more fully detailed, and the story of his campaign and death is more sympathetically told in the sense of it as a great national calamity.

3. Memorial

(a) Josiah's death.—Until his 18th year 2 K 22:10, naming his successor Shalum (Jehoahaz) as a fitter subject. The laments which became "an ordinance in Israel" (2 Ch 35:25) are not to be referred to the Scripture book of that name; which has no hint of J., unless Lam 4:20 be so construed.

(b) The prophetic component of the funds for that purpose, Hilikiah also delivered to Shaphan a book which he had found in the "house of Jeh," that is, in the temple proper; which book, when Shaphan read therein to the king, caused the latter to rend his robe and cloth in dismay and consternation. It was a book in which were commands of Jeh that had long been unknown or disregarded, and along with these, fearful curses to follow the infraction of them. Such a discovery could not be treated lightly; as one might spurn a prophet or priest; say, it immediately called the authority of the prophet into requisition. The king sent a deputation to Huldah the prophetess for her verdict on the book; and she, whether aware of its contents or not, assured him that the curses were valid, and that for impieties against which the prophets continually warned, all the woes written in the book were impending. One of the most venerated Bih. scholars has centered round the question what that book was, what its origin, and how it came there in the temple. The Chronicler says roundly it was "the book of the law of Jeh by the hand of Moses." That it was familiar to the nation's great first prophet and lawgiver was the implicit belief of the king and all his contemporaries. There can be little doubt, judging from the nature of the reforms it elicited and the fact that the curses it contained are still extant, that this "book of the law" was virtually identical with our Book of Deut. But is this the work of Moses, or the product of a later literary activity? In answer, it is fair to say that it is so true to the soundest interpretation of the spirit and power of Moses that none need be in haste in calling it genuinely Mosaic, whatever adaptations and supplementations its laws received after his time. Its highly developed style, however, and an imperfect conformity to the nomadic conditions of Moses' time, make so remote an origin of its present form very doubtful. It comes to us as the matured skill of Israel's literary prime, in a time too soon, when we know (see under Hezekiah), men of letters were keenly interested in rescuing and putting to present use the literary treasures of their past. As to how it came to be lost for a time so much before its discovery that none questioned its being what it purported to be, each
scholar must answer for himself. Some have conjectured that it may have been a product of Solomon's time, and deposited, according to immemorial custom in temple-building, in the foundation of Solomon's temple, where it it was believed that certain ruins made repairs necessary. To the present writer it seems likelier that it was one of the literary products of Hezekiah's time, compiled from scattered statutes, precedents, and customs long in the keeping—or rather, neglect—of priests and judges, put into the attractive form of oratory, and thus it tendered to its providential moment. See further, Deuteronomy;

J's immediate procedure was to call to the temple a representative assemblage—elders, prophets, priests, populace—and to read to them this "book of the covenant" (2 K 23 2). Then he made a solemn Reform covenant before Jehovah to obey it, and all the people stood to the covenant.

So, perhaps for the first time, the people of Judah and Israel had for their guidance not only the case decisions of judges and priests, nor only the emergency warnings and predictions of prophets, but a written and accessible document, covering in a large degree their history, the attack of the heathen and religious life. One of the most momentous productions of all history, the book became the constitution of the Jewish race; nor were its noble provisions superseded when, centuries later, the thrones of race were broken and a Christian civilization came into its heritage. But the book that was destined to have so large a significance in all coming history had its immediate significance too, and never had this been so pressing. J's consternation arose from the sense of how much of the nation's obvious duty had been left undone and unregarded. First of all, they had through heedless years and ages drifted into a medley of religious ideas and customs which had accumulated until all this lumber of Manasseh's idolatry was upon them. Hezekiah had tried to clear away some of its most crude and superstitious elements (see under Hezekiah), but he was handicapped by the lack of its clear issue and objective, which now this book supplied. Zephaniah and what J's will was (Zeph 1 2-6); there must be a clean sweep of the debasing and obscuring cults, and the purgation must be done to stay. So J's first reforming step was to break up the high places, the numerous temples of the idols, and the symbols and utensils of the idolatrous shrines and rites, and to defile them past resurrection. His zeal did not stop with Jerusalem and Judea; he went on to Bethel, which had been the chief sanctuary of the now defunct Northern Kingdom, and in his work here was recognized the fulfilling of an old prophecy dating from the time of its first king (2 K 23 17; cf 1 K 13 1.2). This necessitated the concentration of public worship in the temple at Jerusalem, and in Dt was found the warrant for this, in the precept, natural to Moses' point of view, that the worship of Israel must have a single center as it had in the wilderness. From this negative procedure he went on to the positive measure of reviving the festival services inseparable from a religion requiring purgature, instituting a grand Passover on a scale unheard of since the time of the Judges (2 K 23 21.22), a feature of his reform on which the Chronicler dwells with peculiar zest (2 Ch 35 1-15). Thus both in the idolatries that had drifted into the aspect of priestly and prophetical life, they were committed to a definite and documented issue; this it was which made J's reform so momentous. That the reform seemed after J's untimely death to have been merely outward, is what might reasonably be expected from the inactivity of the unspirituality that it must encounter. Jeremiah had small faith in its saving power against the stubborn perversity of the people (Jer 11 1-14); and the historian of 2 K intimates that more than the piety of a zealous king was needed to turn away the stern decree of Jehovah's anger (2 K 23 26-27). In spite of all hardness and apostasy, however, the nation that had once "stood to the covenant" of Dt could never again be at heart the nation it was before.

Ardent and pious as he was, there seems to have been a lack of balance in J's character. His extreme dismay and dread of the curse 4. Disaster pronounced on the realm's neglect of its law (Deut 28). He had already achieved success in the Northern Kingdom, apparently cherished inordinate dreams of invincibility, and went forth with a small armed body to lead the army of Jeh's nation to its triumph through the northern provinces. At the first onset he was killed, and his expedition came to nothing. In his untimely death the fervid hopes of the pious received a set-back which was long lamented, as one of the cardinal disasters of Israel. It was a sore calamity, but also a stern education. Israel must learn not only the enthusiasm but also the prudence and wisdom of its new-found faith.

(2) A contemporary of Zech (Zec 8 10), at whose house J çer the prophet met some returned Jews from Babylon.

JOHN FRANKLIN GENUNG

JOSIAH, jos-i-atas (TR 'Jevas, ḫevas; WH ḫevas, 'Josiph')

(1) Gr form in AV of Josiah (Mt 1 10.11; cf 1 Esd 1; Bar 1 8), king of Judah.

(2) In 1 Esd 8 33 AV for JESIAS (q.v.).

JOSIBIAH, jos-i-bit. See JOSHEBIAH.

JOSIPHIAH, jos-i-i-fi (Pi, yēsiphā, "Jeh adds"); Found in Exr 8 10, where MT is "and of the sons of . . . Shelomith the son of Josiphiah." With the Heb. name Josiah, J was supplanted by the unpointed text as "the sons of!" and was omitted through haplography) can be supplied above before "Shelomith." J is thus the father of Shelomith, one of Ezra's companions. 1 Esd 8 36 has "Josiphas.

JOT, jot: "Jot" (RV, later edd of AV) is a corruption of iota (early edd of AV, Geneva, Rheims, Bishops—pronounced i-tet), an Eng. transliteration of ἴτα, iōta, the 9th letter of the Gr alphabet (Mt 5 18 ). "Iota," in turn, is the nearest Gr equivalent for the Heb yōḏ ( ), the smallest letter of the Heb alphabet, in NT times being little larger than an Eng. accent ( ). The little (q.v.) is the smallest part of a letter (not part of a letter); however. Consequently, thinking of the law as written out, the sense of Mt 6 17, is: "From this code, so written, not the smallest letter nor part of a letter—not an 'i' nor the crossing of an 'i'—shall be shamed or left undone for things come to pass by the law." (For the meaning, see LAW.) The reference is to the synagogue rolls, which were written in Heb, so that the passage has no bearing on the language used by Christ. For the form of the "jot," of the tables in HBD, art. "Alphabet," more fully in Chwolson, Corp. Inscription. Heb. (1882). See TITLE.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON
JOTAPATA, jô-tap’-a-ta (BJ, III, iii, 7). See JOTABATH.

JOTBAH, jôt’ba (יֹתְבָּה, yôtbah, “pleasantness”): The home of Meshullemeth, the mother of King Amon, daughter of Haruz (2 K 21 19). It may be the same as JOTBATHE (q.v.).

JOTBATHE, jôt’ba-thë (יֹתְבַתְי, yôtbathe): A desert camp of the Israelites between Hor-hagidgad and Abnoua (Nu 33 33-34; Dt 10 7). It was “a land of brooks of water” (Dt 10 7). Site is unknown. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

JOTHAM, jô-thâm (יוֹתָחָם, yôthâm), “Jeh is perfect”; ’îshtâh, 1 Is. 1:4): (1) The youngest son of Gideon-Jerubbaal, the sole survivor of the massacre of his seventy brothers by Abimelech (Jgs 9 5), and by (8 22) the legitimate ruler of Shechem after their death. Recognizing that he was the only prince capable of asserting his claim, J. delivers from the summit of Gerizim his famous fable (9 7-15), applies it to the situation in hand, and then flees for his life to Beer (ver 21). Now Jotham’s name is told of him, but the downfall of Abimelech is referred in part to his “curse” (ver 57). The fable tells of the kingship of the trees which, after having been declared by all useful plants, was finally offered to the bramble. The latter, inflamed by its uselessness and pov- pously offers its “shade” to its faithful subjects, while threatening all traitors with punishment (brambles carry forest fires), quite in the manner of an oriental monarch on assuming the throne. Having thus parodied the relationship of the worthless Abimelech to the Shechemites, J. ironically wishes both parties joy of their bargain, which will end in destruction for all concerned. Otherwise the connection between the fable and its application is loose, for, while the fable depicts the king- ship as refused by all properly qualified persons, in the application the Shechemites are upbraided for their treachery and their murder of the rightfull heirs. In fact, the fable taken by itself would seem strang to protest against kings as a class (cf 1 S 8 10-18; 12 19, etc); so it is possible that either the fable or its application has become expanded in transmission. Or an older fable may have been used for the sake of a single salient point, for nothing is said of the bramble’s having been refused the kingship.

BUTON SCOTT EASTER (2) Twelfth king of Judah, son of Uzziah and Jeruha, daughter of Zadok (2 K 15 8-23; 2 Ch 27 1-9). J. was 25 years of age

1. Accession at the time of his father’s attack and leprosy, and was at once called upon to take the administration of the kingdom (2 K 15 6; 2 Ch 26 1). In doing this he not only judged the people of the land by presiding at the administration of justice, but also was over the household of the king, showing how complete was the isolation of his father. He was thus king in all but name, and is invariably spoken of as reigning in Jerus. His reign lasted for 16 years (2 K 16 3; 2 Ch 27 1), 759-744 (others put later). While the father loved husbandry and had much cattle (2 Ch 26 10)—external affairs with which he could occupy himself in his retirement—to the son fell the stern duties and heavier responsibilities of the state. The relation between father and son is well brought out in the Chronicler’s account of the Amonite war. In 2 Ch 26 8 we are told that “the Ammonites gave tribute [AV “gifts”] to Uzziah, such gifts being compulsory, and of the nature of tribute. In 2 Ch 27 5 we are told that the actual conquest of Ammon was made by J., and that for 3 successive years he compelled them to pay an annual subsidy of 100 talents of silver and 10,000 “cords” each of wheat with barley (the eor [Heb kor] Ammon about 10 bushels). The campaign on the E. of the Jordan was the only one in which J. took part, but as the state suffered no loss of territory during his regency, the external provinces must have been strongly held and well governed.

It is probable that before attempting to win any extension of territory, J. had spent some years in completing the unfinished building

2. The War silver and 10,000 “cords” each of wheat

with barley (the eor [Heb kor] Ammon about 10 bushels). The campaign on the E. of the Jordan was the only one in which J. took part, but as the state suffered no loss of territory during his regency, the external provinces must have been strongly held and well governed.

3. Jotham’s schemes in which his father was en-Change and building gained at the time of his affilition. Operations Like him, he became an enthusiastic builder (2 Ch 27 3). He is rec-orded to have had built towers, castles and cities, and specifically to have completed the Ophel wall in Jerus, which is still standing to the S. of the Haram area. But the crowning architectural glory of his reign was the completion of the temple court by erecting, or setting up, the upper gate of the temple of Jeh” (ver 23). The fable of Jotham is known, as it bears the same name and place in the Herodian temple as in each of its predecessors. It stood facing the S., and was on higher ground than any other of the temple gates. Hence its name. It gave entrance to that upper court of the temple, mentioned in J er 36 10, where it is spoken of as “the new gate of Jeh’s house.” As Jeremiah began his ministry about a century after J.’s death, Jereme-iah’s use of the name commemorates the fact that the gate was not built till long after the other parts of the structure.

During J.’s regency, a formidable combination of the Northern Kingdom and the Syrian state, with Damascus as capital, began to show signs of hostility to Judah. For 4 Syrian years before J.’s death, Pekah occupy League the throne of Samaria. The Assy king, Tiglath-pileser III, was then pushing his arms westward, and a Syrian league was formed to oppose them. J. may have refused to join this league. The situation at his death is thus described: “In those days Jeh began to send against Judah Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah” (2 K 15 37).

J.’s character is represented in a moderately favorable light, being put to his credit that he did not enter the temple (2 Ch 27 2). The wisdom and vigor of his administration, and of his policy for the defense of the country, are recognized. It was owing to his com-}
JOY, joy (יוֹבָא, simḥāh; χαρά, chārā). The idea of joy is expressed in the OT by a wealth of synonymous terms that cannot easily be differentiated.

1. Terms. The commonest is simḥāh (1 Sam 18:6, etc.), variously td in EV "joy," "gladness," "mirth;" from simḥ ('to be bright'), properly "to be bright," "to shine" (Prov 13:9, etc.). The cognate root (Mic 4:3, etc.) is the righteous (in LXX "his bright''), but generally used fig. "to rejoice," "be glad" (Lev 23:40 and very frequent).

Other nouns are māḏāh and sāḏōn, both from 'āš, properly "to spring," "leap," hence "exult," "rejoice;" (ev "grand," "grace"). But we have also agállias, which expresses "exultation," "exultation," (not used in classical Gr. but often in LXX; in the NT, Lk 1:14-16; Acts 2:46; James 1, Heb 5:9), and the corresponding vb. agállō ("exult," "to exult, rejoice excessively" (Mt 5:12, etc.). In EV we sometimes "to joy" (now obsolete as a vb. and in an intransitive sense "to rejoice" (Hab 3:18; 2 Cor 7:13, etc.).

Besides joy in a general sense, as the response of the mind to any pleasurable event or state (1 K 1:40; Est 8:17, etc.), joy as a religious emotion is very frequently referred to in the OT. Religious contrast to the conceited emotion as touching the deepest springs of emotion, including the feeling of exultant gladness which often finds outward expression in such actions as leaping, shouting, and singing. Joy is repeatedly shown as the natural outgrowth of fellowship with God. "In thy presence is fulness of joy; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps 16:11; cf vs 8,9). God is at once the source (Ps 4:7; 51:12) and the object (Ps 33:9; Isa 29:19) of religious joy. The phrase "to rejoice, the glad'" in Jnh" and similar expressions are of frequent occurrence (e.g. Ps 97:12; 119:2; Isa 61:10; Zec 10:7). Many aspects of the Divine character call forth this emotion, such as His lovingkindness (Ps 21:6; 31:7), His salvation (Ps 21:11; Isa 5:9; Hab 3:18), His laws and statutes (Ps 1:2; 119 passim), His judgments (Ps 48:11), His words of comfort in dark days (Jer 15:15,16). The fundamental fact of the sovereignty of God, of the equity of the Divine government of the universe, is a pious joyous sense of security in life (Ps 93:1; 96:10; 97:1) which breaks forth into songs of praise in which even inanimate Nature is poetically called upon to join (Ps 96:11-13; 98:4-9). In the case of those who held such views of God, it was natural that the service of God should eliciting a joyous spirit ("I will offer in his tabernacle sacrifices of joy," Ps 27:6; cf 1 Ch 29:9), a spirit which is abundantly manifest in the jubilant shouting with which religious exultation and exulting of joy is described. God is frequently "rejoicing in his work" (Ps 104:31; Gen 1:31), and over His people "for good" (Dt 30:9). "He will rejoice over thee [Zion] with joy; he will rest in his love; he will joy over thee with singing" (Zeph 3:17).

Such noble and vivid anthropomorphisms are a nearer approach to the truth than the abstract doctrine of the impassibility of God which, owing to Platonistic influences, dominated the theology of the early Christian centuries.

The element of joy in religion is still more prominent in the NT. It is the appropriate response of those who believe to the good tidings of the "good news" which constitute the main content of the NT (Lk 2:10). In the four Gospels, esp. Lk, this element is conspicuous. It is seen in the canticles of Lk 1 and 2. It is both exemplified in the life and character, and set forth in the teaching of Jesus. The New Testament contains the most striking instances that, in spite of the profound elements of grief and tragedy in His life, His habitual demeanor was gladness and joy, certainly not gloomy or ascetic: such as, His description of Himself as the Bridegroom (Jn 3:29) and even His interrupting of a prayer (Mt 14:23) that He came "eating and drinking," giving occasion to the charge that He was a "gluttonous man and a winebibber" (Mt 11:19); His "rejoicing in the Holy Spirit" (Lk 10:21); the fact that He came to "eat and drink," to be "rejoicing, and be exceeding glad" (Mt 14:21); also a more exuberant state of joy, which is in sharp contrast to the conception of His disciples in the hypocrites (6:16) ("Rejoice, and be exceeding glad." 6:12). This spirit is reflected in many of the parables. The discovery of the true treasure of life brings joy (Mt 13:44). The three parables in Lk 16 reveal that the joy of the disciples that He was not only to be "blessed" but to be "begotten" at the marriage (Mt 20:28) and still more on the day of Pentecost when he entered into light, and afterward remained a marked characteristic of the early church (Acts 2:46; 8:39; 13:52; 15:3). Paul speaks of the joy of one who gives to God, and of "joy in the Holy Spirit" as an essential mark of the kingdom of God (Rom 14:17). This joy is associated with faith (Phil 1:25), hope (Rom 5:2; 12:12), brotherly fellowship and sympathy (Rom 12:15; 2 Cor 7:13; Phil 2:1). To "rejoice in the Lord" is enjoined as a Christian duty (Phil 3:1; 4:4; cf 2:17; 1 Thes 5:16). In Christ, the Christian "rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory." (1 Pet 1:8), in spite of his temporary afflictions (ver 6), viewing the suffering of God as a "partaking in the sufferings of Christ that knows no gloom, but is the result of the triumph of faith over adverse and trying circumstances, which, instead of hindering, actually enhance it (Acts 5:41; Rom 6:3; 1 Pet 4:13; cf Mt 5:11,12). Even Our Lord Himself for "the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame" (He 12:2).

JOZABAD, jōz-abad (גּוֹזָבָד, yôzəḇāḏāh; "Jeh" has been met). (1) A Gederathite, and one of David's recruits at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:4 [Heb 5]). He is named with the Benjamites, but possibly he was a native of the town Gedara in Southern Judah. See Curtis, Ch. 196.

(2) (3) Two Manassite captains who joined David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12:20 [Heb 21]).
The institution of the Jubilee Year should become the means of fixing the price of real property (25 15 f; cf vs 25–28); moreover, it should exclude the possibility of selling any piece of land permanently (26 23).

Property—the next verse furnishing the name: "The land is mine, and you are strangers and sojourners with me." The same rule was to be applied to dwellings-houses outside of the walled cities (26 31), and also to the houses owned by Levites, although they were built within walled cities (ver 32).

In the same manner the price of Heb slaves was to vary according to the proximity of the Jubilee Year (26 47–54). This passage deals with the enrolling of a Hebrew by a foreigner living among the Jews; it goes without saying that the same rule would hold good in the case of a Hebrew selling himself to one of his own people.

In 27 17–25 we find a similar arrangement respecting such lands that were "sanctified unto Jehovah". In all these cases the original owner was at liberty to redeem his property at any time, or have it redeemed by some of his nearest relatives (26 25–27.29.48 ff; 27 19).

The crowning feature, though, was the full restitution of all real property in the Jubilee Year. The primary object of this regulation was, of course, the reversion of all hereditary property to the family which originally possessed it, and the reestablishment of the original arrangement regarding the division of the land. But that was not all; for this legal disposition and regulation of external matters was closely connected with the high calling of the Jewish people. It was a part of the Divine plan looking forward to the salvation of mankind. The deepest meaning of it (the Jubilee Year) is to be found in the ἀποκατάστασις τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀποκατάστασις τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e., in the restoring of all that which in the course of time was perverted by man’s sin, in the removing of all slavery of sin, in the establishing of the true liberty of the children of God, and in the delivering of the creation from the bondage of corruption to which it was subjected on account of man’s depravity (Rom 8 19 ff) (cf Keil, Michaelis, Bib. Archaeology).

In the Year of Jubilee a great feature of Jehovah’s favor is foreshadowed, that period which, according to Isa 61 1–3, shall be ushered in to all those that labor and are heavy laden, by Him who was anointed by the Spirit of the Lord Jehovah.

The Jubilee Year, being the crowning point of all Sabbatical institutions, gave the finishing touch as it were to the whole cycle of sabbatic years. It is, therefore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Lev 25 11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Lev 25 19–32. "And in the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 9th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years.

1. Personal Liberty—The import of this institution if we should apply it only to those who were to be freed from the bonds of physical servitude. Undoubtedly, they must have been the foremost in realizing its beneficial effects. But the law was intended to benefit all, the masters as well as the servants. They should never lose sight of their being brothers and citizens of the theocratic kingdom. They owed their life to God and were subject to His sovereign will. Only through loyalty to Him were they free and could ever hope to be free and independent of all other masters.

2. Restitution—The Jubilee Year defined.

3. The Simple Life—fore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Lev 25 11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Lev 25 19–32. "And in the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 9th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years.
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THE INHERITANCE OF THE SABBATH YEAR

The Jubilee Year defined.

Simple Life—fore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Lev 25 11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Lev 25 19–32. "And in the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 9th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years.

1. Personal Liberty—The import of this institution if we should apply it only to those who were to be freed from the bonds of physical servitude. Undoubtedly, they must have been the foremost in realizing its beneficial effects. But the law was intended to benefit all, the masters as well as the servants. They should never lose sight of their being brothers and citizens of the theocratic kingdom. They owed their life to God and were subject to His sovereign will. Only through loyalty to Him were they free and could ever hope to be free and independent of all other masters.

2. Restitution—The Jubilee Year defined.

3. The Simple Life—fore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Lev 25 11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Lev 25 19–32. "And in the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 9th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years.

1. Personal Liberty—The import of this institution if we should apply it only to those who were to be freed from the bonds of physical servitude. Undoubtedly, they must have been the foremost in realizing its beneficial effects. But the law was intended to benefit all, the masters as well as the servants. They should never lose sight of their being brothers and citizens of the theocratic kingdom. They owed their life to God and were subject to His sovereign will. Only through loyalty to Him were they free and could ever hope to be free and independent of all other masters.

2. Restitution—The Jubilee Year defined.

3. The Simple Life—fore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Lev 25 11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Lev 25 19–32. "And in the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 9th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years.
the laying down of its moral and religious foundations. In this connection we must again refer to 25 18–22, "Who shall shew us the truth of God?"

The answer is very simple and yet of surpassing grandeur: "Then I will command my blessing upon you," etc. Nothing was expected of the people but faith in Jeh and confidence in His power, which was not to be shaken by any doubtful reflection. And right here we have found the root of the simple life: no life without the true God, and no simplicity of life without true faith in Him. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Mt 4 4; cf Dt 8 3).

We may well ask: Did the Jewish people ever observe the Jubilee Year? There is no reason why they should not have observed it in preexilic times (cf Lotz in New Sch-Herz, X, s.v. "Subsabatical Year" and "Year of Jubilee"). Perhaps they signally failed in it, and if so, we should not be surprised at all. Not that the institution in itself was cumbersome with any obstacles that could not have been overcome, but what is more common than unbelief and unwillingness to trust absolutely in Jeh? Or, was it observed in post-exilic times? Here, too, we are in the dark. There is, indeed, a tradition according to which the Jubilee Year has never been observed—neither in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah nor at any later period. The truth of this seems to be corroborated by the silence of Jos, who, while referring quite frequently to the sabbatic year, never once mentions the Year of Jubilee.

JUBILEES, BOOK OF. See Apocalyptic Literature.

JUCAI, jōo'kal. See JEHUCAL.

JUDA, jōo'da: Lk 1 39 AV, see JUTTAH; 3 26, see JODA; 3 30, see JUDAS.

JUDAEA, jōo-de'a, jōo-de'a (Jou'ba, Jou'data): The "land of the Jews," the Gr-Rom equivalent of Judah. As most of the Israelites returning from the captivity belonged to the tribe of Judah, they came to be called Jews and their land Judaea. In Tob 1 18 the name is applied to the old kingdom of Judah. For a general description of the physical geography and early history of this region see Judah. The limits of this district varied greatly, extending as the Jewish population increased, but in many periods with very indefinite boundaries.

Under the Pers empire, Judaea (or Judah) was a district administered by a governor who, like Zenobabel ( Hag 1 14; 2 2), was probably usually a Jew. Even as late as Judas Macabaeus, Hebron and its surroundings—the very heart of old Judah—was under the domination of the Edomites, whom, however, Judas conquered ( 1 Mac 5 65); in the time of his brother Jonathan (145 BC), three tetrarchies of Samaria, Aphaera, Lydda and Ramathaim, were added to Judaea (1 Mac 10 30 35; 11 34); in some passages it is referred to at this time as the "land of Judah" (Isa 8; 1 Mac 10 30 33 37). The land was then roughly limited by what may be called the "natural boundaries of Judah" (see Judah).

Strabo (xvi,11,21) extends the name Judaea to include practically all Pal; cf also Lk 4 44 M; Acts 1 13 37, etc. In several NT references ( Mt 4 25; Mk 1 5; 3 7; Lk 5 17; Jr 3 22; Acts 1 8), Judaea is contrasted with its capital Jerus. The country bordering on the shores of the Dead Sea for some miles inland was known as the "land of Judah" (see Judah; Jeshimon) ( Mt 3 1), or the "wilderness" ( Mk 1 4; Lk 3 2); here John the Baptist appeared as a preacher.

According to Mt 19 1 (but cf Mk 10 1, where RV has 'Judaea and beyond Jordan'), some cities beyond Jordan belonged to Judaea. That this was an actual fact we know from Ptolemy (v.16,9) and Jos (Ant, XII, iv, 11).

According to Jos (BJ, III, iii, 5), Judaea extended from Anathoth-Borkaes (i.e. Khan Berkti near Khan es S'deq, close to the most northerly frontier of Judah as described in Judah [v.c.]) to the village Jordan, possibly Tell Arad, near Arabia in the S. Its breadth was from Joppa in the W.

According to Lk 1 39 AV, see JUTTAH; 3 26, see JODA; 3 30, see JUDAS.

JUDAH, jōo'da (יהודה, y'hūdâh, "praised"): (1) 4th son of Jacob by Leah (see separate art.). (2) An ancestor of Kadmiel, one of those who had the oversight of the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 3 9). He is the same as Hodaviah (Ezr 2 40) and Hodevah ( Neh 7 43). (3) A Levite who had taken a strange wife (Ezr 10 28). (4) A Levite who came up with Zenobabel ( Neh 12 8). (5) A priest and musician who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerus ( Neh 12 36); (4), (5) may be the same person. (6) A Benjamite, the son of Hassenuah, who was second over the city of Jerus in the days of Nehemiah (Neh 11 9). (7) One of the princes of Judah who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerus (Neh 12 34).

S. F. HUNTER
JUDAH (יהודה), yhūdāh; in Gen 29 35 B, 'Ijośaś, iōdān, A, 'I[ošas, iōdā: elsewhere B and A, 'Ijośas, iōdās): The 4th son born to Jacob by Leah in Padan-aram (Gen 29 35, etc). Of this patriarch's only scanty details remain to us. He turned his brethren from their purpose to play Joseph, persuading them to sell to the Midianites at Dothan (37 26 ff). A dark stain is left upon his memory by the disgraceful story told in ch 38. Reuben forfeited the rights of primogeniture by an act of treachery; Simeon and Levi, who came next in order, were passed over because of their cruel and treacherous conduct at Shechem; to J., therefore, were assigned the honors and responsibilities of the firstborn (34; 35 22; 49 5 ff). On the occasion of their first visit to Egypt he was left behind, just as for his brethren (42 22,37). Then the leadership passed to J. (43 3, etc). The sons of Joseph evidently looked askance upon J.'s promotion, and their own claims to hegemony were backed by considered rivalry (42 22 ff). The rivalry between the two tribes, thus early visible, culminated in the disruption of the kingdom. To J., the "lion's whelp," a prolonged dominion was assured (49 16 f).

The tribe of Judah, of which the patriarch was the name-father, at the first census in the wilderness numbered 74,600 fighting men; in the census at Sinai the number "from 20 years old and upward" was 76,500 (Nu 1 27; 26 22; see Numbers). The standard of the camp of J., with which were also the tribes of Zebulun and Issachar, was to the E. of the tabernacle "toward the sunrise," the prince of J. being Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (2 3), Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, represented J. among the spies (13 6); he also was told off to assist at the future allocation of the tribal portions (34 19).

The land assigned to J. lay in the S. of Pal (see Judah, Territory of), comprising part of the mountain, the Shephelah, and the Judah, Kingdom of: I. CANAAN BEFORE THE MONARCHY
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I. CANAAN BEFORE THE MONARCHY—Some 4,000 years BC the land on either side of the valley of the Jordan was peopled by a race who, to whatever stock they belonged, was Semitic. It was not until about the year 2500 BC that the tide of Semitic immigration began to flow from North Africa into the countries watered by the Jordan and the Euphrates. It was on the first waves in this human tide consisted of the Philistines who settled in the S.W. on the Mediterranean; they were closely followed by other Can. tribes who occupied the country which long bore their name.

The Canaanites are known to us chiefly from the famous letters found at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt which describe the political state of the country during the years 1415-1360 BC—the years of the reigns of Amenophis III and Amenophis IV. Canaan was at this time slipping out of the hands of Egypt. The native princes were in revolt; trade was withered; and but few Egypt garrisons remained. Meanwhile a fresh tide of invasion was hurling its waves against the eastern frontiers of the land.

The Hebrews are so named by those of other nationality after one of the conqueror ancestors (Gen 10 24), or because they had come from beyond (ἐβλήτος) the Jordan or the Euphrates. Of themselves they called themselves as Israel. Israel was a name assumed by the Confederacy of the eponymous hero of the nation whose real name was Jacob. Similarly the Arabian prophets belonged to the tribe called from its ancestor Korasha, whose name Korash, was at the time Israel were a complex of some 12 or 13 tribes. These 12 tribes were divided into two main sections, one section tracing its descent from Leah, one of Jacob's wives, and the other section tracing its descent from Rachel, his other wife. The names of the tribes which claimed to be descended from Leah were Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, and, indirectly, Gad and Asher; those who claimed to be descended from Rachel were Joseph, which was divided into two clans; Ephraim and Manasseh, Benjamin, and, indirectly, Dan and Naphtali. The rivalry between these two great divisions ran all through the national history of the Hebrews, and was only brought to an end by the annihilation of one of the opposing factions (Isa 11 13). But not only was the Israelite nation divided into two rival groups, but there also, the 12 tribes of Israel were each divided into many clans; each clan in each tribe was itself divided into several more. The rivalry between these groups ran not only within each tribe, but between the tribes. The two great divisions, the tribe of Israel, and the tribe of Judah each to its own side, each tribe of Israel, and the tribe of Judah each to its own side, each tribe.

We find exactly the same state of things obtaining in the history of the Arabian conquests. All through that history there runs the rivalry between the two separate and irreconcilable accounts of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. According to the Book of Jos, it is said the
Invasion was a movement of the whole people of Israel under the leadership of Joshua; according to the Book of Joshua, it was a series of expulsions made from Canaan. Each tribe, in fact, the strongest tribes, was put to flight by the attack of another tribe, and in some cases, whole cities were destroyed. The question of why Israel was not allowed to enter Canaan at once is not answered by the Bible. The answer is that God wanted the Israelites to learn that He is a God of war, and that He would make them strong enough to conquer Canaan.

6. Early Rulers

(a) Judges

The Judges were a class of rulers in Israel who were elected by the people. They were not always approved of by the people, and the people were often disaffected. They were chosen from among the tribes, and their appointment was by lot. The Judges were responsible for maintaining justice and order in Israel, and they were often called upon to lead the Israelites in battle.

(b) Kings

The Kings of Israel were the rulers of the nation, and they were chosen by the people. The Kings were responsible for maintaining justice and order in Israel, and they were often called upon to lead the Israelites in battle. The Kings were also responsible for maintaining the alliance with Egypt and the other nations of the region.

7. The Judges

The Judges were a class of rulers in Israel who were elected by the people. They were not always approved of by the people, and the people were often disaffected. They were chosen from among the tribes, and their appointment was by lot. The Judges were responsible for maintaining justice and order in Israel, and they were often called upon to lead the Israelites in battle.

8. Hereditary Kings

The Hereditary Kings were the rulers of Israel, and they were elected by the people. The Hereditary Kings were responsible for maintaining justice and order in Israel, and they were often called upon to lead the Israelites in battle. The Hereditary Kings were also responsible for maintaining the alliance with Egypt and the other nations of the region.

II. The First Three Kings.

1. The Benjamite King

The Benjamite King was a king who was chosen by the people of Benjamin to lead them in battle. The Benjamite King was responsible for maintaining justice and order in Benjamin, and he was often called upon to lead the people of Benjamin in battle.

2. The Rachel and Leah Tribes

The Rachel and Leah Tribes were the two tribal unions that were formed after the death of Benjamin. The Rachel and Leah Tribes were responsible for maintaining justice and order in the two tribes, and they were often called upon to lead the people of the two tribes in battle.

3. The Deserts

The Deserts were the areas that were inhabited by the Israelites after they left Egypt. The Deserts were divided into two areas: the Northern Desert and the Southern Desert. The Northern Desert was inhabited by the Israelites, and the Southern Desert was inhabited by the Canaanites.

The international standard Bible encyclopedia Judah Judah, Kingdom
III. The Dual Monarchy.—Rehoboam made no decisive attempt to bring back the recalcitrant tribes to their allegiance (1 K 12:21 ff.), though the two countries made raids, one on the other. In the 30th year of his reign, on his own security he built numerous fortresses, the remains of some of which have, it is proven, been recovered within recent years (2 Ch 11:5 ff.). These excited the suspicion of Shishak of Egypt, who invaded the country and reduced it to vassalage (1 K 14:25 ff.). Under Rehoboam's son Abijah, actual war broke out between the two kingdoms (16:6 as corrected in ver. 7; 2 Ch 13). The war was continued during the long reign of his son Asa, whose opponent, Baasha, built a fort some 6 miles N. of Jerusalem in order to cut off that city from communication with the N. Asa confessed his weakness by appealing for help to Ben-hadad of Damascus. The end justified the means. The fort was demolished.

The reign of Asa is also remarkable for the first of those reformations of worship which recur at intervals throughout the history of the Southern Kingdom. The high places were not yet, however, considered illegitimate (1 K 16:14; but cf. 2 Ch 14:5). He, like his grandfather, was a builder of canals, and with a similar, though more fruitful, result (2 Ch 14:9-10). Asa's health and illness helped to bring to the rival kingdoms a peace which lasted beyond his own reign (1 K 15:23).

An effect of this peace is seen in the expanding foreign trade of the country under his successor Jehoshaphat. He rebuilt the navy as in the days of Solomon, but a storm ruined the enterprise (1 K 22:48).

4. Two Kingdoms Contrasted

at Peace
During this reign the two kingdoms came nearer being united than they had done since the disruption. This was not due largely to the Northern Kingdom having been greatly weakened by the wars with Syria and Assyria, and having given up the idea of annexing the smaller country. Moreover, Jehoshaphat had married his son Joram (Jehoram) to Ahab's daughter Athaliah. From a religious point of view, the two states reacted upon one another. Jehoram of Israel informed Jehoshaphat of the worship in the Northern Kingdom, and at the same time that of J. was brought into line with the practice of the sister kingdom (2 K 8:18). The peace, from a political point of view, did much to strengthen both countries, and enabled them to render mutual assistance against the common foe.

Up to the death of Jehoram of Israel, which synchronized with that of Joram and Ahaziah of J., 6 kings had reigned in J. Of these the first 4 died in their beds and were buried in their own mausoleum. During the same period of about 30 years there were in Israel 9 kings divided into 4 dynasties. The second king of the 1st Dynasty was immediately assassinated and the entire family annihilated. Precisely the same fate overtook the 2nd Dynasty. Then ensued a civil war in which two pretenders were killed, one perishing by his own hand. The 3rd Dynasty lasted longer than the first two and counted 4 kings. Of these one was defeated and killed in battle and another assassinated. The fate of the kings of Israel is very like that of the middle and later Abbasid caliphs. The murder of his brothers by the Judean Jehoram, a proceeding once regular with the suzerains of Turkey, must also be put down to the influence of his Islaedite wife.

It was obvious that a crisis was impending. Edom and Libnah had thrown off their allegiance, and the Philist had attacked and plundered Jeru, even taking king's prisoners, with the exception of the youngest (2 Ch 21:16). Moreover, the two kingdoms had become so closely united, not only by intermarriage, but also in religion and politics, that they must stand and fall together. The hurricane which swept away the northern dynasty also swept away the southern royal house more nearly connected with Ahab, and the fury of the queenmother Athaliah made the destruction complete (2 K 11:1).

For 6 years the daughter of Ahab held sway in Jerusalem. The only woman who sat on the throne of David was a daughter of the hated Ahab. In her uniqueness, she thus holds a place similar to that of Shejjer ed-Durr among the Memluk sultans of Egypt. The character of her reign is not described, but it can easily be imagined. She came to her inevitable end 6 years later.

7. Davidic House at Fez

8. Begins to Recover

9. Reviving and accession of Ben-hadad III led Fortunes to a revival in the fortunes of both of the Israelite kingdoms. The act of elecmeny with which Amaziah commenced his reign (2 K 14:5-6; Dt 24:13) in precisely similar contrast to the moral code which had come to prevail in the sister kingdom; and the story of his hiring mercenaries from the Ephraimitic kingdom (2 Ch 25:5-10) sheds a curious light on the relations subsisting between the two countries, and even on those times generally. It is still more curious to find him, some time after, seeking, without provocation, a challenge to Jehoshaphat; and the capture and release of Amaziah evinces some rudimentary ideas of chivalry (2 K 14:8 ff.). The chief event of the reign was the reconquest of Edom and taking of Petra (2 K 14:7).

The principle of the election of kings by the people was in force in Judah, although it seemed to be in
abeyance since the people were content to limit their choice to the Davidic line. But it was exercised when occasion required.

10. Monarchy Still Elective

Joash had been chosen by the populace, and it was they who, when the public discontent culminated in the accession of Amaziah, chose his 16-year-old son Uzziah (or Azariah) to succeed him.

The minority of the king involved something equivalent to a regency. As Jehoiahaz, at first carried on the government for Joash, Elah was assassinated under the tutelage of Zechariah (2 Ch 26 5), and the latter part of his reign was covered by the regency of his son Jotham.

It is obvious that with the unstable dynasties of the north, such government by deputy would have been impracticable.

The reign of Uzziah (2 Ch 26) was one of the most glorious in the annals of the Judaean kingdom. The Phœnis and southern Arabs, who had been so powerful in the time of David and Solomon, were subdued, and other Bedawin were held in check.

The frontiers were strengthened with numerous castles. Now that Edom was again annexed, the Red Sea trade was resumed. Irrigation was re-established, and the agriculture of the country were developed. Uzziah also established a standing army, properly equipped and trained. Artillery, in the shape of catapults and other siege engines, was manufactured. It is obvious that in this reign we have advanced far beyond the earlier and ruder times.

In this and the preceding reigns, we notice also how the priests are becoming a distinct and powerful caste. Zadok and Abiathar were in those early days invested with the duties and dignity of the Melchizedekian Priesthood.


The kings might at pleasure discharge the functions of the priest. But the all-powerful position of Jehoiahaz seems to have given the order new life; and in the latter part of the reign of Uzziah, king and priest come into conflict, and the king comes off second-best (2 Ch 26 16 ff).

Uzziah is the first king of J. to be mentioned in the Assyrian annals. He was fighting against 'Pal' in the years 747-740 B.C. He is said to have been a mighty warrior, and to have a thousand chariots and a hundred thousand horsemen.

14. Advent of Assyria

Great eastern power upon the scene of Assyria Judaean politics could end but in one way—as it was soon to do with Israel also. The reign of Jotham may be passed over as it coincided almost entirely with that of his father. But in the following reign we find J. already paying tribute to Assyria in the year of the fall of Damascus and the conquest of the East-Jordan land, the year 734 B.C.

During the regency of Jotham, the effeminacy and luxury of the Northern Kingdom had already begun to infect the Southern (Mic 1 9; 16. Judah a 6 16), and under the irresolute Ahaz Protocatece the declension went on rapidly. This rapprochement in morals and customs did not prevent Israel under Pekah joining with Rezin of Syria against J., with no less an object than to subvert the dynasty by placing an Aramean on the throne (Isa 7 6). What the result might have been, had not Isaiah taken the reins out of Ahaz' hands, it is impossible to say. As it was, J. felt the strain of the conflict for many a year. The country was invaded from other points, and many towns were lost, some of which were never recovered (2 Ch 23 7 ff).

The country was invaded from other points, and many towns were lost, some of which were never recovered (2 Ch 23 7 ff).

It was a part of the cosmopolitan tendencies of the time that the worship became tarnished with foreign innovations (2 K 16 10). The temple for the first time in its history was closed (2 Ch 28 17).

Altars of Baal were set up in all the towns.

16. Cosmo- a open spaces of Judas, each representing some urban god (Jer 11 13). About Tendencies the closing of the temple Isaiah would not be greatly concerned. Perhaps it was his suggestion (Isa 4). The priests who were supreme in the preceding reigns had lost their influence: their place had been taken by the prophets. The introduction of Baalism, however, was no doubt due to Ahaz alone.

IV. Period of Reformation

The following reign—that of Hezekiah—was, perhaps as a result of the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom, a period of reformation. Isaiah Indep- a is now supreme, and the history of the independent kingdom will be found in his biography.

It must have been with a sigh of relief that Hezekiah saw the Northern Kingdom disappear forever from the scene. The relations of the two countries had been too uniformly hostile to make that event anything but one for good. It was no doubt due to Isaiah that Hezekiah sought to recover the old independence of his country. Their patriotism was near to be their own undoing.

Sennacherib invaded Pal, and Hezekiah found himself a mere appendage of the superpower of Jerusalem. Isaiah's patriotism rose to the occasion; the invading armies melted away as by a miracle; J. was once more free (2 K 18 13 ff).

A curious result of Sennacherib's invasion was the disappearance of the high places where Levitical priests officiated in the

2. Reform opposition to those of the temple. Religion When the Judaean territories were limited to the city, these of necessity vanished, and, when the siege was over, they were not restored. They were henceforward regarded as illegal. It is generally held by scholars that this reform occurred later under Josiah, on the discovery of the 'Book of the Law' by Hilkiah in the temple (2 K 22 8), and that this book was Dt. The high places, however, are not mentioned in the law book of Dt. The reform was probably the work of Isaiah, and due to considerations of morals.

The Judaean had always had a friendly feeling toward Egypt. Egypt had come to be a rather petty nation, and the Egyptian power became threatening, it was to Egypt they turned for safety. Recent excavation and Judah has shown that the influence of Egypt upon the life and manners of Pal was very great, and that that of Assyria and Babylonia was comparatively slight, and generally confined to the N. In the reign of Hezekiah a powerful party proposed an alliance with Egypt with the view of checking the designs of Assyria (2 K 17 4; Isa 30 23; 31 1).

Hezekiah followed Isaiah's advice in rejecting all alliances.

The commercial and other ties which bound Pal to Egypt were much stronger than those between Pal and the East. One of the chief articles of trade of Pal was the trade in horses. This traffic had been begun by Solomon (1 K 10 26). The chief seat of the trade in Pal was Lachish (Mic 1 13).

In their nomadic state the Israelites had no horses, and the use of the horse was looked upon with suspicion by the prophets (Dt 17 16; Zec 9 10). When the horse is spoken of in the OT, it is as the chief weapon of the enemies of the nation (Ex 15 1), and commentators have considered this to have been because it was a sign of the absolute control of the nation over the nomadic tribes.

On the death of Hezekiah, the nation reverted to the culture and manners of the time of Ahaz and Manasseh, and even went farther than he in corrupt practices. The chief and despotic practice of sacrifice as a form of religious worship became common in Israel (Mic Manasseh 6 7). The influence for good of the prophets had gone (2 K 21). There is a curious story in 2 Ch 33 11 f that Manasseh
was taken captive by the Assyrians, and, after spending some time in captivity in Babylon, reformed and was restored to his throne. His son, however, prospered, and all these reforms, and public discontent grew to such an extent that he was assassinated (2 K 21 19 ff).

Once more the tide turned in the direction of reform, and on this occasion it rose higher than ever before. The reformation under Josiah was never again wholly undone. The enthusiasm of the iconoclasts carried them far beyond the frontiers of Judah (2 Ch 36 6), for on this occasion they were backed up by the newly found "Book of the Law." All boded well for a prosperous reign, but unforeseen disasters came from without. The Scythian invasion swept over Southwestern Asia (Jer 1 14–16; 6 1, etc.). The storm passed, and hope rose higher than before, for the power of Assyria had been shattered forever.

Already in 722, when Sargon seized the throne on the death of Shalmaneser, Babylonia had revolted, and crowned Marduk-baladan king (Isa 39 1). Hezekiah received a delegation from Marduk-baladan (2 K 20 12 ff.), no doubt in the hope of freeing himself from the Assyrian danger by an alliance. The revolt of Merodach-baladan was maintained for 12 years; then it was suppressed. There was, in fact, no place of Babylonia on the accession of Sennacherib, Sargon's son, in 705, which went on till 691, and the events referred to in 2 K 20 may have happened at this time, for Hezekiah's reign seems to have ended about 700.

Sennacherib was assassinated in 681 (Isa 37 38) and was succeeded by his son Esar-haddon, who rebuilt Babylon, razed to the ground by his father, and under whom the province remained quiet. In 674 hostilities with Egypt broke out, and that country was overrun, and Tirhakah (q.v.) was expelled in 670. Two years later, however, occurred the revolt of Egypt and the death of Esar-haddon. Assur-bani-pal succeeded, and Egypt regained her independence in 660. The revolt of Babylon, the incursion of the Scythians (Jer 1 14 ff.) and the death of Assur-bani-pal followed. Two more kings sat on the throne of Assyria, and the Nineveh that was taken by the combined Scythians (Mandor) and Babylonians (Herod. i 74; Nah; Zeph 2 13–15; Hab 1 5 ff.).

The Scythian tempest passed quickly, and when it was over the Assyrian peril was no more. Pharnah-necoh seized the opportunity to avenge the injuries of his country by the invasion of the erstwhile Assyrian territories. Josiah, pursuing the policy of alliance with Babylonia inaugurated by Hezekiah, endeavored to arrest his progress. He was defeated and mortally wounded at Megiddo (Zee 12 11).

By the foolhardy action of Josiah, J. lost its independence. The people, indeed, elected Jehohaz (Shallum) king, but he was immediately deposed and carried to Egypt (2 K 23 30). The people, however, chose Josiah's son, Jeconiah (Eliakim) as vassal-king. After the defeat of the Pharaoh at Carchemish, the old Hittite stronghold, by Nebuchadrezzar, Jehoiakim submitted, and became a dependency of Babylon. There must have been some return of prosperity. (Josiah's) name is honored for his luxury and extravagance and oppressive taxation (Jer 22 13 ff.), but the country was raided by the neighboring Bedawin (2 K 24 2), and Jehoiakim came to an untimely end (Jer 22 19).

The prophets were no longer, as under Hesekiah, all-powerful in the state. The influence of the court, the power of the temple, the favor of the people, were doubtless great but the majority

11. Prophets was against him. His program was to undo the reforms of Josiah, and to suppress the Abrahamic elements in the national religion. Soon after his return from shipwreck, Isaiah had preached reliance upon the national God and through it the political independence of the nation. It was the sad duty of Jeremiah to advise the surrender of the national independence to the newly risen power of Medo-Babylonia.

12. The Deportations

It was under him also that the first great deportation from the land occurred (Jer 22 4–5). The first deportation, of the sons of Zedekiah, was set on the throne under the title of Zedekiah. Against the advice of Jeremiah, this, the last king of J., declared himself independent of Babylon, and threw his lot with Egypt under the leadership of Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), thus securing his oath of fealty to the last Pharaoh. The siege of the city lasted two years. It was taken on the fatal 9th of Ab in the year 586. Zedekiah's family was put to the sword, and he himself was taken to Babylon. Egypt shared the fate of J., with whom she had been often so closely connected, and Hophra was the last of the Pharaohs.

The kingdom of J. had lasted 480 years, counting from its commencement, exactly twice as long as the kingdom of Israel, counting from the time when that kingdom is said to have been founded by Abraham (Gen 12). Time alone will tell whether this longer existence was due in the first place to the religious faith of the people. This is clear from the fact that the national religion not only survived the extinction of the nation, but spread far beyond its original territories and has endured down to the present day. But there were also circumstances which conspired to foster the growth of the nation in its earliest and most critical period. One of these was the comparative isolation and remoteness of the country. Neither the kingdom of Israel nor that of J. is for a moment to be compared to those of Egypt and Assyria. Even the combined kingdom under David and Solomon hardly deserves that comparison; and separate, the Northern Kingdom would be about the size of New Hampshire and the Southern Kingdom about that of Connecticut. The smaller kingdom survived the larger because it happened to be slightly farther removed from the danger zone. Even had the two kingdoms held together, it is impossible that they could have withstood the expansion of Assyria and Babylonia on the one side and of Egypt on the other. The Egyp party in Judean politics in the times of Isaiah and Jeremiah were so far in the right, that, if J. could have maintained her independence in alliance with Egypt, these two countries combined might have withstood the power of
JUDAH, TERRITORY OF (נְדָעָה), yehudah:—

1. Geographical Data.
she failed from the days of Joshua onward (see JERICHO). From Jericho four roads pass upward to the plateau of Judah; unless the corresponding passes on the western frontier, they do not traverse any definite line of valley, but in many places run across the hill country.

These roads are: (a) The earliest historically, though now the least frequented, is the most northerly, which passes westward at the back of ancient Jericho (near Ein Khetab) and ascends into Elusa (Moslem) and to Bethel: (b) the route traversed by the modern Jerus-Jericho road, to the Jordan, and the natural cleft which enters into this road are traversed by the hills with Wady Jureif Ghâlan and runs by Nebi Musa, joining the line of the modern carriage road or path, and is traversed by the deserted ruin of the Saracenic Al-Muntâr el-Ahmâr. Here runs the road for the thousands of pilgrims who visit the shrine of Nebi Musa in the spring. (d) The most natural pass of all is by way of Wady el-Kunéirah, across the open plateau of el-Buqatâ and over the shoulder of Jebel el-Muntâr to Bethlehem. From 'Ain Pesakhah a very steep road, probably ancient, ascends to join this last route in el-Bukèa.

Somewhere along these routes must have lain the "the road." And the "Wilderness of Jeruel," the scene of the events of 2 Chr 20. The hill country of Judah is distinguished from other parts of Pal by certain physical characteristics. Its central part is a long plateau—or really series of plateaus—running from the stony and barren and complicated with but scanty springs: "dess" is less plentiful than in the north; several of the elevated plains, e.g. about Bethlehem, Beth Jala, and Hebron, are well suited to the growth of corn and olive trees, in the sheltered valleys and on the terraced hill-laid hillsides to the W. of the water-parting, vines, olives, figs and other fruit trees flourish exceedingly. There is evidence everywhere that cultivation was far more highly developed in ancient times; on most of the hill slopes and in the W. the traces of ancient terraces can still be seen (see BOTANY). This district in many parts, esp. on its eastern slopes, is evidently a pastoral land, and flocks of sheep and goats abound, invading in the spring even the desert itself, visible from the environs of all Judah's greater cities and doubtless profoundly influencing the lives and thoughts of their inhabitants.

The altitude attained in this "hill country" is usually about 3,000 ft. in the north (e.g. Ramallah, 2,850 ft., Nebi Samwil, 2,935 ft.), but is higher near Hebron, where we get 5,545 ft. at Râmâl el Khallîl. Many would limit the term "hill country of Judaeas" to the higher hills centering around Hebron, but this is unnecessary. Jerus is situated near a lower and more expanded part of the plateau, while the higher hills to its north, are, like that city itself, in the territory of Benjamin.

II. The Tribe of Judah and Its Territory.—In Nu 26:15-22 we are enumerated "in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho" (ver 8), Judah is described as made up of the families of the Shelomites, the Perezites, the Zerethites, the Hezronites and the Hamulites. "The families of Judah according to the book of them that were numbered of them," a total of 76,500 (ver 22). In Jgs 1 10 we read that the Kenites united with the tribe of J. and from other references (Josh 14-6-15; 15-15-19; Jgs 1 12-15-20) we learn that the two Kenites, Caleb and Othniel also were absorbed; and it is clear from 1 S 27 10; 30 9 that the Jerahmeelites closely connected with the Calebites (of 1 Chr 2 42) also formed a part of the tribe of J. The Kenizzites and Kenites were probably of Edomite origin (Gen 36 11; cf 1 Chr 2, 22), and this large admixture of foreign blood may partly account for the complex isolation of J. from the other tribes (e.g. she is not mentioned in Jgs 5).

The territory of the tribe of J. is described ideally in Josh 15, but it never really extended over the maritime plain to the W. The natural boundary which have already been described as the frontiers of the "hill country"; to the S. the boundary was "even to the wilderness of Zin southward, at the uttermost part of the south." i.e. of the Negeb (ver 1), and from thence (3) as far south as Kadesh-barnea, "even to Aidas, 50 miles S. of Beersheba, far in the desert: the position of the boundary of Gebrah, i.e. of scorpions, is not known. The "Brook of Egypt" is generally accepted to be the Wady el-Arish. The fact is, the actual frontier shaded off imperceptibly into deserts, perhaps with the possibilities of agriculture and depending therefore upon the rainfall. The northern boundary, the mountains of Judah, has now, lost, probably roughly marked the edge of the habitable area (see NEGEV).

The northern boundary which separated the land of J. from that of Benjamin is nowhere defined. The various locations mentioned in Josh 15 5-12 are dealt with in separate articles, but, omitting the very doubtful, the following, which are generally accepted, will show the general direction of the boundary line: The border went from the mouth of the Jordan to Beth-horôn (Ain Hâlajâ), and from the Valley of Achor (Wady Kelt) by the ascent of Adamûnina (Tâla'at el Dumnâ) to the waters of En Shemesh (probably the Wady el Ubûd, or Wady el Egyûb), and the Valley of Hînnoon (Wady er Rabâ). The line then crossed the Vale of Kaphshah (el Buqatâ) to the waters of Nephtoah (Láltâ), Kîrîth-jearim (Kureyt el 'Arâb), Chezalon (Keâlîh), Beth-sheanem (Ain Shenêm), Ekron (Yârûb) and Adullam (Ahdûlâm) to the goings out of the border were at the sea. According to the above line, Jerus lay within the bounds of Benjamin, though, according to a tradition recorded in the Palm, the site of the altar was in a piece of land belonging to Judah. The above frontier line can be followed on any modern map of Pal, and if it does not in many parts describe a natural boundary, it can be remembered that the frontiers of village and town possessions in modern Pal are extremely arbitrary, and though underdetermined by any natural boundary such as streams or mountain summits, they persist from generation to generation, and this too over a long period when there was constant warfare between different clans.

The territory of J. was small: even had it included all within its ideal boundaries, it would have been no more than 2,000 sq. miles; actually it was nearer 1,300 sq. miles, of which nearly half was desert.

III. The Boundaries of the Kingdom of Judah.—These were very circumscribed. In 2 Chr 11 5-12 there is a list of the cities chiefly those on the frontier which Solomon fortified. On the E. were Bethel, Etam and Tekoa; on the S. were Beth-sur, Soc, Adullam, Gath, Marahesh, Ziph, Adoram, Lachish, Azekah, Zorah, Ajalon and Hebron. The sites of the great majority of these are known, and they are all upon the borders of the Shephelah, between the Jezreel and Jordan valleys. It will be seen that the military preparation then made was against an attack from the W. In the 5th year of the reign of Rehoboam the expected attack came, and Shishak (Sheshenq I) of Egypt swept over the land and not only conquered all J. and Jerus, but, according to the reading of some authorities in the account of this campaign given in the great temple of Karnak, he headed over to Jeroboam of Israel certain strongholds of Judah.

The usual northern frontier between the two Heb kingdoms appears to have been the southernmost of the three natural lines described in I above, namely by the Valley of Ajalon on the W. and the Gorge of Michmas (Wady Sweeniit) on the E. Along the central plateau the frontier varied. Bethel (1 K 12 29; 2 K 10 29; Am 3 14; 4 4; 7 10.3; Hos 10 15) belonged to Israel, though once it fell to J. when Abijah took it and with it Jeshanah (Ain Simia) and Ephron (probably of Talm, Mârâth). (2 Chr 11 8-10), on the other hand, the S. of the Wady Sweeniit, was on the northern frontier of J., hence instead of the old term "from Dan to Beer-sheba," we read now of "from Geba to Beer-sheba" (2 K 23 8). Basamb, king of Israel, went S. and fortified Ramah (or Edom, but 4 miles from Jerus) against J. (1 K 18 17), but Aa stopped his travel...
work, removed the fortifications and with the materials strengthened his own fortress at Geba and Mizpah (1 K 15:1-22). In the Jordan valley Jericho was held by Israel (1 K 16:34; 2 K 2:4).

After the Northern Kingdom fell, the frontier of J. appears to have extended a little farther N., and Bethel (2 K 23:15-19) and Jericho (to judge from Ezra 2:54; Neh 3:2; 7:36) also became part of the kingdom of J. For the further history of this district see JUDAE.

LITERATURE.—See esp. IGHL, chs viii-xv; PEF, III, and Saunders, Intro to the Survey of Western Pal.

JUDAH AT (AV UPON) THE JORDAN (תֵּית יִרְדֵּן, yehidh ha-yarden): A place marking the eastern limit of the territory of Naphthali (Josh 19:34). It is generally thought among scholars that the text is corrupt; but no very probable emendation has been suggested. Thomson (LB, II, 466) proposes to identify it with Seiyid Jehdda, a small white-domed sanctuary about 3 miles to the S.E. of Tell el-Kadýy.

JUDAISM, jōō'dā-im'. See Israel, Religion of.

JUDAS, jōō'das (יוֹדָס, Ioudas; Gr form of Heb "Judah"): (1) A Levite mentioned in 1 Esd 9:23—JUDAH (3).

(2) Judas Maccabaeus, 3d son of Mattathias (1 Mac 2:4). See Maccabees.

(3) Judas, son of Chalphi, a Jewish officer who supported Jonathan in the battle of Hazer (1 Mac 11:70; Ant, XIII, v, 7).

(4) A person of good position in Jerus at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (2 Mac 1:10); he has been identified with Judas Maccabaeus and also with an Essene prophet (Ant, XIII, vi, 2; BJ, II, 5).

(5) Son of Simon the Maccabean, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Mac 16:2). He was wounded in the battle which he fought along with his brother against Cendebeus (1 Mac 16:1 f; Ant, XIII, vii, 3), and was murdered by Ptolemy the usurper, his brother-in-law, at Dok (1 Mac 16:11 f).

J. HUTCHISON

JUDAS, JUDA: (1) The name of an ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3:30). In AV it occurs also in Lk 3:26, but RV has "Joda." (WH "Joth, Jōda").

(2) Judas Iscariot (see separate art.).

(3) One of the brothers of Jesus (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3). See JUDE.

(4) An apostle, "not Iscariot" (Jn 14:22). He is generally identified with Lebbæus (Mt 10:3) and Thadæus (Mk 3:18). See Lebbæus; Thadæus.

He is called JUDAS OF JAMES (q.v.) (Lk 6:16; Acts 1:13), which means "son of James," not (AV) "the brother of James."

(5) A Galilean who stirred up rebellion "in the days of the enrolment" (Acts 5:37). See JUDAS OF GALILEE.

(6) One with whom Paul lodged in Damascus, whose house was "in the street which is called Straight" (Acts 9:11). Nothing further is known of him. A house is pointed out as his, in a lane off the Straight Street.

(7) Judas Barsabbas (Acts 15:22-27; 32; see separate art.).

JUDAS BARSABBAS, bär-sab'as (יוֹדָס בָּרָסְבָּבָס, Ioudas Barsabbas): Judas was, with Silas, a delegate from the church in Jerus to the gentle Christians at Corinth, Syria and Cilicia. They were appointed to convey the letter containing the decision of "the apostles and the elders, with the whole church" regarding the attitude to be taken by gentle Christians toward the Mosaic law, and also to explain "the same things by word of mouth." They accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and, "being themselves also prophets," i.e., preachers, they not only handed over the epistle but stayed some time in the city preaching and teaching. They seem to have gone no further than Antioch, "they were dismissed in peace from the brethren unto those that had sent them forth," and it was Paul and Silas who some time afterward strengthened the churches in Syria and Cilicia (Acts 15:40-41).

According to ver 34 AV, Judas returned to Jerus without Silas, who remained at Antioch and afterward became Paul's companion (ver 40). The oldest MSS, however, omit ver 34, and it is therefore omitted from RV. It was probably a marginal note to explain ver 40, and in time it crept into the text. Judas and Silas are called "chief men among the brethren" (ver 29), probably elders, and "prophets" (ver 32).

Barsabbas being a patronymic, Judas was probably the brother of Joseph Barsabbas. He cannot be identified with any other Judas, e.g. "Judas not Iscariot" (Jn 14:22). We hear no more of Judas after his return to Jerus (Acts 15:22 ff).

S. F. HUNTER

JUDAS ISCARIOT, is-kar'ē-ōt (יוֹדָס הַכַּרְוָאִית, Ioudas Ischariōtis, i.e. ish kər'īdēh, "Judas, man of Kerith"): One of the twelve apostles and the betrayer of Jesus; for etymology, etc., see JUDAS.

I. Life.—Judas was, as his second name indicates, a native of Kerioth or Kerith. The exact locality of Kerith (of Jsh 16:25) is doubtful, but it lay probably to the S. of Judaea, being identified with the ruins of el Karijtein (cf A. Plummer, art. "Judas Iscariot" in HDB).

He was the son of Simon (Jn 13:2) or Simon Iscariot (Jn 6:71; 14:26), the meaning of Iscariot explaining why it was applied to his father also. The first Scriptural reference and Early evidence to J. is his election to the apostleship (cf Mt 10:4; Mk 3:19; Lk 6:16). He may have been present at the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (cf Jn 1:28), but more probably he first met Jesus during the return of the latter through Judaea with His followers (cf Jn 3:22). According to the Gospel of the Twelve (Simon the Cananaean), J. was among those who received the call at the Sea of Tiberias (cf Mt 4:18-22).

For any definite allusion to J. during the interval lying between his call and the events immediately preceding the betrayal, we are indebted to St. John alone. These Betrayal allusions are made with the manifest purpose of showing forth the nefarious character of J. from the first, and in their sequence there is a gradual development and growing clearness in the manner in which Jesus makes prophecy regarding his future betrayer. Thus, after the discourse on the Bread of Life in the synagogue of Capernaum (Jn 6:60), Peter protested the allegiance of the apostles (ver 69), Jesus answered, "Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil" (ver 70). Then follows St. John's commentary, "Now he abhorred Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve" (ver 71), implying that Judas was already known to Jesus as being in spirit one of those who "went back, and walked no more with him" (ver 66). But the situation, however diabolical, it is not that it have been to the ambitious designs which probably actuated J. in his acceptance of the apostleship (cf
below), was not sufficiently critical to call for immediate desecration on his part. Instead, he lulled his fears of exposure by the fact that he was not mentioning anything, and, as already observed, the personal motives of the faithful. Personal motives of a sordid nature had also influence in causing him to remain. Appointed keeper of the purse, he disregarded the warnings of Jesus concerning greed and hypocrisy (cf Mt 16:9; Mk 12:1-8) and appropriated the funds to his own uses. As a cloak to his avarice, he pretended to be zealous in their administration, and therefore, at the anointing of Jesus' feet by Mary, he asked "Why was not this ointment sold for 300 shillings, and given to the poor?" Now this he said, not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and having the bag took away what was put therein" (Jn 12:5; cf also Mt 26:7-13; Mk 14:3-8).

Yet, although by this craftiness J. concealed for a time his true nature from the rest of the disciples, and fomented any discontent that 3. The Betrayal might arise among them (cf Mk 14:4), he now felt that his present source of income could not long remain secure. The pregnant result of his Master's words regarding the day of his burial (cf Mt 26:12; Mk 14:8; Jn 12:7) revealed to His betrayer that Jesus already knew all the evil powers that were at work against Him; and it is significant that, according to Mt and Mk, who are the synoptists and the most direct of the traditions, J. departed immediately afterward and made his compact with the chief priests (cf Mt 26:14-15; Mk 14:10; cf also Lk 22:3-6). But his absence was only temporary. He was present at the washing of the disciples' feet, there to be differentiated once more by Jesus from the rest of the Twelve (cf "Ye are clean, but not all" and "He that eateth my bread uplifted his heel against me," Jn 13:18), but again without being named. It seemed as if Jesus wished to give Judas every opportunity, even at this late hour, of repenting and making his confession. For the last time, when they had sat down to eat, Jesus appealed to him thus with the words, "One of you shall betray me." At this, which perhaps he had dreamed of in Mk 14:18 and Lk 22:21; Jn 13:21). And at the end, in answer to the anxious queries of His disciples, "Is it I?" He indicated his betrayer, not by name, but by a sign: "He it is, for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him." (Jn 13:29; cf also Mt 26:20-23). Immediately Jesus left the upper room; the opportunity which he sought for was come (cf Jn 13:30; Mt 26:16). There is some doubt as to whether he actually received the eucharistic bread and wine previous to his departure or not, but most modern commentators hold that he did not. On his departure, J. made his way to the high priests and their followers, and coming upon Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, he betrayed his Master with a kiss (Mt 26:47-50; Mk 14:42-50; Lk 22:47-53). After the betrayal, Mk, Lk and Jn are silent as regards J., and the accounts given in Mt and Acts of his remorse and death vary in detail. According to Mt, the account begins "He was convicted of Judas' sense of guilt, and becoming still more mortified at his repulse by the chief priests and elders, "he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself." (cf also Mt 27:2-5). The chief priests purchased the potter's field, afterward called the "field of blood," and in this way was fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah (11:12-13) ascribed by Matthew to Jeremiah (Mt 27:3-10). The account given in Mk, Lk and Jn is more typical, as it mentions neither Judas' repentance nor the chief priests, but simply states that J. "obtained a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out" (ver 18). The author of Acts finds in this the fulfillment of the prophecy (cf Zech 11:12-13). The Vulgate rendering, "When he had hanged himself, he burst asunder," suggests a means of reconciling the two accounts.

According to a legendary account mentioned by Papias, the death of J. was due to the intervention of Hermas (Apocul. 5). A so-called "Gospel of Judas" was in use among the gnostic sect of the Cainites.

II. Character and Theories. — Much discussion and controversy have centered, not only around the discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of J., but also around his character and the problems connected with it. That J. the betrayer of Jesus should also be one of the Twelve has given opportunity for the attacks on both which have been made. The acceptance of the theories which would invalidate the historical value of much of the scriptural writings. Other theories, in explanation, viz. that J. joined the apostolic band with the definite intention of betraying Jesus. The aim of this intention has again resulted in the actions of the two, which have been used to excite the elevation of the character of Jesus, and to free him from the imputation of cowardly treachery. According to one, J. was a strong patriot, who saw in Jesus the foe of his race and the one who would destroy the ancient customs and the interests of his country. This view is, however, irreconcilable with the rejection of J. by the chief priests (cf Mt 27:3-10). According to the other, J. regarded himself as a true servant of Christianity, who assumed the role of traitor to expedite the action of the Trinitarian God and induce Him to manifest His miraculous powers by calling down upon himself the curse of God from heaven to help Him (cf Mt 26:53). His suicide was further due to his disappointment at the failure of Jesus to fulfill his expectations. This, together with the ancient times with the Cainites (cf above), and in modern days with De Quincey's view, and the terms and manner of denunciation employed by Jesus in regard to J. (cf also Jn 17:12) render this view also untenable.

Another view is that J. was foreordained to be the traitor; that Jesus was conscious from the first that He was to suffer death on the cross, and chose J. because He knew that he should betray Him and thus fulfill the Divine decrees "(cf Mt 26:54). These holding this view base their arguments on the phrase of Jesus implied in Jn 2:24; Jesus "knew all men": Jn 6:64, "Jesus knew from the beginning who should betray him" (cf Jn 18:9). Jn 18:4, "knowing all the things that were coming upon him." Yet, to take this phrase as a too rigid application of the doctrine of predestination, it would treat J. as a mere instrument, as a means and not an end in the hands of a higher power. It would render meaningless the appeals and reproaches made to him by Jesus and deny any personal responsibility and sense of guilt which it was Our Lord's very purpose to awaken and stimulate in the hearts of His hearers. John himself wrote after the event, but in the words of Our Lord there was, as we have seen, a growing cleavage in the manner in which He foretold His betrayal. The omniscience of Jesus was greater than that of a mere chair-vauntor who claimed to foretell the exact course of events. The omniscience of one who knew on the one hand the ways of His Eternal Father among men and, on the other, penetrated into the deepest recesses of human character and beheld there all its secret feelings and motives and tendencies.

Although a full discussion of the character of J. would of necessity involve those ultimate problems of Free Will and Original Sin (Westcott) which no theology can adequately solve, the theory which regards J. as a Gradual apostate is the most practical. It is significant that J., alone among the disciples was of southern extraction; and the differences in temperament, in character, together with the petty prejudices to which these generally give rise, may explain in part, though they do not
JUDAS OF JAMES ('Ioðás, 'Iacóddou, 'Ioudás Iakóddou'): One of the twelve apostles (Lk 6:16; Acts 1:13; for etymology, etc., see JUDAS). AV has the reading "brother of James," and RV reads "son of James." The latter is to be preferred, in Jn 14:22 he is described as "Judas (not Iscariot)." The name corresponds with the "Thaddaeus" or "Leb- baeus whose surname was Thaddæus" of Mt 10:3 and Mk 3:18 (cf. THADDÆUS). The identification of Thaddæus with Judas is generally accepted, though Ewaleu Janes hold that they were different persons, that Thaddæus died during Christ's lifetime, and that Judas was chosen in his place (cf. Bruce, Training of the Twelve, 34). If the RV is accepted as the correct rendering of Lk 6:16 and Acts 1:13, this Judas cannot be identified either with the Judas (Mk 6:3 AV), Judas (Mk 6:3 RV), or Judas (Mt 13:55), the brother of Jesus; or with the Judas (Jude ver 1 RVm) or Jude (Jude ver 1 AV), the brother of James, whether these two latter Judases are to be regarded as the same or not. The only incident recorded of Judas of James is in Jn 14:22, where during Christ's address to the disciples after the last supper he put the question, "Lord, what is coming to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" C. M. KERR

JUDAS, THE LORD'S BROTHER. See JUDAH.

JUDDAH, jud'a. See JUDDAH.

JUDE, joo'd (Ioðas, Ioudas): Brother of the Lord, and author of the Ep. of Jude. See JUDAS OF JAMES and following article.

JUDE, THE EPISTLE OF: The Writer

I. JUDE'S POSITION IN THE CANON
II. THE OCCASION OF ITS COMPOSITION
III. DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBRариANS AND APOSTATES
IV. RELATION OF JUDE TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

1. Resemblances
2. Differences
3. Further Contrasts
4. Summary
5. Evidence of Priority of Peter
6. Confirmatory References

V. DATE OF THE EPISTLE
VI. THE LIBRARIANS OF JUDE'S EPISTLE

LITERATURE

The writer of this short ep. calls himself Jude or Judas (Ioðas, Ioudas). His name is a common one among the Jews: there were few

The Writer of the other ep. of more frequent use. Two among the apostles bore it, viz. Judas, mentioned in Jn 14:22 (cf. Lk 6:16), and Judas Iscariot. Jude describes himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (ver 1). The James here mentioned is no doubt the person who is called "the Lord's brother" (Gal 2:19), the writer of the ep. that bears his name. Neither of the two was an apostle. The opening sentence of Jude simply affirms that the writer is a "servant of Jesus Christ." This, if anywhere, should be the appropriate place for the mention of his apostleship, if he were an apostle. The appellation "servant of Jesus Christ" is "never thus barely used in an address of an ep. to designate an apostle" (Alford). Phil 11 has a similar expression, "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ," but the designation common to two persons necessarily sticks to the rank of the inferior. In other instances "servant" is associated with "apostle" (Rom 1:1; Tit 1:1). Jude vs 17.18 speaks of the "apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: that they said to you"—language which an apostle would hardly use of his fellow-apostles.

In Mk 6:3 are found the names of those of whom Jesus is said to be the brother, namely, James and

JUDAS OF DAMASCUS. See DAMASCUS.

JUDAS OF GALILEE (Ioðas, ho Galli- latos): Mentioned in Acts 5:37 as the leader of an insurrection occasioned by the census of Quirinius in 7 AD (see QUIRINIUS). He, and those who obeyed him, it is said, perished in that revolt. Jos also repeatedly mentions Judas by this same name, "the Galilean," and speaks of his revolt (Ant., XVIII, 1, 6; XX, v, 2; XXI, 11, vii; XVII, vii; XVII, v; XVIII, 11), names him a Gaulo- nite, of the city of Gamala. As Gamala was in Gaulonitis, not far from the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, it may be regarded as belonging to that province. The party of Judas seems to have been identified with the Zealots.
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Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.

The chief reason why it was rejected by some and regarded with suspicion by others seems to be because it is without a quotation from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, so Jerome informs us (Vox. Ill., 4). It indicates in mind another spurious writing, viz. the Assumption of Moses, when he spoke of the contention of Michael and the rebel angels, and the devil Abel (ver. 9). This, however, is not quite certain, for the date assigned to that writing is the 14 AD, and although Jude might have seen and read it, the compiler of the Epistle may have retained a copy near his own day that it could hardly have exerted much influence on his thought. Besides, the similarity of the Epistle and its dealing with a special class of errorists would limit to a certain extent its circulation among Christians. On this account it was a_popular reference by some and the absence of a reference to it by others.

II. The Occasion of Its Composition.—Jude, after his brief introduction (vs. 1, 2), explains very definitely why he writes as he does. He indicates distinctly his anxiety on behalf of the saints (ver. 3): "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." He had in mind to ward off the errorists who were doing great damage, and he had in mind to work on the salvation common to all Christians. Perhaps he contemplated the composition of a book or treatise that would have discussed the great subject in an exhaustive manner. But in face of the perils that were present, at the time already present in the community, his purpose was indefinitely postponed. We are not told how he became acquainted with the dangers which beset his fellow-believers, but the conjecture is probably correct that it was by means of the evangelist. At any rate, he was thoroughly conversant with the evils in the churches, and he deals with them as if he had beheld the enormities that were practised and the ruin that had ensued.

The address of the Epistle is remarkable for the affection Jude expresses for these saints. Obviously they are distinct from the libertines of whom he speaks with such solemn condemnation. They were the faithful who kept aloof from the ungodly that surrounded their books in classification. The Canon of Muratori includes Jude among the books of Scripture, though it omits the Epp. of Jas, Pet and He. This is one of the earliest documents containing a list of the NT books not including the four Gospels. Some date the fragment as c 170 AD, as it claims to have been written not long after Pius was bishop of Rome, and the latest date of Pius is 142–57 AD. The words of the document are, "The Shepherd was written very recently in our own time by Hermes, while his brother Pius sat in the chair of the Church of Rome." Twenty or twenty-five years would probably satisfy the period indicated by the words, "written very recently in our own time". We would fix the date of the fragment at c 170 AD. Salmon, however, strongly inclines to a later date, viz. c 200–210 AD, as does Zahn.

Zahn (Intro to the N.T., II, 259, ET), and Professor Chase (H.D.B.) are of the decided opinion that the Didache, 7: 1, 2, is a "false prophecy", and for some thou shalt rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love above thine own soul [or life]," is founded on Jude, 7: 2. Dillmann (Ueber einige merkwürdige sprüche des Didache, 1891) in passim remarks that the famous document was written not later than 80 AD. It appears, therefore, more than probable that the Ep. of Jude was known to the authors of the Didache, 1891, at the end of the 1st cent. From the survey we have thus rapidly taken of the field in which the Ep. circulated, we fairly pass on to the question, who is Jude, and when and where was it written?

1. Surreptitious foes.—For there are certain men crept in privily, men who are ungodly men, viz. "ungodly men", (ver. 4). They are enemies who frown to be friends, and hence in reality are spies and traitors. These ungodly men appear to have creep into the company of the godly, actuated by evil inclination and enterprise. (2) Persecutors of grace and deniers of Christ.—"Turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Saviour Jesus Christ." These are those who by a vile perversion turn the grace and the liberty of the Gospel into a means for gratifying their crooked desires. The words "in lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Saviour Jesus Christ" is a doctrine and life repudiate their Master and Lord.
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(3) Censurable and arrogant detractors.—"In their dreaming, they glide the distances, and set up, as it were, and rig all at dignities" (ver 8). Destitute of true reverence, they rail at the holiest and best things, and sit in judgment upon all authority. "And they have the private tongue of the lawless: "Our lips are our own: who is lord over us?" (Ps 19 4).

(4) Ignorant calumniators and brutal sensualists.—"These rail at whatsoever things they know not: and what they understand naturally, like brutes created without reason, in these things they are destroyed" (ver 10). We must not so much know, as something lofty and noble, they deride and denounce; what the Lord hath gifted to ministers to their disorderly appetites and their debased tastes.

(5) Hypocrites and deceivers.—"These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts when they feast with you, shepherding you without feasting themselves; chewing the fat of oxen, and drink wine without water . . . autumn trees without fruit . . . what waves of wandering stars, for which the blackness of darkness hath been reserved forever" (ver 12, 13). A most graphic picture of the insincerity, the depravity, and the doom of these insouciant. And yet they are found in the bosom of the Christian body, ever sitting with the saints at their love-feasts.

(6) Grumblers, fault-finders, pleasure-seekers, booters, parasites.—These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts . . . showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage" (ver 16). They impede Divine wisdom, are the foes of peace and quietness, boast of their capacities to manage things, and yet they can be servile, even sycophants, when thereby advantage is secured.

(7) Schismatics and sensualists.—"These are they who do not separate, having not the Spirit" (ver 19). It was characteristic of the false teachers and mockers who had invaded the Christian church that they drew a line of demarcation between themselves and others, or between different classes of believers, which the Holy Spirit would not have them do. They made use of all the great professions of Christianity to their own crafty and wicked ends. There seems to be a hint in these words of incipient Gnosticism, that fatal heresy that boated of a knowledge of a deep mystery which the initiated possessed, of which the great mass of Christians were ignorant. Jude brands the pretension as the offspring of their own sensuality, not at all of God's Spirit.

Such is the forbidding portrait drawn of the libertines in the Ep. But Jude adds other and even darker features. He furnishes a number of examples of apostates and of apostacy which disclose even more strikingly the spirit and the doom of them that pervert the truth, that deny the Lord Jesus Christ, and that mock at the things of God. These all mark a fatal degeneracy, a "falling away" which bodes nothing but evil and judgment. Against the corrupters and skeptics Jude writes with a vehemence that in the NT is without a parallel. Matters must have come to a dreadful pass when the Spirit of God is compelled to use such strong and awful language.

IV. Relation of Jude to the Second Epistle of Peter.—The relation is confined to 2 Pet 2—3 4.

1. Resemblances to Jude, at least no more than does Jas or 1 Pet. Between the sections of 2 Pet indicated above and Jude the parallelism is close, both as to the subjects treated and the historical illustrations introduced, and the language itself is of considerable extent is common to both. All readers must be impressed with the similarity. Accordingly, it is very generally held by interpreters that one of the writers copied from the other. There is not entire agreement as to whether Peter copied from Jude, or Jude from Peter. Perhaps a majority favor the former of the two alternatives, though some of the very latest and most learned of those who write on Intro- ductions to the NT hold the view that Jude copied from 2 Pet. Reference is made particularly to Dr. Theodore v. Zahn, whose magnificent work on Introduction has been but recently tr€ into Eng., and who argues convincingly that Jude copied from 2 Pet.

However, it must be admitted that there are in the two ep. as pronounced differences and diver-
gences as there are resemblances. If one of the two did actually copy from the other, he was careful to add, subtract, and change what he found in his book, but best suited his purpose. A servile copyist he certainly was not. He maintained his independence throughout, as an exact comparison of the one with the other will demonstrate.

If we bring them into close proximity, following the example of professor Zahn in the "Bible Comm." (Intro to 2 Pet), we shall discover a marked difference between the two pictures drawn by the writers. We cannot fail to perceive how much darker and more sinister is that of Jude. The evil, alarming certainly in Peter, becomes appalling in Jude. Subjoined are proofs of the fact above stated:

2 Pet 2 1
But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers

Jude ver 4
For there are certain men crept in privily . . . .

2 Pet 2 2
who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them . . . .

Jude ver 4
... ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying our only.Saviour, and Lord, Jesus Christ.

2 Pet 2 3
And in covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you . . . .

Jude ver 16
. . . . murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts (and their mouth speaketh great swelling words), showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage.

These contrasts and comparisons between the two ep. prove (1) that in Jude the false teachers are worse, more virulent than in Peter, and (2) that in Peter the whole description is predictive, whereas in Jude the deplorable condition is actually present.

If 2 Pet is dependent on Jude, if the apostle cited from Jude, how explain the strong predictive element in his opening verses (2 Pet 2 1—3)? If as Peter wrote he had lying before him Jude's letter, which represents the corrupters as already within the Christian community and doing their deadly work, his repeated use of the future tense is absolutely inexplicable. Assuming, however, that he wrote prior to Jude, his predictions become perfectly intelligible. No doubt the virus was working when he wrote, but it was latent, undeveloped; for worse would appear; but whether the poison was widely diffused, as vs 12.19 clearly show. The very life of the churches was endangered.

2 Pet 2 4.5
For if God spared not the angels when they sinned . . . .

Jude vs 5.6
. . . . the Lord, having saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them . . . . and angels that . . . . left their proper habitation . . . .

Peter speaks of the angels that sinned, Jude of their apostasy. Peter makes prominent the salvation of Noah and his family when the flood overwhelmed the world of the Contrasts are evidently, while Jude tells of those who, delivered from bondage, afterward were destroyed because of their unbelief. He speaks of no rescue; we know of but two who survived the judgments of the wilderness; who entered the Promised Land. Caleb and Joshua.

Peter mentions the fate of the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, but he is careful to remind us of the deliverance of righteous Lot, while Jude makes prominent their nameless crimes and consigns them to "the punishment of eternal fire," but he is silent on the rescue of Lot. Manifestly Jude's illustrations are darker and more hopeless than Peter's.
Peter instances Balaam as an example of one who loved the hire of wrongdoing, and who was rebuked for his transgression. But Jude lists three notables in the instances in the OT to indicate how far in apostasy and rebellion the libertines had gone. Three words mark their course, rising into a climax, "way," "error," "gaysaying." They went in the way of Cain, i.e. in the way of self-will, of hate, and the spirit of murder. Moreover, they "ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire." The words denote an activity of viciousness that enlisted all their eagerness and all their might. Balaam's error was one that led into error, one that seduced others into the like sin. The reference seems to be to the whole career of this heathen prophet, and includes his betrayal of the Israelites through the women of Moab (Nu 31.16). Balaam is the prototype of Jude's libertines, both in his covetousness and his seductive counsel. Furthermore, they "perished in the gaysaying of Korah." This man with 250 followers rebelled against the Divinely appointed leaders and rulers of Israel, Moses and Aaron, and sought to share their authority in Israel, if not to displace them altogether. Comparable with these rebels in ancient Israel are the treacherous and malignant foes whom Jude so vigorously denounces.

Peter speaks of them as "daring, self-willed, they trembled not to rail at dignitaries: whereas angels, though greater in might and power, bring not a railing judgment against them before the Lord" (vs 10.11). Jude is more specific: These dreamers "defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and revile the glorious dominion of power. And yet their show of wisdom will deceive them in their revelry. They were those who had been fascinated by the new teaching, and although not captured by it, they were engaged in its study, were drawn toward it and almost ready to yield. On these the faithful were to have mercy, were to convince them of their danger, show them the enormity to which the false system inevitably leads, and so win them back to Christ's allegiance. As if Jude said, Deal with the wavering in love and fidelity; but rescue them if possible.

There were others whose peril was greater: "And some save, snatching them out of the fire." These were identified with the wicked, were scoched by the fires of destruction and hence almost beyond reach of rescue; but if possible they are to be saved, however scathed and blackened. Others still there were who were in worse state than the preceding, who were polluted and smirched by the foul contamination of the guilty seducers, and such were to be saved, and the rescuers were to fear lest they should be soiled by contact with the horrible defilement. This is Jude's tremendous summary of the shameful work and frightful evils wrought in the bosom of the church by the libertines. He discloses in these trenchant verses how deeply sunk in the false teaching they were, and how awful the ruin they had wrought. The description is quite unparalleled in 2 Pet. The shadings in Jude are darker and deeper than those in 2 Pet.

The comparison between the two writings warrants, we believe, the following conclusions: (1) 2 Pet. is a letter written to Peter's own church in the OT period of Peter's lifetime. Jude is a letter written perhaps in the opening of the NT period. Jude gives an account of Peter's teaching which was incorporated in the NT period. 2 Pet. is a letter written to the Gentile church in the NT period of Peter's life. Jude gives an account of Peter's teaching which was incorporated in the Gentile church. In 2 Pet. Peter ascribes to Peter the Apostle the authorship of the letter. In Jude, Peter ascribes to Peter the Apostle the authorship of the Epistle. Hence the following conclusions are drawn: (2) 2 Pet. and Jude are both letters written by Peter in the NT period. Jude is more schematic in its condensed form than 2 Pet. 2 Pet. is more continuous in its progressive form than Jude. (3) 2 Pet. and Jude are both letters written by Peter in the NT period. Jude is more schematic in its condensed form than 2 Pet. 2 Pet. is more continuous in its progressive form than Jude. (4) 2 Pet. and Jude are both letters written by Peter in the NT period. Jude is more schematic in its condensed form than 2 Pet. 2 Pet. is more continuous in its progressive form than Jude. (5) The author of 2 Pet. and Jude is Peter. Jude is more schematic in its condensed form than 2 Pet. 2 Pet. is more continuous in its progressive form than Jude.
of the one passage to the other is very close, indeed, they are almost identical. Both urge their readers to remember what had been said by the apostles of the first generation (ch. 16) in order to avoid the immoral scoffers who would invade or had invaded the Christian brotherhood. But Peter distinctly asserts that these mockers shall appear in the last days. His words are, "Knowing this first, that in the last days the scoffers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts." Jude writes, "in the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts." The phrases, "the last days," and "the last time," denote our age, the dispensation in which we live, as 1 Pet 1:2 proves. Peter puts the appearance of the mockers in the future, whereas Jude, after quoting the words, significantly adds, "These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit." He means, of course, the mockers just mentioned, and he affirms they are now present. With Peter they are yet to come when he wrote, but with Jude the prediction is already fulfilled, so far as the scoffers are concerned. Therefore Jude's writing is subsequent to Peter's, and if there be copying on the part of either, it is Jude to copying Peter.

Peter mentions "your apostles." Including himself in the phrase, but Jude does not employ the pl., pronoun, for he was not of the apostolic body. But why the pl. "apostles"? Because at least one apostle was spoken of the perilous times which were coming on the church. Paul unites his brother Peter in what Peter, and writes, "But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come" (2 Tim 3:1–5). His prediction is near akin to that of Peter: it belongs apparently to the same historic time and to the same perilous classes of mockers and corrupters. On 2 Pet 3:15 the apostle lovingly and tenderly speaks of his "brother Paul," and says suggestively that in his Ep. he speaks of these things—no doubt of the scoffers of these last days among the rest. He certainly seems to have Paul in mind when he mentioned the words, "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come." Here, then, is positive ground for the reference in Jude ver 4 to a writing concerning those who had crept into the fold and who were of old doomed to this condemnation, with which writing his readers were acquainted; they had it in the writing of the apostles Peter and Paul both, and so were forewarned as to the impending danger. Jude's Ep. is a present to Peter's.

V. Date of the Epistle.—There is little or no agreement as to the year, yet the majority of writers hold that it belongs to the latter half of the 1st cent. Zahn assigns it to 70–75 AD; Lumbly, c 80 AD; Salmon, before the reign of Domitian (81 AD); Salmon, however, particularly, prior to Domitian than 80 AD, probably within a year or two of the Pastoral Epp. Zahn strongly insists on 64 AD as the date of Peter's death. If the 2d Ep. bearing his name is authentic, the apostle could not possibly have copied from Jude, for Jude's letter was not in existence when he died. Even on the supposition that he suffered death 65–66 AD, there could have been no copying done save by Jude, for it is almost demonstrable that Jude was written after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). If 2 Pet is pseudo-epigraphous and written about the middle of the 2d cent., as some confidently affirm, it has no right to a place in the Canon nor any legitimate relation to Jude. If genuine, it antedates Jude.

VI. The Libertines of Jude's Epistle.—Their characteristics forcibly exhibited, but no information is given us of their origin or to what particular region they belonged. They bore the Christian name, were of the lowest morals, and were guilty of shameful excesses. Their influence seems to have been widespread among people of more elevated station than 2 Pet would assign them in such severe language. Their guilty departure from the truth must not be confounded with the Gnosticism of the 2d cent., though it tended strongly in that direction; it was a 1st-cent. defection. Were they newly risen sensualists, without predecessors? To some extent their forerunners had already appeared. Sensuality in some of its grosser forms disgraced the church at Corinth (1 Cor 6:1–13; 6:13–20). In the common meals of this Lord's day speak of devout and orderly mockers, who would invade or had invaded the Christian brotherhood. But Peter distinctly asserts that these mockers shall appear in the last days. His words are, "Knowing this first, that in the last days the scoffers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts." Jude writes, "in the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts." The phrases, "the last days," and "the last time," denote our age, the dispensation in which we live, as 1 Pet 1:2 proves. Peter puts the appearance of the mockers in the future, whereas Jude, after quoting the words, significantly adds, "These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit." He means, of course, the mockers just mentioned, and he affirms they are now present. With Peter they are yet to come when he wrote, but with Jude the prediction is already fulfilled, so far as the scoffers are concerned. Therefore Jude's writing is subsequent to Peter's, and if there be copying on the part of either, it is Jude to copying Peter.

Peter mentions "your apostles," including himself in the phrase, but Jude does not employ the pl., pronoun, for he was not of the apostolic body. But why the pl. "apostles"? Because at least one apostle was spoken of the perilous times which were coming on the church. Paul unites his brother Peter in what Peter, and writes, "But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come" (2 Tim 3:1–5). His prediction is near akin to that of Peter: it belongs apparently to the same historic time and to the same perilous classes of mockers and corrupters. On 2 Pet 3:15 the apostle lovingly and tenderly speaks of his "brother Paul," and says suggestively that in his Ep. he speaks of these things—no doubt of the scoffers of these last days among the rest. He certainly seems to have Paul in mind when he mentioned the words, "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come." Here, then, is positive ground for the reference in Jude ver 4 to a writing concerning those who had crept into the fold and who were of old doomed to this condemnation, with which writing his readers were acquainted; they had it in the writing of the apostles Peter and Paul both, and so were forewarned as to the impending danger. Jude's Ep. is a present to Peter's.

V. Date of the Epistle.—There is little or no agreement as to the year, yet the majority of writers hold that it belongs to the latter half of the 1st cent. Zahn assigns it to 70–75 AD; Lumbly, c 80 AD; Salmon, before the reign of Domitian (81 AD); Salmon, however, particularly, prior to Domitian than 80 AD, probably within a year or two of the Pastoral Epp. Zahn strongly insists on 64 AD as the date of Peter's death. If the 2d Ep. bearing his name is authentic, the apostle could not possibly have copied from Jude, for Jude's letter was not in existence when he died. Even on the supposition that he suffered death 65–66 AD, there could have been no copying done save by Jude, for it is almost demonstrable that Jude was written after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). If 2 Pet is pseudo-epigraphous and written about the middle of the 2d cent., as some confidently affirm, it has no right to a place in the Canon nor any legitimate relation to Jude. If genuine, it antedates Jude.

VI. The Libertines of Jude's Epistle.—Their characteristics forcibly exhibited, but no information is given us of their origin or to what particular region they belonged. They bore the Christian name, were of the lowest morals, and were guilty of shameful excesses. Their influence seems to have been widespread among people of more elevated station than 2 Pet would assign them in such severe language. Their guilty departure from the truth must not be confounded with the Gnosticism of the 2d cent., though it tended strongly in that direction; it was a 1st-cent. defection. Were they newly risen sensualists, without predecessors? To some extent
13–26; Dt 1:9–17). This arrangement ceased to be practicable when the children of Israel settled down in Canaan. Although David took counsel with the heads of thousands and hundreds (1 Ch 13:1), it need not be assumed that this was a continuation of the plan adopted by Moses, who was not organized till the time of David. In the days of the Judges justice was administered by those who had risen by wisdom or valor to that rank (Jgs 4:5). An organized circuit court was established by Samuel, who judged cases himself, and also made his sons judges (1 S 7:16; 8:1). After the monarchy was instituted, the king tried all cases, when requested to do so by the wronged person, in the palace gate (1 K 7:7; Prov 20:8). There was no public prosecutor (2 S 14:4; 15:2–6; 1 Ch 18:14; 1 K 3:16; 2 K 15:5). Under David and Solomon there were probably local courts (1 Ch 23:4; 26:29). Jehoshaphat organized a high court of justice (2 Ch 19:8). The prophets often complain bitterly that the purity of justice is corrupted by bribery and false witness (Isa 1:23; 5:23; 10:1; Am 5:12; 6:12; Mic 3:11; 7:3; Prov 6:19; 12:17; 18:5). Even kings sometimes pronounced unjust sentences, esp. in (1 S 22:21–22; 1 K 22:26; 2 K 21:16; Jer 36:26). An evil king could also bend local courts to do his will, as may be gathered from the case of Naboth’s vineyard (1 K 21:1–13).

The first duty of a judge was to execute absolute justice, showing the same impartiality to rich and poor, to Jew and foreigner. He was forbidden to accept bribes or to wrest the judgment of the poor (Ex 23:6–8; Dt 16:19). He must not let himself be swayed by popular opinion, or unduly favor the poor (Ex 23:2). The court was open to the public (Ex 18:13; Ruth 4:12). Each party presented his view of the case to the judge (Dt 1:16; 25:1). Possibly the accused appeared in court clad in mourning (Zec 3:3). The accuser stood on the right hand of the accused (Zec 3:1; Ps 100:6). Sentence was pronounced after the hearing of the case, and the judgment carried out (Josh 7:24,25). The only evidence considered by the court was that given by the witnesses. In criminal cases, not less than two witnesses were necessary (Dt 19:15; Nu 30:13; Dt 17:6; cf Mt 18:16; 2 Cor 13:1; 1 Tim 5:19). In cases other than criminal the oath (see Oath) was applied (Ex 22:11; cf He 6:16). The lot was sometimes appealed to (Josh 7:14–18), especially in private disputes (Prov 18:18), but this was exceptional. When the law was not quite definite, recourse was had to the Divine oracle (Lev 24:12; Nu 15:34).


The Eng. name of the Book of Jgs is a tr of the Heb title (כְּרִיטָן, shoph'tan), which is reproduced in the Gr Κρίται, Krítaí, and the Lat Libri dicitur. In the list of the canonical books of the OT given by Origen (apud Euseb., HE, VI, 25) the name is transcribed Καρτίας, Sarathém, which represents rather "judgments" (shoph'tan; κρίματα, krimata) than "judges." A passage also is quoted from Philo (De Confus. Linguarum, 26), which indicates that he recognized the same form of the name; compare the Gr title of "Kingdoms" (Βασιλεία, Basileia) for the four books of S and K.

In the order of the Heb Canon the Book of Jgs invariably occupies the 7th place, following immediately after the Book of Joshua. Probably upon these premises this is regarded as the "earlier prophets" (לְבָתיִים, rišhā'im), the first moiety of the 3d great division of the Heb Scriptures. As the Book of Jgs was classified and regarded as "prophetic," equally with the other historical books, on the ground of the religious and spiritual content of its history conveyed. In the rearrangement of the books, which was undertaken for the purposes of the Gr Canon, Jgs maintained its position as 7th in order from the beginning, but the short historical Book of Ruth was removed from the place which it held among the Rolls (נְגֵמִיָּה), in the 3d division of the Jewish Canon, and added to its end as a kind of appendix, probably because the narrative was understood to presuppose the same conditions and to have reference to the same period of time. The Gr order was followed in all later VSS, and has maintained itself in modern Bibles. Origen (loc. cit.) even states, probably by a mere misunderstanding, that Jgs and Ruth were comprehended by the Jews under the one title Saphathem.

The Book of Jgs consists of 3 main parts or divisions, which are readily distinguishable.

2. Place in the Canon (2:6–16).—A brief summary and recapitulation of the events of the conquest of Western Palestine, for the most part parallel to the narrative of Josh, but with a few additional details and some divergences from the earlier account, emphasizing (2:17–36) the general failure of the Israelites to expel completely the original inhabitants of the land, which is described as a violation of their covenant with Jeh (2:1–3), entailing upon them suffering and permanent weakness. The introductory ver (1:1), which refers to the death of Joshua as having already taken place, seems to be intended as a general indication of the historical period of the book as a whole; for some at least of the events narrated in 1–2:5 took place during Joshua’s lifetime.

(2) The central and main portion (2:6–16).—A series of narratives of 12 "judges," each of whom in turn, by his devotion and prowess, was enabled to deliver Israel from thraldom and oppression, and for a longer or shorter term ruled over the people whom he had thus saved from their enemies. Each successive repentance on the part of the people, however, and their deliverance are followed, on the death of the judge, by renewed apostasy, by which means God entails upon them renewed misery and servitude, from which they are again rescued when in response to their prayer the Lord "raises up" for them another judge and deliverer. Thus the entire history is set as it were in a recurrent framework of moral and religious teaching and warning; and the lesson is enforced that it is the sin of the people, their abandonment of Jeh and persistent idolatry, which entails upon them calamity, from which the Divine long-suffering and forbearance alone makes for them a way of escape.

(a) 2:6–3:6: A second brief introduction, conceived entirely in the spirit of the following narratives, which seems to attach itself to the close of the Book of Josh, and in part repeats almost verbatim the account there given of the story of the land, of Israel’s leader (Jgs 2:6–9 | Josh 24:28–31), and proceeds to describe the condition of the land and people in the succeeding generation, ascribing their misfortunes to their idolatry and repeated neglect of the warnings and commandments of the judge of Israel’s land, whose presence was to be the test of Israel’s willingness to obey Jeh and at the same time to prevent the nation from sinking into a condition of lethargy and ease.
(b) 3 7–3 11: Judgeship of Othniel who delivered Israel from the hand of Cushan-rishathaim.

c) 3 12–30: Victory of Ehud over the Moabites, to whom the Israelites had been in servitude 18 years. Ehud slew their king Eglon, and won for the 7th year of his period of tranquility. (d) 3 31: In a brief words Shamgar is named as the deliverer of Israel from the Philis. The title of "judge" is not accorded to him, nor is he said to have exercised authority in any way. It is doubtfull whether the writer intended him to be regarded as one of the judges.

e) Chs 4, 5: Victory of Deborah and Barak over Jabin the Can. king, and death of Sisera, captain of his army, at the hands of Jael, the wife of a Kenite chief; followed by a Song of Triumph, descriptive and commemorative of the event.

(f) Chs 6–8: A 7-year oppression at the hands of the Midianites, which is described as peculiarly severe, so that the land became desolate on account of the perpetual raids to which it was subject. After a period of hesitation and delay, Gideon defeats the combined forces of the Midianites and Amalekites and the "children of the east," i.e. the wandering Bedawins from the eastern deserts, in the valley of Jerreel. The locality and course of the battle is described by the poet and it is not possible to follow his account in detail because of our inability to identify the places named. After the victory, Gideon is formally offered the position of ruler for himself and his descendants, but refuses; nevertheless, he seems to have exercised a measure of restraining influence over the people until his death, although he himself and his family apparently through covetousness fell away from their faithful to Jeh (8 27–33).

(g) Ch 9: The judgeship of Abimelech, son of Gideon by a concubine, who by the murder of all but one of his brethren, the legitimate sons of Gideon, secured the throne at Shechem for himself, and for 3 years ruled Israel. After successfully stamping out a revolt at Shechem against his authority, he is himself killed when engaged in the siege of the citadel or tower of Thebez by a stone thrown by a woman.

(h) Chs 10–16: Tola and Jair are briefly named as successive judges of Israel for 29 and 22 years respectively.

(i) Chs 10–12: 7: Oppression of Israel for 18 years by the Philis and Ammonites. The national deliverance is effected by Jephthah, who is described as an illegitimate son of Gilead, and who had been cast out of his account driven out from his home and had become the captain of a band of outlaws. Jephthah stipulates with the elders of Gilead that if he undertakes to do battle on their behalf with the Ammonites, he is afterward to be recognized as their ruler; and in accordance with the agreement, when the victory has been won, he becomes judge over Israel (11 9; 12 7). See JEPHTHAH.

(i) Chs 12, 13: 7: Three of the so-called "minor" judges, i.e., Gideon, Tola, and Jair, judged Israel in succession for 7, 10 and 8 years respectively. As they are not said to have delivered the nation from any calamity or oppression, it is perhaps to be understood that the whole period was a time of rest and tranquility.

(j) Chs 13–16: The history of Samson (see separate art.).

(3) An appendix, chs 17–21.—The final section, in the nature of an appendix, consisting of two narratives, independent apparently of the main portion of the book and of one another. They contain no indication of date, except the statement 4 it repeated that "in those days there was no king in Israel" (17 6; 18 1; 19 1; 21 25). The natural inference is that the narratives were committed to writing in the days of the monarchy; but the events themselves were understood by the compiler or historian to have taken place during the period of the Judges, or at least anterior to the establishment of the kingdom. The lawless state of society, the violence and disorder among the tribes, would seem the most probable conclusion. No name of a judge appears, however, and there is no direct reference to the office or to any central or controlling authority. Jos also seems to have known them in reverse order, and in the position preceding the histories of the judges themselves, and not at the close of the book (Ant. V, ii, 8–12; iii, 1; see E. König in HDB, II, 810). Even if the present form of the narratives is thus late, there can be little doubt that they contain elements of considerable antiquity.

(a) Chs 17–18: The episode of Micah the Epherait and the young Levite who is consecrated as priest in his house. A war party, however, of the tribe of Dan during a migration northward, by threats and promises induced the Levite to accompany them, taking with him the priestly ephod, the household goods of his patron, and a costly image which Micah had caused to be made. These Micah in vain endeavors to recover from the Danites. The latter sack and burn Laish in the extreme N. of Canaan, and renaming it "Dan," they set up the image which they had stolen, and establish a rival priesthood and worship, which is said to have endured "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (18 31).

(b) Chs 19–21: Outrage of the Benjamites of Gibeon against the concubine of a Levite lodging for a night in the city on his way from Bethlehem to the hill country of Ephraim. The united tribes, after twice suffering defeat at Gibeah, and the might of Benjamin, exact full vengeance; the tribe of Benjamin is almost annihilated, and their cities, including Gibeon, are destroyed. In order that the tribe may not utterly perish, peace is declared with the 600 survivors, and they are provided with wives by stratagem and force, the Israelites having taken a solemn vow not to permit intermarriage between their own daughters and the members of the guilty tribe. The period covered by the history of the Book of Jgs extends from the death of Joshua to the death of Samson, and adds perhaps a later reference in 18 31, "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh," (cf 18 31). It is, perhaps impossible, to compute in years the length of time that the writer had in mind. That he proceeded upon a fixed chronological basis, supplied probably by tradition but modified or arranged on a systematic principle, seems evident. The difficulty may be due in part to the corruption which the figures have suffered in the course of the transmission of the text. In 1 K 6 1 an inclusive total of 480 years is given as the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in Abin, judged Israel in succession for 7, 10 and 8 years respectively. As they are not said to have delivered the nation from any calamity or oppression, it is perhaps to be understood that the whole period was a time of rest and tranquility.

4. Chronology. — The period of the Judges is uncertain, and the date of the Book of Joshua referred to the 4th year of the reign of Solomon. This total, however, includes the 40 years wandering in the desert, the time occupied in the conquest and settlement of the Promised Land, and an uncertain period after the death of Joshua, referred to in the Book of Jgs itself (8 10) until the older generation that had taken part in the invasion had passed away. There is also to be reckoned the 40 years' judgeship of Eli (1 S 4 18), the unknown length of the judgeship of Samuel (7 15), the years of the reign of Saul (cf 1 S 13 1, where, however, no statement is made as to the length of his reign), the 40 years during which David was king (1 K 2 11), and the 4 years of Solomon before the building of the Temple. The recurrence of the number 40 is already noticeable; but if for
the unknown periods under and after Joshua, of Samuel and of Saul, 50 or 60 years he allowed—a moderate estimate—there would remain from the total of 480 years a period of 300 years in round numbers or a fraction of the time of the Judges. It may be doubted whether the writer conceived of the period of unsettlement and distress, of alternate oppression and peace, as lasting for so long a time.

The chronological data contained in the Book of Jgs itself are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deliverance by Ehud and rest (3:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deliverance by Gideon and rest (6:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Deliverance by Gideon (6:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Deliverance by Jephthah (11:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Deliverance by Jephthah and rest (11:12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has been supposed that in some instances the rule of the several judges was contemporaneous, not successive, and that therefore the total period during which the judges ruled should be reduced accordingly. It has been considered sufficiently probable that this is the case, and that it is in the mind of the writer, for in each case he describes the rule of the judge as over "Israel" with no indication that "Israel" is to be understood in a partial and limited sense. His words must therefore be interpreted in their natural sense, that in his own belief the rulers who succeeded him exercised control in the order named over the entire nation. Almost certainly, however, he did not intend to include in his scheme the years of oppression or the 3 years of Abimelech's rule. If these be deducted, the resultant number (296) is very near the total which the statement in 1 K 6:1 suggests.

No stress, however, must be laid upon this fact. The repeated occurrence of the number 40, with its double and half, can hardly be accidental. The same fact was noted above in connection with earlier and later rules in Israel. It suggests that there is present an element of artifice and conscious arrangement in the scheme of chronology, which makes it impossible to rely upon it as it stands for any definite or reliable historical conclusion.

Within the Book of Jgs itself no author is named, nor is any indication given of the writer or writers who are responsible for the form in which the book appears; and it would seem evident, also, that the 3 parts or divisions of which the book is composed are on a different footing as regards the sources from which they are drawn. The Talmudic tradition which names Samuel as the author can hardly be seriously regarded. The historical introduction of the traditional narrative of the conquest of Palestine is parallel to but not identical with that contained in the Book of Josh. Brief and disconnected as it is, it is of the greatest value as a historical commentary and contains elements which bear in origin, if not in their present form, of considerable antiquity. The main portion of the book, comprising the narratives of the judges, is based upon oral or written traditions of a local and perhaps a tribal character, the value of which is enhanced by the fact that unembodied in some instances have been more carefully preserved than in others.

In particular, around the story of Samson there seem to have gathered elements derived from the folklore and the wonder-lending spirit of the countryside; and the exploits of the national hero have been enshrined in song and opera, surrounded with a glamour of romance as the story of them has passed from lip to lip among a people who themselves or their forefathers owed so much to his prowess. Of this central part of Jgs the Song of Deborah (chs. 4, 5) is the most ancient, and bears every mark of being a contemporary record of a remarkable conflict and victory. The text is often difficult, almost unintelligible, and has so greatly suffered in the course of transmission as in some passages to be beyond repair. As a whole the song is an eloquent and impassioned ode of triumph, ascribing to Jeh the great deliverance which has been wrought for His people over their foes.

The narratives of Jgs, moreover, are set in a framework of chronology and of ethical comment and teaching, which are probably independent of one another. The moral exhortations and the lessons drawn from hardships and sufferings, which the people of Israel incur as the consequence of their disobedience, are conceived as a divine arrangement of events, and the general idea of the book is that of a people suffering under the oppression of kings, with occasional periods of deliverance, who were led to repentance and to a recognition of the goodness of God in delivering them, and who were brought to acknowledge the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as the God of Israel. It is the religious conviction and ethical teaching that is predominant in the writings of that book. In the judgment of some scholars, therefore, they are to be ascribed to the same author or authors. Of this, however, there is no positive evidence, and it is perhaps hardly probable. They certainly belong to the same school of thought, of clear-sighted doctrine, of reverent piety, and of jealous concern for the honor of Jeh. With the system of chronology, the figures and dates, the ethical commentary and inferences would seem to have no direct relation. The former is perhaps a later addition, based in part at least upon tradition, and applied to existing accounts, in order to give them their definite place and succession in the historical record. Finally, the three strands of traditional narrative, moral comment, and chronological framework were woven into one whole by a compiler or reviser who completed the book in the form in which it now exists. Concerning the absolute dates, however, at which these processes took place very little can be determined.

The two concluding episodes are distinct, both in form and character, from the rest of the book. They do not describe the life or deeds of a judge, nor do they, at least, convey any moral teaching or warning. They are also mutually independent. It would seem therefore that they are independent of the scheme of dates and events or experiences, preserved by tradition, which, because they were not understood to have been part of the period of the Judges, were included in this book. Without the internal nature of the narratives themselves we should suggest that they belong rather to the earlier than to the later part of the time during which the judges held rule; and because their character is similarly attested. There is no clue, however, to the actual date of their composition, or to the time or circumstances under which they were incorporated in the Book of Jgs.

The discussion of the relation of the Book of Jgs to the generally recognized sources of the Pent and to Jgs has been in part anticipated in the previous paragraph. In the earliest introductory section of the book, and in the final exhortation, a form of the historical introduction of the Pent is presented, and this in the form of a form of the Pent "sources" are in great measure absent. There is more to be said for the view that regards the introduction (1—2 and 1o), with its verbal parallels to Josh and Judges, and which undoubtedly from the Pent, to which, however, very much has been omitted,
and the remainder adapted and abbreviated. Even this moderate conclusion cannot be regarded as definitely established. The later author or compiler was in possession of ancient documents or traditions, of which he made use in his composite narrative, but whether these were parts of the same book or fragments on the lines of the book is not known. Moses and in Josh must be regarded as undetermined. There is no trace, moreover, in Jgs of extracts from the writing or school of P; nor do the two concluding episodes of the book (chs 17-21) provide any means by which to attach an identification with any of the leading "sources" of the Pent.

The moral and religious teaching, on the other hand, which makes the varied experiences in the times of the Judges a vehicle for ethical instruction and warning, is certainly derived from the same school as Dt, and reproduces the whole tone and spirit of that book. There is no evidence, however, to identify the writer or reviser who thus turned to spiritual profit the lessons of the age of the Judges with the author of Dt itself, but he was animated by the same principles, and endeavored in the same way to expound the same great truths of religion and the Providence of God.

There are two early Gr tr of the Book of Jgs, which seem to be one whole independent of another. These are represented by the two great schools of criticism: (1) the Alexandrian, and (2) the Ethiopic. With the former is associated a group of cursive MSS and the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian text, VS. It is therefore probable that the tr is of Egyptian origin, and by some it has been identified with that of Hebrew. It has been shown, moreover, that in this book, and probably elsewhere, the ancient character of the text of B is not always maintained, but in parts at least betrays a later origin. The other VS which is contained in A and the majority of the uncial and cursive MSS of the Gr texts, and, while certainly a real and independent tr from the original, is thought by some to show acquaintance with the VS of B. There is, however, no definite evidence that B's tr is really older. Some of the critics who deal with A are in council with A form sub-groups; thus the reception of Lucian is believed to be represented by a small number of cursives, the text of which is printed by Lagarde (Liberum VT Canoniconum, Para Prior, 1883), and is substantially identical with that in the "Complutensian Polyglot." (See F. G. Moore, Critical and Exegetical Comm, on Jgs, Edinburgh, 1895, 811 f). It is probable that the true original text of the LXX is not entirely preserved in A, but is represented completely either by the one VS or the other VS, but that it partially underlies both, and may have been in the conflicting readings which must be judged each on its own merits.

Of the other principal VSS, the Old Lat and the Ethiopic, the former, with the Aramaic, and the latter with the Aramaic, have attached themselves to a sub-group of the MSS associated with A. The agreement of the LXX of the Book of Jgs has not hitherto been published, but, like the rest of the OT, it text would no doubt be found to agree substantially with B. Jerome's tr follows closely the MT, and is independent of both Gr VSS; and the Pesh is also a direct rendering from the Heb.

Thus the main purpose of the Book of Jgs in the form in which it has been preserved in the OT is not to record Israel's past for its own sake, or to place before the writer's own eyes the events of his own day, but to use these events and the national experiences of adversity as a text from which to deduce religious warning and instruction. With the author or authors, spiritual edification is the first interest, and the facts or details of the history, while a faithful record that was for all time, could not fail to entail the same disadvantages. The author is primarily a preacher of righteousness to his fellow-countrymen, and to this aim all other elements in the book, whether chronological or historical, are secondary and subordinate. In his narrative he sets down the whole truth, so far as it has become known to him through tradition or written document, however discreditable it may be to his nation. There is no ground for believing that he either ignored or misrepresents on the lines of the other trs or in dark colors than the record of the transgressions of the people deserved. Neither he nor they are to be judged by the standards of the 20th cent., with its accumulated wealth of spiritual experience and long training in the principles of righteousness and truth. But he holds and asserts a lofty view of the character of Jeh, of the immutability of His wrath against obstinate transgression and the certainty of its punishment, and yet of the Divine pitifulness and mercy to the man or nation that turns to Him with a penitent heart. The Jews were not mistaken when they counted the Book of Jgs among the Prophets. It is prophecy, more than history, because it exhibits and enforces the permanent lessons of the righteousness and justice and loving-kindness of God.


JUDGES, PERIOD OF:

I. Sources
II. Chronology
III. General or Political Situation
1. The Canaanites
2. The Suppression of the Canaanites
3. The Invasion of the Canaanites
4. The Need of Central Government

V. Religious Conditions
VI. Theological Interpretation

LITERATURE

I. Sources.—Our chief sources of information are the Book of Jgs and 1 S 1-12. The material contained in these is not all of the same age. The oldest part, by common consent, is the Song of Deborah (Jgs 5). It is a contemporaneous document. The period of the Judges is reckoned too early, and are generally regarded as presenting a faithful picture of the times with which they deal. The Book of Ruth, which also refers to this period, is probably in its present form a later composition, but there is no adequate ground for denying to it a historical basis (König, Einleitung, 286 f; Kent, Student's OT, I, 810 f).

II. Chronology.—The period of the Judges extends from the death of Joshua to the establishment of the monarchy. How long a time elapsed between these limits is a matter of wide difference of opinion. The chronological data in the Book of Jgs, i.e. omitting Ed and Samuel, make a total of 410 years. But this is inconsistent with 1 K 6 1, where the whole period from the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon is reckoned at 480 years. Various attempts have been made to harmonize these diverging figures, e.g. by eliminating the 70 years attributed to the Minor Judges (10 1-5; 12 7-15), by not counting the 71 years of foreign domination, and by the theory that some of the judges were contemporaneous. It is probable that the 480 years in Ex 1-6 was a round number, based on the 250 years of the exact records. Indeed, it is doubtful if there was any fixed calendar in Israel before the time of the monarchy.

The only way then to determine the length of the period of the Judges is from the date of the Exodus. The common view is that Exodus took place during or just before the reign of Merenptah in the latter half of the 13th cent. BC. This, however, leaves hardly more than 150 years to the period of the Judges, which fell in the 2d half of the 12th cent. BC. Hence some, to whom this seems too short, assign the Exodus to the
reign of Amenophis II, about 1450 BC. This harmonizes with the 480 years of 1 K 8:1, and is supported by other indications (P.O.R. 420-24). Still others had connected the Exodus with the expulsion of the Hyksos about 1550 BC (G. A. Reisner); and this would fit in very well with the chronological data of the Book of Judges. The objection to the last two views is that they require a too long period of subjection of the Israelites in Canaan to Egypt, of which there is no trace in the Book of Jgs. See, further, Judges, Book of, IV.

III. General Political Situation.—The death of Joshua left much land yet to be possessed by the Israelites. The different tribes had

1. The Canaanites (Jgs 1:3), but the actual possession of the territory assigned each still lay in the future and was only gradually achieved. The Canaanites remained in the land, and were for a time a serious menace to the power of Israel. They retained possession of the plains and many of the fortified cities, e.g. Gezer, Harareb, Ajalon, Shaalhim, and Jerus on the northern border of Judah (Jgs 1:21-29:35), and Bethshan, Bileam, Taanach, Megiddo along the northern border of Manasseh (Jgs 1:27:8).

Besides these foes within Canaan, the Israelites had enemies from without to contend with, viz. the Moabites, Midianites, Ammonites, and Philistines. The Israelites in the plains were still the centres of a system of international arrangement, and from this such united action is clearly taught in the Song of Deborah, at least so far as the 10 northern tribes are concerned. The omission of Judah and Simeon from this ancient song is strange, but may not be so significant as sometimes supposed. The judges, who were raised up to meet the various emergencies, seem to have exercised jurisdiction only over limited areas. In general the different tribes and clans acted independently of each other. Local home rule prevailed. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jgs 17:6).

That Canaan was not during this period subdued and kept in subjection by one of the great world-powers, Egypt or Babylonia, is to be regarded as providential (Jgs 1:21-28). The Canaanites each of these tribes were all more or less local in character. In no case did they act together, through the duty of their Elect, and such united action is clearly taught in the Song of Deborah, at least so far as the 10 northern tribes are concerned. The omission of Judah and Simeon from this ancient song is strange, but may not be so significant as sometimes supposed. The judges, who were raised up to meet the various emergencies, seem to have exercised jurisdiction only over limited areas. In general the different tribes and clans acted independently of each other. Local home rule prevailed. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jgs 17:6).

That Canaan was not during this period subdued and kept in subjection by one of the great world-powers, Egypt or Babylonia, is to be regarded as providential (Jgs 1:21-28). The Canaanites each of these tribes were all more or less local in character. In no case did they act together, through the duty of their Elect, and such united action is clearly taught in the Song of Deborah, at least so far as the 10 northern tribes are concerned. The omission of Judah and Simeon from this ancient song is strange, but may not be so significant as sometimes supposed. The judges, who were raised up to meet the various emergencies, seem to have exercised jurisdiction only over limited areas. In general the different tribes and clans acted independently of each other. Local home rule prevailed. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jgs 17:6).

1. Struggles

2. Civil Strife
a people with fixed institutions, customs and ideas. When then Israel settled in Canaan, they had both a heathen inheritance and a heathen environment to contend with. It should therefore occasion no surprise to find during this period such lapses from the purity of the Mosaic faith as appear in the ephod of Gideon (Jgs 8:24–27), the images of Micah (Jgs 17:3–18), and the sacrifice of Jephthah’s daughter (11:24–30). In the transition from a nomadic to an agricultural life it was inevitable that the Hebrews with their native heathen proclivities would adopt many of the crude and even immoral religious customs and beliefs of the people among whom they settled. But the purer Mosaic faith still had its representatives. The worship of the central sanctuary at Shiloh remained imieselors. Leaders like Deborah and Samuel revived the spirit of Moses. And there can hardly be a doubt that in many a quiet home a true and earnest piety was cultivated like that in the home of Elisheva and NaOMI.

VI. THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION.—The Bib. historian was not content simply to narrate events. What concerned him most was the meaning lying behind these things. He was interested in them, not for its own sake, but because of its application to the people of his own day. Hence intermingled with the narratives of the period of the Judges are to be found religious interpretations of the recorded events and exhortations based upon them. The fundamental lesson thus inculcated is the same as that continually insisted upon by the prophets. The Divine government of the world is based upon justice. Disobedience to the moral law and disloyalty to Jehovah are means, therefore, to Israel’s suffering and disaster. All the oppressions of the period of the Judges arose in this way. Relief and deliverance came only when the people turned unto Jehovah. This religious pragmatism, as it is called, does not lie on the surface of the events, so that a naturalistic historian might see it. But it is a correlate of the ethical monotheism of the prophets, and constitutes the one element in the OT which makes the study of Israel’s history supremely worth while.


ALBERT CORNELIUS KNIDSON

JUDGMENT, JU'jment, jü'ment: Often in the OT for "to act as a magistrate" (Ex 18:13; Dt 1:16; 16:18, etc.), justice being administered generally by "elders" (Ex 18:13-27), or "kings" (1 S 8:20) or "priests" (Dt 18:15). Applied to God as the Supreme Judge (Ps 9:7; 10:18; 96:13; Mic 4:3, etc.; Ps 7:8, "Jeh. ministereth judgment," vividly describes a court scene, with Jeh as Judge).

Often in the NT, ethically, for (1) "to decide," "give a verdict," "declare an opinion" (Gr krinó); (2) "to investigate," "scrutinize," "inquire" (Gr anakrinó); (3) "to discriminate," "distinguish" (Gr diakrinó). For (1), see Lk 7:43; Acts 15:19; for (2) see 1 Cor 2:15; 4:3; for (3) see 1 Cor 11:11; 14:29 m. Used also forensically in Lk 22:30; Acts 25:10; and applied to God in Jl 6:22; He 10:30. The judgments of God are the expression of His justice, the formal declarations of His judgments, whether embodied in words (Dt 6:1 AV, RV "statutes"), or deeds (Ex 6:6; Rev 16:7), or in decisions that are yet to be published (2 Cor 2:7). Man’s consciousness of God inevitably associates God’s judgments as declarations of the Divine justice, with his own condemnation, i.e., he knows that a strict exercise of justice means his condemnation, and thus "judgment" and "condemnation" become in his mind synonymous (Rom 5:16); hence the prayer of Ps 143:2, "Enter not into judgment!"; also, Jn 6:29, "the resurrection of judgment!" (AV "damnation"); 1 Cor 11:29, "eateth and drinketh judgment!" (AV "damnation").

H. E. JACOBS

JUDGMENT, DAY OF. See JUDGMENT, LAST.

JUDGMENT HALL, ju'jment hól (τὸ πρατηρίων, τὸ πρατηρίων, "then led they Jesus . . . unto the hall of judgment . . . and they themselves went not into the judgment hall" [Jn 18:28 AV]; "Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again" [18:33 AV]; "Pilate went again into the judgment hall" [19:9], "He commanded him to be kept in Herod's judgment hall," in the passages in the Gospels, ARV renders uniformly "Praetorium.")

The word originally meant the headquarters in the Roman camp, the space where the general’s tent stood, with the camp altar; the tent of the commander-in-chief. It next came to mean the military council, meeting in the general’s tent. Then it came to be applied to the palace in which the Roman governor or procurator of a province resided. In Jerusalem it was the magnificent. palace which Herod the Great had built for himself, and which the Roman procurators seem to have occupied when they came from Caesarea to Jerusalem to transact public business.

Praetorium in Phil 1:13 has been variously rendered, "the camp of the praetorian soldiers," "the praetorian guard," etc. For what is now believed to be its true meaning, see Praetorium.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

JUDGMENT, LAST: In Christian theology the Last Judgment is an act in which God interposes directly into human history, brings the course of this world to a final close, determines the eternal fate of human beings, and places them in surrounding spiritual and social conditions.

The concept is purely transcendental, and is to be distinguished from the hope that God will interfere in the history of the world to determine it undeniably toward good. The transcendental doctrine is possible only when an exalted idea of God has been attained, although it may afterward be united with crasser theologies, as in certain naive conceptions of Christianity at the present day.

In the religion of Israel, the doctrine of the Last Judgment arose from "transcendental" speculation, and the concept of the "Day of the Lord." 2. The Just as hope of immortality replaced Doctrine in desire for length of days on earth, just so the Religion as for "the rejuvenation of Pal" was of Israel substituted "an eternal abode in a new earth," so the ideal of a military victory over Israel’s enemies expanded into God’s solemn condemnation of evil. The concept thus strictly defined is hardly to be sought in the OT, but Dt 12:1–3 may contain it. The idea of a final withdrawal would appear to be in En 91:17, where the final state is contrasted with a preceding reign of earthly happiness. (If there has been no redaction in the latter part of this section, its date is prior to 165 BC. Hereafter the idea is so pervasive in the Jewish writings that detailed reference is needless. But it is by no means universal. Writings touched with Gr thought (En 108; 4 Macce;
Philochor) are content with an individual judgment at death. A unique theory is that of the Test. XII P (Levir 18 8-14, e.g.), where the world grows into final blessedness without catastrophe. But much more common is the notion transcedent to the Book ideas, ingrained as they were in the thought of the people (even in Philo; of his prophecy of national earthly glory in Ezrr 9). This type of thought was so tenacious that it held its own alongside of the transcendental, and both points of view were accepted by more than one writer. Then the earthly happiness precedes the heavenly (as in En 91), and there are two judgments, one by the Messiah and the other by God (2 Esd 7; Sir Bar 29, 30). So in Rev, where in ch. 19 Christ overcomes the enemy in battle-symbolism and establishes the Millennium, while the Last Judgment is held by God (20 11 ff). Otherwise the Messiah is never the judge except in the Parables of Enoch, where He appears as God's vicar uniformly (as in 47 3 God first comes on the scene in 

JUDITH, BOOK OF:

I. NAME

II. CANONICITY

III. CONTENTS

IV. FACT OR FICTION?

V. DATE

1. Probably during the Maccabean Age

2. Other Opinions

(a) Invasion of Pompey

(b) Insurrection under Bar Cochba

VI. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE

VII. VERSIONS

1. Greek

2. Latin

3. Hebrew

LITERATURE.

I. NAME.—This apocryphal book is called after the name of its principal character Judith (יוֹדִית, ydōtith, "a Jewess"); (יוֹדִית, ydōdith, Ἰουδίθ, ioōdith). The name occurs in Gen 26 34 and the corresponding masc. form (יוֹדִית, ydōtith, "a Jew"). In Jer 36 14.21.23 (name of a scribe). In other great crises in Heb history women have played a great part (cf Deborah, Jgs 5, and Esther). The Books of Ruth, Est, Jth and Susannah are the only ones in the Bible (including the Apoc) called by the names of women, these women being the principal characters in each case.

II. Canonity.—Though a taste of Jewish patriotism written originally in Heb, this book was never admitted into the Heb Canon, and the same with the Book of Tob. But both Jth and Tob were recognized as canonical by the Council of Carthage (397 AD) and by the Council of Trent (1545 AD). Though, however, all Romanists include these books in their Bible (the Vulg), Protestant VSS of the Bible, as well as the Apocyplysean, exclude the whole of the Apoc (see Apocypula). In the 1.XX and Vulg, Tob and Jth (in that order) follow Nêb and precede Est. In the Ev of the Apoc, which unfortunately for its understanding stands alone, 1. Esd, Tob, Jth and natural science, occupy the first place and in the order named. In his tr of the Apoc, Luther, for some unexplained reason, puts Jth at the head of the apocryphal books, Wisdom taking the next place.

III. CONTENTS.—The book opens with an account of the immense power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, whose capital was Nineveh. (In the days of the real Nebuchadnezzar, Assyria had ceased to be, and its capital was destroyed.) He calls upon the peoples living in the western country, including Pal, to help him to subdue a rival king whose power he feared—Arphaxad, king of the Medes (otherwise quite unknown). But as they refused the help he demanded, he first conquered his rival, annexing his territory, and then sent his general Holofernes to subdue the western nation for his defence of his authority. The Assyrian general marched at the head of an army 132,000 strong and soon took possession of the lands N. and E. of Pal, demolishing their idols and sanctuaries that Nebuchadnezzar alone might be worshipped as god (chs 1-3). He now directed his forces against the Jews who had recently returned from exile and newly rebuilt and reestablished their temple. Having heard of the ruin of other temples caused by the invading foe, the Jews became greatly alarmed for the safety of their own, and fortified the mountains and villages in the south, providing themselves with food to meet their needs in the event of war. At the urgent request of Joakim ("Eliakein" in the Vulg and Pes), the inhabitants of Bethulia (so the Lat., Eng., and other VSS, but Bethulia, Betulia is more correct according to the Gr) and of Bethemetham (both places otherwise unknown) defended the adjoining mountain passes which commanded the way to Bethulia, once laid siege to Bethulia, and by cutting off the water supply aimed at starving the people to submission. But he knew little of the people he is seeking to conquer, and asks the chiefs who are with him who and what these Jews are. Achior, the Ammonite chief, gives an account of the Israelites, con-
Judgment Seat of Christ

The Medes banquet that, 19), put often join eluding fortress of called First city and fugitive Passing warmly once this turns, this teaches: obey God and trust Him, and all will be well.

The author had no intention to teach history. Torrey, however, goes too far when he says (see Jew Enc, “Book of Jtt”) that the writer aimed at nothing more than to write a tale that would amuse. A tone of religious fervor and of intense patriotism runs through the narrative, and no opportunity of enforcing the claims of the Jewish law is lost. Note the place, what is it in the course of five days. A rich, devout and beautiful widow called Judith (daughter of Merari, of the tribe of Simeon [8 1]), hearing of these things, rebukes the murmurers for their lack of faith and exhorts them to be true to their Nabi.

As Onias, by his providence to the people, she resolves to attempt another mode of deliverance. She obtains consent to leave the fortress in the dead of night, accompanied by her maidservant, in order to join the Assyry camp. First of all she prays earnestly for guidance and success; then doffing her mourning garb, she puts on her most gorgeous attire together with jewels and other ornaments. She takes with her food allowed by Jewish law, that she might have no necessity to eat the forbidden meats of the Gentiles. Passing through the camp, she soon reaches the Assyrians. First of all, the soldiers on watch take her captive, but on her assuring them that she is a fugitive from the Hebrews and desires to put Holophernes in the way of achieving a cheap and easy victory, she is allowed to proceed on her way; and at long last, she is warmly welcomed and made much of. She reiterates to Holophernes the doctrine taught by Achior that these Jews can easily be conquered when they break the laws of their Deity, and she knows the necessities of their situation would lead them to eat food prohibited in their sacred laws, and when this takes place she informs him that he might at once attack them. Holophernes listens, applauds, and is at once captured by her personal charms. He agrees to her proposal and consents that she and her maid should be allowed each night to say their prayers out in the valley near the Heb fortress. On the 4th night after her arrival, Holophernes arranges a banquet to which only his household servants and the two Jewses are invited. When all is over, by a preconcerted plan the Assyrian general and the beautiful Jewish widow are left alone. He, however, is dead drunk and heavily asleep. With his own scimitar she cuts off his head, calls her maid with the proposal the previous night, and together they leave the camp as if for their usual prayers and join their Heb compatriots, still frantic about the immediate future. But the sight of the head of their arch foe puts new heart into them, and next day they make proposal to the prince of the land what had happened, and win an easy victory. Judith became ever after a heroine in Jewish romance and poetry, a Heb Joan of Arc, and the tale of the deliverance she wrought for her people has been told in many languages. For later and shorter forms of the tale see VII, 4 (Heb Midrashes).

IV. Fact or Fiction?—The majority of theologians down to the 19th. cent. regarded the story of Jtt as pure history; but with the exception of O. Wolf (1861) and von Gumpach, Protestant scholars in recent times have agreed that the Book of Jtt is a historical novel with a purpose similar to Dnt, Est and Tob. Schurer classes it with “parenthetic narrations” (parastatische Erzählung). The Heb novel is perhaps the earliest of all novels, but it is always a derivative written entirely on the principle or principles. Roman Catholic scholars defend the literal historicity of the book, though they allow that the proper names are more or less disguised. But the book abounds with anachronisms, inconsistencies of the law, impossibilities, and is evidently written for the lesson it teaches: obey God and trust Him, and all will be well. The author had no intention to teach history.

The Medes banquet 19), put often join eluding fortress of called First city and fugitive Passing warmly once this turns, this teaches: obey God and trust Him, and all will be well. The author had no intention to teach history.
probable that he belonged to that neighborhood. Though, however, the author wrote in the time of the Maccabees, he seems to set his history in a framework that is some 200 years earlier, as Noldke (Die antijude. Lit., 1898, 96; Aufsätze zur jüdischen Geschichte, pp. 255f.) observes. Schurer (Gesch. der V. III, 395f.) shows. In 350 BC, Herodotus in Athens, invaded Egypt, his chief generals being Holofernes (2, 4, etc.) and Bagoas (12, 11), both of whom are in Jth officials of King Nebuchadnezzar and in particular are mentioned in the expedition against the Jews. This was intended probably to disarm the criticism of enemies who might resent any writing in which they were painted in unfavorable colors.

(1) Invasion of Pompey.—That it was the Invasion of Pompey which gave rise to the book is generally admitted.

2. Other Details about the Date

Ps Sol and Jth will feel that in the former he has to do with the book of Judith, and in the latter with the book of Esther. Volkmann and Graetz date this book in the days of the emperor Trajan (or Hadrian?). Volkmann was often obliged to his attempt to prove that the campaigns of Nebuchadnezzar stand readily for those of Trajan. But it is a sufficient refutation of this view that the book is professedly written in the days of Artaxerxes of Rome (55), who died in 100 AD, and whose reference to the book of Esther was made to him in his days as authoritative and even as canonical, so that it must have been written long before.

VI. Original Language.—That a Heb or (less likely) an Aram. original once existed is the opinion of almost all modern scholars, and the evidence for this seems conclusive. There are many Hebaisms in the book, e.g. "et tay ḫămārōn, en tais hēmeras" (in the days of, 1 7, and 9 besides); the frequent use of ṣaphēa, ṣāphēa, in the sense of the Heb. "nēlāy," m. "sēbāh," and even its repetition (also a Hebraism, 4 8); of ṣēbē ṣēbē ṣēphārē, epī ṣēbē ṣāphēa (5 18) and ṣēbāh ṣēbāh ṣēphēa, ṣēubah ṣēbahā ṣāphēa (2 17). Note further the following: "Let not thy eye spare," etc. (2 11; cf. Ezek 5 11, etc.); "as I live, an eye," etc. (4 5); "the God of heaven" (6 5; 11 17); "son of man," parallel with "man," and in the same sense (8 16); "and it came to pass when she had ceased crying," etc. (10 1); "the priests who serve in Jerus before the face of our God" (11 13). In 16 3 we have the words of the Lord: "For a god that shattereth the battle is [the] Lord." Now "Lord" without the article can be only the Heb. "Yahveh," read always "adonay," "Lord." But the phrase, "to shatter battle," is not good Gr or good sense. The Heb words shabbath ("to rest"), shabbahu, "Sabbath," and shabbath ("to break"), are written much alike, and in the original Heb we must have had the causative form of the first vb.; "A God that maketh war cease is [the] Lord." (see Ps 46 9). Moreover, the Heb idiom which strengthens a finite vb. by placing a cognate (absolute) infinitive before it is represented in the Gr of this book in the usual form in which it occurs in the LXX (and in Welsh), viz. a participle followed by a finite vb. (see 2 13). The present writer has noted other examples, but they are prevented by lack of space from adding them here. That the original book was Heb and not Aram. is made extremely likely by the fact that the above examples of Heb idiom are peculiar to this language. Noted also it came to pass that," (2 4), with the implied "waqawṣī," and what is said above about 11 13, where the senseless Gr. arose through the confusion of two similarly written Heb (not Aram.) words. There are cases also of mistakes in the Gr text due to wrong tr from the Heb, as in 1 8 (where for "nations" read "cities"

or "mountains"); 2 2 (where for "concluded," Heb הַיָּדִים, wo-γγαλ, read "revealed," ἡδύοι "we-go-γαλ"); 3 1.9.10 (see Fritzsche, a., etc.).

VII. Versions.—The Gr text appears in three forms:

1. Greek text. LXX; (2) that of codd. 10, 108 (Lucian's text), an evident revision of (1); (3) cod. VS which closely resembles the text of the Old Lat and Pesh in most points.

There are two extant Syr VSS, both of them dependent on the Gr text (3) noted above. The Pesh is given in Walton's Polyglot and in a critically revised form in Lagard's Lib. VSS. The so-called Hexaplar Syr text was made by Paul of Tella in the 6th cent.

(1) The Old Lat text seems to have been made from the Gr text, cod. 58 (see above). (2) Jerome made his Lat translation of the Heb VSS, both of them dependent on the Gr text (3) noted above. Several later Heb VSS of the book have been found, none of them with strong claims to be considered the original text, though Gaster (see EB, II, 4. Hebrew Bible, col. 2342) does make such a claim for Codex Sangallensis (PSSA, XVI, 156-63). The Heb midrashim were made to conform to the life of Jewish homes and vary according to the circumstances of their origin. But they agree in these points: Proper names of persons who were involved in the wars are those of the Maccabees. Judith is a Jewish maiden and daughter of Ahihai, according to the Gaster MS, and in the variants adopted by Geller (see vii 2), the king who is killed. Translations of these midrashim may be seen in Jellinek, Bihl. Hamburg., L 352-77. Zeitschr. für wiss. Theologie, 1896, 337 f. Ball, Speaker's Apoc, 1. 25 ff.; Scholz, Komm., Anhang I and II; Gaster, op. cit. Gaster argues that the much shorter form of the tale in the MS is older than the longer VS. But if a writer were to expand the bulk of an old story, he would hardly be likely to invent several proper names and change others. It is probable that Judith came to be represented as a pure maiden (a virgin) under the influence of the low conception of marriage fostered in the mediæval Christian church.

LITERATURE.—For the editions of the Gr text and for comms. on the Apoc., see under Apocryphal Literature. But on Jth note, in particular the commentaries by Fritzsche and Ball, the latter containing the complete bibliography. But the following must in addition be mentioned: Scholz, Comm. über das Buch Judith, und über Bel und Dorotho, 1896; a 2d ed has appeared; A. S. Weissemann, Das Buch Judith historisch-kritisch geklärt, Wien, 1891; Schirmer, Geschichte der vollständigen Apoc., 1892; cf. full bibliography: cf. H. P. II, iii, 32-37; Pentin, The Apoc in English Lit., Judith, 1908; and several others in the Bible dict., esp. that by F. C. Porter in HDB.

J U B I L E E, jubileon (1) "Továv, pound; (2) "Iováh," "Iúlah;"

(1) 1 Ed. 9 34 = "Uéll" in Ezr 10 34.

(2) 1 Ed. 9 35 = "Joél" in Ezr 10 43.

J U G G L E R Y, jugjārī (γύγρια, goetía); the word occurs once in 2 Mac 12 24 RvM (AV "craft," RV "crafty guile").

J U I C E, jus, Jūs: The word occurs once in Cant 8 2 (υίος Καντ, ῥημαίος, "sweet wine"), and once in RvM of Job 6, 6, where for the word of an egg m. reads, "the juice of purslain." LXX has ῥημαίον κενόν, ῥημαίον κενόν, "empty words."

J U L I A, Júlía (Ἰουλία, Iōlia): The name of a Rom Christian to whom St. Paul sent greetings, the wife or sister of Philologus with whom he was coupled (Rom 16 15). The name points to a member of the imperial household.

J U L I U S, Júlijus (Ἰολίους, Iōlías): The cognate of the Augustan cohort under whose charge Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome (Acts 27 15). See ARMY, ROMAN; BAND, AUGUSTAN.

J U M P I N G, jum'ping. See GAMES.
JUNIAS, jōnī'-ās or JUNIA, jōnī'-a ('Ioovías, Jounias, Jounia); One to whom, with Andronicus, greetings are sent by Paul at the close of his letter to the Romans (Rom 16:7). The name may be masc., Junias, a contraction of Junianus, or fem. Junia; it is Ioovias, the accus. form, that is given. In all probability this is the masc. Junias, Paul defines the two as (1) "my kinsmen," (2) "my fellow-prisoners," (3) "who are of note among the apostles," and (4) "who also have been in Christ before me."

(1) They were Jews. Paul calls the Jews "my brethren" (Rom 16:3; cf. "kinsmen according to the flesh") (Rom 9:3). Because Prisca and Aquila, a Jew and Jewess, are not designated as kinsfolk, Conybeare and Howson suppose "the epithet to denote that the persons mentioned were of the tribe of Benjamin;"

(2) They had been companions of Paul in some unrecorded imprisonment. The phrase denotes more than the fact that they, like Paul, had suffered imprisonment for the sake of Christ.

This may mean (a) that they were well known to the apostolic circle (so Gifford and Weise), or (b) distinguished as apostles. The latter is probably correct, "apostle" being used in a wide sense (cf 1 Cor 15:7). The prophetic ministry of their kinsfolk consisted of apostles, prophets, and teachers (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11), the apostles being missionaries in the modern sense (see Lindsay, Church and Ministry, ch. iii). Some apostles were missionaries sent out by particular churches (Acts 13:23; 2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25). (4) They were among the first converts, "early disciples" like Mnaon of Cyprus (Acts 21:16).

S. F. HUNTER

JUNIPER, jōnī'-per ('junír, ëth; jâdârêt, jāthmén, K J 9:4; m. "broom" Ps 120:4, m "broom" Job 30:4 Is 4:3 "broom"). This is quite certainly the Arab. ratam (Retama retam, N. O. Leguminosae), a variety of bough which is one of the most characteristic shrubs of the deserts of Southern Palestine and southward to Egypt. Though the shade it affords is but slight, in the absence of other shrubs it is frequently used by desert travelers as a refuge from the scorching rays (cf 1 K 19:4). The root yields good charcoal, giving out much heat (Ps 120:4). For people to be reduced to chew it for nourishment betokens the lowest depth of starvation (Job 30:4).

Indeed so hopeless is this root as a source of food that many commentators believe that the accepted text in error, and by altering a single letter, substituting פ for ד, they get a reading which has been adopted in RVM, "to warm them" instead of "their meat," which certainly is much more probable.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

JUPITER, jōpī'-tēr, jōpī'-tēr (Zeus, Zeia): "Jupiter" is mentioned in the NT only on 1 Cor 15:23; Acts 14:12, 13, with Zeus; elsewhere in RVM in all cases. In addition the Gr stem appears in διονύστης, διοπέλεως, in Acts 19:35, EV "which fell down from Jupiter;" but the word means "from the clear sky" (cf "from heaven" in the RVm). "Jupiter" was considered the Lat equivalent of the Gr Zeus, the highest god in the developed Gr pantheon, and Zeus in turn, in accord with the syncretism of the period, was identified with countless deities in the local cults of Asia Minor and elsewhere. So in Acts 14:12, 13, "Zeus" and "Hermes" are local deities that had been renamed. On the other hand, the Zeus of 2 Macc 6:2 is the genuine Gr deity, who had been adopted as a special patron by Antiochus Epiphanes and to whose temple in Athens Antiochus had contributed largely. The title "Olympus" (2 Macc 6:7) is derived from the early worship on Mt. Olympus, but had come to be thought one of the god's highest appellations; Xenios, "protector of strangers," was a title in a cult particularly popular with travelers. See Abomination of Desolation, and Smith, H. G. H., 323-34. Burton Scott Easton

JUPITER AND MERCURY. See Astrology, III, 1; Mercury; Jupiter.

JURISDICTION, jō'-ri-s-dik'-shun (éxowías, ezowía): The word ezowía is well known in NT Gr. It is derived from the word éxest, and suggests the absence of any hindrance to an act. It contains the idea of right and might (Cremers). In the NT it met. consisted of apostles, prophets, and teachers (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11), the apostles being missionaries in the modern sense (see Lindsay, Church and Ministry, ch. iii). Some apostles were missionaries sent out by particular churches (Acts 13:23; 2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25). (4) They were among the first converts, "early disciples" like Mnaon of Cyprus (Acts 21:16).

JUSHAB-HESED, jōsh-ab-he'-sed (pâl pîn, yâshâb hešād, "loving-kindness is returned"): Son of Zerubbabel. The name is probably symbolic (1 Ch 3:20); cf Semea-Jeshob.

JUSTICE, just'is (râ'/ús, râ'dhâk, râ'/ús, sôdhe: ävâ'âr'ôn, dikasâ'ôn): The original Heb and Gr words are the same as those rendered "righteousness." This is the common rendering, and in about half the cases where we have "just" and "justice" in AV, ARV has changed to "righteousness." It must be constantly borne in mind that the two ideas are essentially the same. See Rigurresumers.

Justice had primarily to do with conduct in relation to others, esp. with regard to the rights of others. It is applied to business, where just weights and measures are demanded (Lev 19:33-34; Dt 25:15-16; Am 8:5; Prov 11:1; 16:11; Ezek 45:9-10). It is demanded in courts, where the rights of rich and poor, Israelite and sojourner, are equally to be regarded. Neither station nor bribe nor popular clamor shall influence judge or witness. "Justice, justice shalt thou follow" (Dt 16:20; cf vs 18-20; Ex 23:1-3-6-9). In general this justice is contrasted with that wickedness which "feared not God, and regarded not man" (Lk 18:2).

In a larger sense justice is not only giving to others their rights, but involves the active duty of establishing their rights. So Israel awaits upon God's justice or cries out: "The justice due to me [lit. "my justice"] is passed away from my God!" (Lsa 40:27). Jch is to show her to be in the right as over against the nations. Justice here becomes mercy. To "seek justice" means to "relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Lsa 1:17; cf 11:4; Jer 22:3; 7:44). The same idea appears in Dt 24:12-13; Ps 37:21-26; 112:4-6, where the tr is "righteous" instead of "just."

In this conception of justice the full meaning of
the NT is not yet reached. It does not mean sinlessness or moral perfection. Job knows the sin in his heart (Job 13:23; 7:21), and yet speaks of himself as a just or righteous man (12:4; 13:18). The Psalms and Proverbs depend upon the righteousness of God which he knows that no man is righteous in God’s sight (Ps 145:1; cf 7:8; 19:20-24). It is not a lack of humility or dependence upon God when the Psalmist asks to be judged according to his righteousness. In the OT, the just, or righteous, man is the one who holds to God and trusts in Him (Ps 33:18-22). This is not the later Judaistic legalism with its merit and reward, where God’s justice is simply a matter of giving each man what he has earned.

The word “justice” does not occur in the NT, and in most cases where we find “just” in AV it is changed to “righteousness” in ARV. The idea of justice or righteousness (remembering that these are essentially the same) becomes more spiritual and ethical in the NT. It is a matter of knowing God’s own spirit is the standard (1 Jn 3:7; Mt 5:48). The mere give-and-take justice is not enough. We are to be merciful, and that to all. The ideal is righteousness, not rights. As Holman understood: the keynote of the Sermon on the Mount is justitia and not jus! God’s justice, or righteousness, is founded in His essential nature. But, just as with man, it is not something abstract, but is seen in His relations all over to the world. It is His kingship establishing and maintaining the right. It appears as retributive justice, “that reaction of His holy will, as grounded in His eternal being, against evil wherever found” (Hab 1:13).

The great prophets, Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea, all insist upon Jeh’s demand for righteousness.

But this is not the main aspect of God’s justice. Theology has been wont to set forth God’s justice as the fundamental fact in His nature with which we must reconcile His mercy as best we may, the two being conceived as in conflict. As a matter of fact, the Scriptures make a distinction between justice, or righteousness, as the action of His mercy. Just as with man justice means the relief of the oppressed and needy, so God’s justice is His kingly power engaged on behalf of men, and justice and mercy are closely joined together as the two sides of God and a Saviour (Isa 45:21). “I bring near my righteousness or [my] justice! ... and my salvation shall not tarry” (Isa 46:13; cf Ps 51:14; 103:17; 71:15; 116:5; Isa 51:5.6). The “righteous acts of Jeh” mean His deeds of deliverance (Jgs 5:11). And so Israel sings of the justice, or judgments, or righteousness of Jeh (they are the same), and proclaims her trust in these (Ps 7:17; 53:23,24,25; 36:6; 140:12.13; 50:5.6; 94:14.15; 103:6; 145:1).

The NT, too, does not lack the idea of retributive justice. The Son of Man “shall render unto every man according to his deeds” (Mt 16:27; cf 25:14-46; Lk 12:45-48; Rom 2:2-5; 6:23; 2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:21-25; 2 Thess 1:8,9; 2:2,3; 10:26-33). But God’s justice is far more than this. The idea of merit and reward is really superseded by a higher viewpoint in the teaching of Jesus. He speaks, indeed, of recompense, but it is the Father and not the judge that gives this (Mt 6:14.6.18). And it is no mere justice of earth, because the reward transcends the human mediocrity (Mt 25:46.47). Mt 10:30; Lk 12:37). This is grace not desert (Lk 17:10). And the parable of Mt 20:1-15 gives at length the death-blow to the whole Judaistic scheme of merit and reward.

And God’s justice is not merely gracious, but redemptive. It not simply apportions rights, it establishes righteousness. Thus, just as in the OT, the judge is the Saviour. The difference is simply here: in the OT the salvation was more national and temporal, here it is personal and spiritual. But mercy is opposed to justice no more here than in the OT. It is by the forgiveness of sins that God establishes righteousness, and this is the supreme task of justice. Thus it is that God is at the same time “just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus” (Rom 3:26). “He is faithful and righteous” (or “just”), see AV) to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1 Jn 1:9).

**HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL**

**JUSTIFICATION, jus-ti-fi-kā’shan (Gr. ἸUSTΙFICATION, vb. ἸUSTΙFICAΣΤΙΣ, LXX and NT ἸΣΥΣΤΑΣΙΑ, dikaiosynai, ἸΣΥΣΤΑΣΙΟΣ, ἸΣΥΣΤΑΗΣ, vb. ἸΣΥΣΤΑΣΙΟΣ, ἸΣΥΣΤΑΗΣ, justification, “to justify,” in a legal sense, the declaring just or righteous. In Bib. lit. ἸΣΥΣΤΑΘΩ, ἸΣΥΣΤΑΘΩ, without denying the real righteousness of a person, is used invariably or almost invariably in a declarative or forensic sense. See sin, ἸΤΙΘΕΝ, 11:826; Thayer, Grimm, and Cremer under the respective words):**

I. **THE WRITINGS OF PAUL**

1. Universality of Sin
2. Perfection of the Law of God
3. Life, Work, and Death of the Atoning Saviour
   1) Paul’s Own Experience
   2) The Resurrection Connected with the Death
   3) Faith, Not Works, the Means of Justification
   4) Baptism Also Eliminated
   5) Elements of Justification
   a) Forgiveness of Sins
   b) Imputation to Good Standing as Righteous
   6) Justification Has to Do with the Individual

II. **THE OTHER NT WRITINGS**

1. The Synoptic Gospels
2. John’s Writings
3. 1 Peter and Hebrews
4. Epistle of James

III. **THE OT**

IV. **LATER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE**

1. Apostolic and Early Church Fathers
2. Council of Trent
3. Luther
4. Schleiermacher
5. Meaning and Message to the Modern Man

**LITERATURE.**—See Comm., and Bib. Theologies under “Justice” and “Righteousness;” and esp. Cremer, Bib.-Theol. Lex. of NT Gr.
4 3), as it is an essential part of an ordered universe, but that does not mean at all that it is also holy, right and good (Rom 7 12). It was added, of course, on account of transgressions (Gal 3 19), for it is only a world of intelligent, free spirits capable of sin, which need sin, and its high and beautiful sanctions make sin seem all the more sinful (Rom 7 13).

It was fundamental in Paul's thinking that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures (1 Cor 15 3). In due season He died for the justification of sinners. While we were working and sinning He died for us (ver 8): we are justified in His blood (ver 9), and the Atoning is through Him that we have been saved from wrath (ver 9). While we were enemies, God through the death of His Son (ver 10), being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God set forth as a propitiation (3 24-25). There is no reconciliation, no justification, except through and by and for Christ.

(1) Paul's own experience—his own experience cannot be left out of the account. He lived through the doctrine, as well as found it through illumination of the Spirit. It was not that he had only outwardly kept the law. He had been jealous for it, and had been blinded by its requirements and righteousness (Phil 3 6). What was born in upon him was how little such blamelessness could stand before the absolute standards of the law. How far he was shaken by doubts of this kind we cannot say with certainty; but it is clear that the concomitant of the Damascus conversion scene was the case of such an upright man and strenuous zealot without a psychological preparation, without supposing doubts as to whether his full-filling of the law could have brought him to be saved. God, now, would educate a man like him. Paul, there was no way of overcoming these doubts but in a renewed struggle for his own righteousness shown in the flesh. Hence Damascus Damascus (Asaph) is the Christian's experience of being born again, as the blazing light of noonday. This conversion broke down all his old views of the nature of life, of sin, of his innate righteousness. His assurance of salvation through works of the law done never so conscientiously and perfectly. The revelation of the glorified Christ, with the assurance that He, the God-Man Messiah, was the very one whom He was persecuting, destroyed his dependence on his own righteousness, a righteousness which had led him to such shocking conclusions. Although this was for him an individual experience, yet it had universal applications. It showed him that there was an inherent weakness in the law through fleshly mind, that the whole physical, natural, human, spiritual, material man, was considered as sinful, as working only on this lower plane, and that the law never can be illuminating by the Spirit. He, though sent in the likeness of the flesh of sin, yet (as an offering) for sin condemned sin and cast it out (Rom 3 19-20). If he might be fulfilled in those who through Him walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit (v 8), the law's righteousness as thus revealed. If the law had been able to do that, to give life, Christ need not have come. Righteousness would have been by the law (Gal 3 21). But the facts show that the law was not thus able, neither the law written on the heart given to men, nor the law given to Moses (Rom 1 18-3 19). Therefore every mouth is stopped, and all flesh is silent before God. On the ground of law-keeping, what the modern man would call morality, our hope of salvation has been shattered. The law has spoiled the doctrine against us (Gal 3 10). It cannot therefore lead us to righteousness and life, nor was that its supreme intention: it was a pedagogue or tutor to lead us to Christ that we might be justified by faith (ver 24; see Thmas in R 17, 488-84).

What made Paul to differ from his companions in the faith was that his own bitter experience under the revelation of Christ had led him to these facts.

(2) The resurrection connected with the death.—It was remarked above that the ground of justification to Paul is the work of Christ. This means esp. His death as a sacrifice, in which, as Ritschl well says (Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, 3. Aufl., 1899, I, 157), the apostles saw exercised the whole power of His redemption. But that death came from His resurrection, when first awakened them to the knowledge of a decisive worth for salvation, as well as finally confirmed their faith in Jesus as the Son of God. "The objective salvation," says Ritschl (p. 158), "which was connected with the sacrificial death of Christ, and which continued on for the church, was made secure by this, that it was asserted also as an attribute of the resurrected one," who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification (Rom 4 25). But this last expression is not to be interpreted with literal preciseness, as though Paul intended to distinguish between the forgiveness of sins as brought about by the death, and justification, by the resurrection, for both forgiveness and justification are identified in 4 6-8.

It was the resurrection, which gave Christians their assurance concerning Christ (Acts 17 31); by that resurrection He has been exalted to the right hand of God, where He maketh intercession for His people (Rom 8 34), which mediatorial foundation is upon His death—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev 13 8 n; cf Gr text).

B. Wells well says: "It was by the certainty of the exaltation of Christ to Messianic sovereignty brought about by the resurrection that Paul attained to faith in the saving significance of His death, and not conversely. Accordingly, the assurance that God cannot condemn us who believe in Jesus to His resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand (Rom 8 34), is the same assurance which the death was the death of the mediator of salvation, who has redeemed us from condemnation. The objective atonement—Christ's death, but the appropriation of it in justification is possible only if we believe in Him, His death, and we can attain to faith in that only as it is sealed by the resurrection (Bibl. Theol. of NT, I, 458-57).

(3) Faith, not works, the means of justification.—The means or condition of justification is faith (Rom 3 22-25, 26, 28, etc) which rests upon the pure grace of God and is itself, therefore, His gift (2 8). This making faith the only instrument of justification is presupposed in every case of the receptive attitude of the soul, it is in the nature of the case the only avenue through which Divine blessing can come. The gifts of God are not against the laws of the soul which He has made, but rather are in and through those laws. Faith is the hand outstretched to the Divine Giver, who, though He sends rain without our consent, does not give salvation except through an appropriate spiritual response. This faith is not simply belief in historical facts, though this is the basis of the atoning death (Rom 3 25), and the resurrection (10 9) of Jesus, but is a real heart reception of the gift (ver 10), and is therefore able to bring peace in our relation to God and salvation. The object of this faith is Jesus Christ (2 22, etc), that is, that He only comes the gift of righteousness and the reigning in life (5 17), not Mary, not angels, not doctrine, not the church, but Jesus only. This, to be sure, does not exclude God the Father as an object of faith, as the redeeming act of Christ is itself the work of God (2 Cor 5 19), whose love expressed itself toward us in this way (Rom 5 8). Faith in the only one God is always presupposed (1 Cor 6 8), but it was the apostolic custom rather to appeal once to God and then to Christ (Acts 20 21). But the oneness of God the Father and Christ the Son in a work of salvation is the best guaranty of the Divinity of the latter, both as an objective fact and as an inner experience of the Christian.

The justification being by faith, it is not by works or by love, or by both in one. It cannot be by the former, because they are lacking either in time or amount or quality, nor could they be accepted in any case until they spring from the heart renewed, for which faith is the necessary presupposition. It cannot be by the latter, for it exists only where the Spirit has shed it abroad in the heart (Rom 5 5), the indispensable prerequisite for receiving which is faith. This does not mean that the crown of Chris-
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Justification is not love, for it is (1 Cor 13:13); it means only that the root is faith. Nor can love be fostered in faith, for faith is the condition of the expression of the strength of the word often quoted for that purpose, "faith working through love" (Gal 5:6). The apostle is speaking here only of those who are already "in Christ," and he says that over against the Galatians, who are for the sake of legal observances, the only availthing thing is not circumcision or its lack, but faith energizing through love. Here the interest is, as Ritschl says (II, 343), in the kingdom of God, but justification proper has reference to the apportionment of the present world to the individual, or the excellent remarks of Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, 1894, 226-27. At the same time this text reveals the tremendous ethical religious force abiding in faith, according to St. Paul. It reminds us of the great sentence of Luther in his preface to the Ep. to the Rom, where he says: "Faith is a Divine work within us which changes and renovates us in God according to Jn 1:13, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. This destroys the old Adam and makes new creatures of us in heart, will, disposition, and all our powers. Oh, faith is a living, active, jealous, mighty thing, inasmuch as it cannot possibly remain unproductive of a new atmosphere of a new freedom of the Lord, according to Luther's definition (Werke, Ed. 20, p. 229)."

4. Baptism also eliminated.—Not only are good works and love removed as conditions or means of justification of the sinner, but baptism is also eliminated. According to Paul, it is the office of baptism not to justify, but to cleanse, that is, symbolically to set forth and seal the work that the Spirit of God has wrought in the sinner by a dramatic act of burial, which for the subject and all witnesses would mark a never-to-be-forgotten era in the history of the believer. "Baptism," says Wetten (I, 454), "presupposes faith in Him as the one whom the church has acknowledged, and also binds to adherence to Him which excludes every dependence upon any other, inasmuch as He has acquired a claim upon their devotion by the saving deed of His self-surrender on the cross." So important was baptism in the religious atmosphere at that time that hyperbolical expressions were used to express its cleansing and illuminating office, but these need not mislead us. We must interpret them according to the fundamental conceptions of Christianity as a religion of the Spirit, not of magic nor of material media. Baptism pointed to a complete parting with the old life by previous renewal through faith in Christ, which renewal baptism in its true seal and announced in a climactic act of self-dedication to him, and this, while symbolically and in contemporary parlance of both Jew and Gentile, a bird, that is, a sign to others, but also in the psychological experience of the baptized. But while justification is often attributed to faith, it is never to baptism.

(5) Elements of justification.—What are the elements of this justification? There are two: (a) Forgiveness of sins (Rom 4:5-8; cf Acts 13:38, 39). With this are connected peace and reconciliation (Rom 5:1-10; cf 10:11). (b) The declaring or appointing as righteous, or just (Rom 8:21-30; 4:2-9:22; 5:19-11:16-21, etc.). C. F. Schmid is perfectly right when he says that Paul (and James) always uses dikaiosuné in the sense of esteeming and pronouncing and treating as right according to an inner principle, as the Mosaic law (Rom 2:13; 3:20) and also according to grace (Bib. Theol. of the NT, 1870, 497). The word is a forensic one, and Godet goes so far as to say that the word is never used in all Gr. lit. for making right (Rom 3:28), but also for making just. The contempts of "to justify" is not "to be a sinner," but is "to accuse" or "to condemn" (Rom 8:33:34), and the contrast of "justification" is "condemnation" (5:18). Besides, it is not the infusing of a new life, of a new holiness, which is counted for righteousness, but it is faith which is so counted (Rom 4:5; Phil 3:9). That upon which God looks when He justifies is not for the sake of legal observances, the only availthing thing is not circumcision or its lack, but faith energizing through love. Here the interest is, as Ritschl says (II, 343), in the kingdom of God, but justification proper has reference to the apportionment of the present world to the individual, or the excellent remarks of Bruce, St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, 1894, 226-27. At the same time this text reveals the tremendous ethical religious force abiding in faith, according to St. Paul. It reminds us of the great sentence of Luther in his preface to the Ep. to the Rom, where he says: "Faith is a Divine work within us which changes and renovates us in God according to Jn 1:13, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. This destroys the old Adam and makes new creatures of us in heart, will, disposition, and all our powers. Oh, faith is a living, active, jealous, mighty thing, inasmuch as it cannot possibly remain unproductive of a new atmosphere of a new freedom of the Lord, according to Luther's definition (Werke, Ed. 20, p. 229)."

As to the argument from baptism urged by Sanday-Headlam, it must be said that Paul always conveys the idea of justification as taking place in the individual, and with believers and for believers, that faith and not to which they are baptized is not justification, but the death and resurrection of Christ (8:34), and that the righteousness of God has been manifested not through baptism but through faith in Jesus (Phil 2:20), being justified freely, not through baptism, but through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Rom 3:22), being justified freely, not through baptism, but through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Rom 3:22), being justified freely, not through baptism, but through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Rom 3:22). With Paul baptism has always a mystical significance as symbolizing and externally actualizing union with the death of the Lord, and would be both impossible and impertinent in the case of those who are not already believers in Christ and thus inwardly united to His society.

II. The Other NT Writings.—So much for Paul. Let us now take a glance at the other NT books. It is a commonplace of the theology that is called "modern" or "critical," that Paul and not Jesus is the founder of Christianity as we know it, that...
the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ, atonement, justification, etc., are Paul's work, and not his Master's. There is truth in this. It was part of the humanity of Christ as well as His pedagogical method to live a life of love and light, to die for the sins of the world, and then go back to the Father that the Holy Spirit might come and lead His followers into all truth. A full statement of the doctrines of Christianity on His part would have been premature (Jn 16:12), would have been pedagogically unwise, if not worthless. First the blade, then the ear, who could bear the fruit of the full grain in the ear (Mk 4:28). It would also have been spiritually and philosophically impossible, for Christianity was not a set of teachings by Christ—but a religion springing out of His life, death, resurrection, ascension, intercession, mediatorial activity in history through the Spirit who works in His disciples and on the world through and by that life, death, etc. The only question is whether the apostles were true to the spirit and content of His teaching; that is, in its moral and divine outlines. 

1. The Synoptic Gospels

So far as the Synoptic Gospels, as Harnack says (What Is Christianity? 24 ed, rev., New York, 1901, 68), that the "whole of Jesus' message may be reduced to these two heads: God as Father, and the human soul so ennobled that it can and does unite with Him," that an essential part of His message is omitted, viz., that salvation is bound up in His (Christ's) own person. (The reader is asked to verify the references for himself, as space will not allow quotation.) See Mt 10:37-38; 16:24-27. Confession of Him (not simply of the Father) determines acknowledgment above (10:32), where judgment is rendered according to our attitude to Him in His unfortunate ones (25:35 ff.). No sooner was our faith right, than the necessity of the unfold necessity of His death and resurrection (16:21). The evening before that death occurred, He brings out its significance, perpetuates the lesson in the institution of the Supper (Mk 14:24), and reinforces it after His resurrection (Lk 24:26). Paul himself could hardly have expressed the fact of the atonement through Christ's death more decisively than Mt 20:28; 26:28. With this foundation, could the Christian doctrine of salvation take any other course than that actually did take? Instead of referring men to the Father, Christ forgives sins Himself (9:2-6), and Herod cons all men as needing this forgiveness (6:12). While the time had not arrived for the Pauline doctrine of righteousness, Jesus prepared the way for it, negatively, in demanding a humble sense of sin (6:8), inner fitness and perfection (vs 6:8.20.48), and positively in requiring recourse to Him by those who felt the burden of their sins (11:28), to Him who was the rest-giver, and not simply to God the Father, as in Deut 33:27. Christ Rom 8:1 is an echo. For it was specially to those to whom, as to the awakened Paul, the law brought condemnation that He came, to heal and to save (Mt 2:2; 17:13; Lk 17:5). It was for sinners and to sinners that He came (Lk 16:2; 7:9, 14:7; 11:59, just as Paul understood; and the way for their salvation was not better law-keeping, but trusting prayer in the confession of sin (Lk 18:13), really equivalent to faith, the humble heart and a hunger for righteousness (=faith). See Mt 6:33. He, who brings most of His own pride, works, is the least likely to obtain the kingdom of heaven (18:34; Mk 10:14). Not only entrance, but the final reward itself is of grace (Mt 19:30; 20:1-16), a parable in the true spirit of Paul, and in the promise of Paradise to the penitent robber (Lk 23:43). At the very beginning the message sounded out, "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel" (Mk 1:15), the gospel which was summed up in Christ, who would gather the people, not directly to God, the Father, but to Himself (Mt 23:37). All this means justification through that faith in Himself, in His Divine-human manifestation (Mt 16:13-16), of which faith He expresses Himself with anxiety in Lk 18:8, and the presence of which he greeted with joy in Mt 8:10. Ihmels is right therefore in holding (RB, XVI, 400) that Paul's proclamation was continuous with the self-witness of Jesus, which conversely pointed as a consequence to the witness of Paul.

2. John's Writings

Justification by faith is not more implicit in John's Gospel than in the first three; it is only more explicit (Jn 3:14-16). Eternal life is the blessing secured, but this of course in its own way and in its own time. Faith is not conceivable in those under condemnation and without faith; and the confession of sins that leads to forgiveness seems only another name for the justification that brings peace (Jn 14:20). Everything is, as with Paul (Eph 2:7; Tit 3:4), led back to the love of God (1 Jn 3:1), who sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins (4:10).

Seeberg's point that the "Pauline doctrine of justification is not found in any other NT writer" (History of Doctrine, I, 48) is true when you consider that it has the all the marks of a fully developed system. Its conception is different from Paul's (3:18 ff.), which is not only an act of grace, but also a fact of human experience (Rom 5:1). Paul is generalizing in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 13:38) are meaningly estimated (6:17). It is He in whom, though we see Him not, yet believing, we rejoice greatly with joy unsearchable (1 Pet 1:8), praying for the end of our faith (Heb 6:19), and having it (Rom 4:19). It is, only however, through the precious blood of a lamb without blemish, even that of Christ our Pasch, and is only through Him that we are believers in Jesus (the true light, the true faith, 2:21). The familiar expression, "Come to Jesus," which simply means have faith in Jesus for justification and salvation, goes back to Peter (2:4). The Ep. to the Hebrews has other interests to look after, but it does not deny faith, but rather exhorts us to draw near with a true heart in the name of Jesus (10:22), which it lays at the foundation of all faith and all religion (ch 11). The writer can give no better exhortation than to look unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith (12:2), an exhortation in the true spirit of Paul, whose gospel of faith for justification is also summed up in 16.

We come lastly to the core of the matter in regard to NT representations of justification—the famous passage in Jas 2:14-26, which at first sight seems a direct blow at Paul. Of James Here we are met by the interesting problem of the date of the Epistle. There is no way to enter into this (see James, Epistle Qf.), what we say must be independent of this question. A careful look at this vigorous and most valuable letter (valuable in its own place, which is not that of Paul's letters, in comparison with which it is a strange epistle) shows that it is a lawful and genuine letter, which is a chapter in the English literature, speaking of the way to do justice, the poor and the destitute, the bondman and the young widow.
which he did not mean to reject it as useless [straw has most important uses], but as giving the doctrine of salvation, for which we must look to Paul) will show how much the part of James to Paul is apparent and not real.

(1) In this section James uses the word faith simply for intellectual belief in God, and esp. in the unity of God (2:20; see also verse 18, where Paul uses it for a holding of Christ as Lord and as Saviour). He knows no faith which does not bring forth good works corresponding to the heavenly Christ. Therefore he who does not give his life to the things which does not come from faith is sin. For James faith is the justification of men to the heavenly Christ (2:1), or it is the theologico-acknowledged title of the justification of which is for James speaking, just of him who is righteous, an analytical judgment. He and Peter say that the Divine recognizes without Paul did not understand the fact. He was left to Luther through his deep religious experience first to last doctrine of justification.) (2) James uses the word “works” as meaning practical morality, going back beyond legalism, behind Pharisaism, to the position of the OT prophets, whereas Paul uses the word as meritorious action deserving reward. (3) When James is in his “do, be judicious” to w., the judicial judgment of God, which recognizes this righteousness of life as actual. His arguments concern the use of grace of God in which He graciously receives the believing sinner returning to Him, and takes him into fellowship with Himself. James, in the early church, uses the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 10:43), and that he would have contested the Pauline idea of justification by grace, insisting only that works may be possible. Theologically, the chief if not the only difference between the ancient and modern is the center of his point of view, while the atonement was fundamental with all Paul’s thinking. See, further, James, Epistles.

III. The Old Testament.—A word in conclusion as to the OT. All the NT writers built on the OT. That there should be a clear or contradiction between the OT and what we call the NT would have been to them inconceivable. But they realized that the law all the time is condemned (Dt 27 26 LXX; Gal 3:10; of Ps 14:13:2; Rom 3:20; see vs 9-20, and the reference to the OT in ARV). The prophets insisted upon the practical works of righteousness.—What doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly before thy God? (Mic 6:8) His narrowness was clear of his catholic inheritance that he could reproduce Paul purely. He made a judge by which we could go either back to Paul or forward to the Reformation. And of course we must not think that the Council of Trent was another to that of 95 Theses. It was the last revival in the ancient church that “faith alone saves,” and, on the other, he silenced that principle for a thousand years. The very Catholic theologian who stood nearest to that was no friend to the Reformers (Zeitschrift f. Thol. u. Kirche, 1891, 177). His misapprehension of the religious attitude or services could take the place of uprightness of life. This does not mean that the OT writers understood that men were justified simply by their good deeds, for it was always believed that unverifiable all was the mercy and loving-kindness of God, whose forgiving grace was toward the broken and contrite spirit, the iniquities of whom were not to be carried by the Servant of God. But Paul will nullify many (Ps 103 8-13; 85 10; Isa 57 15; 53 11, and many other passages).

IV. Later Development.—A brief statement now on the development of the doctrine of the Christian church. It is humiliating to Christ business immediately after the apostles the first generation to the heights of Paul, or even the lower levels of his brethren. There are passages which remind one of his: because that the atmosphere is different. Christ's messianic business rather than as a gospel of the grace of God. We cannot go into the reasons for this: suffice it to say that in gentle and the NT writings were not yet in the consciousness of the church to the extent that they dominated her thinking. The fine passage In Clement of Rome (97 AD, ch xxxii): “They all therefore [i.e. Abraham and other fathers] is glorified and magnified, and that they and their own works or the righteous doings which they wrought, but through His God will. And so we, having been called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding, but through the grace of God: that we should believe in holiness of heart, but through faith, wherefore none the Almighty God justifies (Gen 3:9).” This has been from the beginning: to whom be glory forever and Amen."

But the whole passage is that complemented faith with other parts of the church—hospitability and godliness the saving virtues for Lot in Gen 19, couples holiness and faith together as equal for Rahab in ch xlii, and represents forgiveness of sins through keeping commandments and love in ch I. Ignatius speaks 157 AD, about 110-15 A.D. speaking also of Christ dying for us, that believing on His death we might escape death (2 Pet. 2:9). The angel taught the payment of the final sacrifice. Paul on preserving the OT. And they must believe (1 Thess 5:18), the Old Testament. He kept, the Old Testament.

None of them will be perfect in your faith and love toward Jesus Christ, for these things are the beginning and the end of life—the beginning and the love of the end, and the two being found in unit are God, while all things else fail in their train unto true nobility” (Eph 1). The so-called Barnabas (date uncertain) puts the death of Christ Jesus at the foundation of salvation, which is expressed, by the remission of sins through His blood (Eph 5), the kingdom of Jesus being on the cross, so that they who set their hope on Him shall live forever (ch 8), while the time even believers are not yet justified (ch 4), for which finally a whole series of works are done and works of darkness avoided (ch 19). The Shepherd of Hermas and the Ancient Hymn —2 Clem are even more moralistic, whereas the true text is that God shall be the beginning of the merit. The same critical tone sounds through that invaluable little prophecy that was first published in 1873 and first published by him in Constantinople in December, 1863, The Teaching (Didache) of the XII Apostles, that is the first almost full-fledged as early as in Tertullian (80 AD) and Cyprian (200 AD). See Cyprian, 1890, 146 ff. And thus it continued until—so far as our outline is concerned—it struck Augustine, bishop of Hippo and on the cross of Christ the center of his point of view, while the atonement was fundamental with all Paul’s thinking. See, further, James, Epistles.

Those consequences are best seen in the decrees of the Council of Trent (Session 6, 1547), to which we now turn, and which are the definite and final
crystallization of the mediaeval development, so far as that development was Catholic. (1) Justification is a translation from a natural state to a state of grace. With this procedure works are conditioned, and the soul is assisted, and with this in his turn man cooperates and prepares himself for justification. This cooperation has the merit of conformity, though the first call comes before any merit. (2) Faith is an element in justification, "Receiving faith by hearing, they of free will draw near to God, believing those things to be true which have been Divinely revealed and promised." Faith as a living trust in a personal Saviour for salvation is lacking. Among the truths believed is the mercy of God and that He wishes to justify the sinner in Christ. (3) This faith begets love to Christ and hatred to sin, which are elements also of the justifying process. (4) Now follows justification itself, "which is not a bare remission of sins, but also sanctification and renewal of the inner man through the voluntary reception of grace and of gifts." (5) But this renewal must take place through baptism, which, to the prepared adult, both gives and seals all the graces of salvation, forgiveness, cleanning, faith, hope and love. (6) Justification is preserved by obeying the commandments and by good works, which also increase it. (7) In case it is lost—and it can be lost, not by venial, but by mortal sin, let all who are born again to the sacred sacrament of penance. (8) To get it, to keep or regain it, it is also necessary to believe the doctrines as thus laid down and to be laid down by this Council (see the decrees in any ed, or in Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Patrologia, 306–16, or in Buckley's or in Waterworth's translations, and for an admirable and objective summary see Seeberg, History of Doctrine, II, 433–38).

Recent researches in Luther's early writings have shown that almost from the beginning of his earnest study of religious questions, he mounted up to Paul's view of justification by faith alone (Loofs, DG, 4. Aufl., 1906, 696–98). Faith is the trust in the mercy of God through Christ, and justification is the declaring righteous for His sake, which is followed by a real making righteous. From the beginning to the end of his life as a religious teacher these are the elements of his doctrine. Speaking of 1513–15, Loofs says: Upon the changes of sensation, forgiveness, faith=trust in His grace=the regulators of his religious self-judgment, Luther's piety rests, and corresponding to them his view of Christianity, and even later" (than 1513–15); and he adds that "to reckon as righteous" (reputari justum) must not be understood with Luther as an opposition "to make righteous," for his "to be justified without merit" in the sense of "to forgive" (absolvit) is at the same time the beginning of a new life: "restituit me sic absolvit... ipsa resurrecto. His constantly and firmly held view, even more deeply eschatologically later than in 1513–15, that "to be justified without merit" = "to be resurrected [to be born again]" = "to be sanctified" is a pregnant formulation of his Christianly. So much being said, it is not necessary to draw out Luther's doctrine further, who in this respect "rediscovered Christianity as a religion," but it will suffice to refer to the Histories of Doctrine (Seeberg gives a full and brilliant exposition), to Theologie, 2. Aufl., 1901 (Die Index a.v. "Rechtfertigung," and I, 349), and esp. to Thieme, Die sittliche Triebkraft des Glaubens: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthere Theologie, 1893, 103–311.

From Luther and the other reformers the NT doctrine went over to the Protestant churches without essential modification, and has remained their nominal testimony until the present. A classic expression of it, which may be taken as representing evangelical Christendom, is the 11th of the 39 Articles of the Anglican Church of England: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or de-servings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." It is true that at one time Wesley's opponents accused him of departing from this doctrine, esp. on account of his famous Minute of 1770, but this was due to a radical misunderstanding of that Minute, for to the last he held staunchly Paul's doctrine (for proof see my article in Lutheran Quarterly, April, 1906, 171–75).

A new point of view was brought into modern theology by Lyman, who starts from the fundamental fact of Christian experience: reconciliation with Christ, which fact becomes ours by union with Christ through faith. To this union brings into the heart all other blessings, but justification is not considered as even in thought a separate act based on Christ's death, but as part of a great whole of salvation, historically realised step by step in Christ. The result is to break and destroy the distinction between justification and regeneration, as they are simply different aspects of union with Christ.

Ritschl carried forward this thought by emphasizing the grace of the Father. The 3rd Council of Trent, in the name of Christ the Son to the Christian community, says: "To which God imputes the praise of the Church its founder," and in the second instance to individuals "as by faith in the Gospel they attach themselves to this community, they believe with God and trust in the revelation of his grace in Christ." This brings sinners to fellowship with God which means eternal life, which is here and now realized, as the Fourth Gospel points out, in leadership over the world (cf. Franks in DCQ, I, 929–36). The judicial or forensic aspect of justification so thoroughly in-wrought in Paul's thought is denied by Ritschl. "In whatever way we view the matter," he says, "the attitude of God in the act of justification cannot be conceived as that of a judge" (Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, ET, 1906, 90). W. N. Clarke agrees with Ritschl in eliminating regeneration as an element in the work of salvation, and harks back to the Catholic view in seeking its dependence on the new life as the subsequent Christian life. Thus the Ritschlian book has had as much influence in destroying the NT conception of justification as it has in concealing the readers as that of J. H. Newman, Lectures on Justification, 1838, 3d ed, 1874, which contains some of the finest passages in religious literature (pp. 227–29), but which was so sympathetic to the Catholic view that the author had nothing essential to retract when he joined Rome in 1845. "Whether we say we are justified by faith, or by works, or by sacraments, all these but mean this one doctrine that we are justified by grace which is given through sacraments, imprecated by faith, manifested in works" (p. 306).

Lastly, has the NT conception of justification by faith any message to the modern man, or is it, as Lagarde held, dead in the Protestant churches, something which went overboard with the old doctrine of the Trinity and of Atonement? After an able historical survey, Holl concludes (Die Rechtfertigungsgleber im Lichte der Geschichte d. Protestantismus, Tübingen, 1906, 40–42) that there are two principles thoroughly congenial with this doctrine, viz. that of the sano and importance of personality, the 'I' that stands face to face with God, responsible to Him alone; and second, the restoration of the Reformation thought of an all-working God. The pressure of these two principles, for him the question of justification becomes a living one. "The stand-
ard on which he must measure himself is the Absol- 
Norr, simply on account of single acts, but with his 
it is entirely corrupt, and that he can do no other than to despair when the majesty of 
41. There is, then, no other solution than the venture of faith that the same God who 
His sovereign grace, that we live through Him and 
Luther is right that religiously we can find no hold except on the Divine act of grace, 
To give up the doctrine of justification, says Holl 
Again, he says to allow consciousness personal 
Holl writes as a liberal, and he quotes a stronger liberal still, Treitschke, as saying that in 
the 19th cent. it was the orthodox preachers who 
proclaimed this doctrine, who built better than the 
Norr, says Holl in another book (Was hat die 
Rechtfertigungsllehre dem modernen Menschen 
zusagen? Tübingen, 1907, 26), can anyone who has 
experienced justification as an inner transformation 
been misled into moral unconcern. A moral ideal 
becomes his, much stronger and more compelling 
than worldly ethics. The new attitude toward 
God constituted by justification impels to an 
unending movement in the service of God and man. 
The doctrine has not had its day. It is a part of the 
universal gospel. As long as sinful man has to do 
with an all-holy God, the experience of Paul, Luther 
and Wesley becomes in a sense normative for the 
race.

LITERATURE.—Besides the books mentioned in 
the text, the following on justification itself may be consulted 
those marked with a star are Protestant, those with a 
dagger are Catholic (High Church Anglican); Goodwin, 
new ed., with preface by Wesley, 1867; Janz, 1839; 
Hare, new ed. 1839 (1st ed. with preface by Jackson, 
1817); Kerwick, 1841; Hourtery, 1846 (Bampton 
Lectures for 1845); McIrvine, 1861, 3d ed., 1868 
(Righteousness of Faith, Important); Buchanan, 1857 
(1st ed. 1850, second ed. 1860); Harkey, 1857; Davies, 1875; Sadler, 1878; and 
Herzog besides these, Laurence, Bampton 
Lectures for 1849, sermon 6; Drummond, Apostolic 
Teaching and Christ's Teaching (see index); Schützer, 
NT Theologie, 2 vols., 1909-10; the various systematic 
Theologies: Theologies of the NT, and Comm, may be 
considered under Rechtfertigungsllehre. 
Paulus und nach Jakobus, 1903; Kühn, Die Stellung des 
Jakobusbriefes u. Apost. Paulinischen 
Rechtfertigungsllehre, 1905.

John Alfred Fulkner

JUSTLE, jus'tle' (ןָּשַּׁנ, skhâb): The word occurs 
once in Nah 2 4 (in AV and RV), where ARV has 
"rush to and fro."

JUSTUS, jus'tus' (יוֹשֵׁב, Yo'shôb): There are 
three of this name mentioned in the NT.

(1) It was the Rom surname of Joseph Bar-
sabbas (q.v.) (Acts 1 28).

(2) A Corinthian proecleety (σέβομαι τόν 
Θεόν), whose house adjoined the synagogue and 
who received Paul when the Jews opposed him 
(Acts 18 7). He was probably a Rom citizen, one 
of the coloni, and so he would be of assistance to the 
apostle in his work among the better class of 
Corinth. There is some disagreement among MSS 
regarding the name. TR gives "Justus" alone, 
RV following NE, Vulg, Boh, Arm, gives "Titus 
Justus"; WH, Tisch., B.D, give "Titus Justus"; 
Cheyne (EB, a.v. "Justus") thinks these forms a 
corruption of "Tertius Justus," and that the bearer 
of the name was the "Tertius" of Rom 16 22. 
Paul still continued his lodgings with Aquila and 
Priscilla, but made the house of Justus his own 
synagogue.

(3) A Jew, Jesus Justus, mentioned with Mark 
and Aristarchus by Paul in his letters to the 
Colossians (Col 4 11), is a fellow-worker and one 
that had been a comfort unto him. 
S. F. Hunter

JUTTAH, jut'a' (יוֹתָה, yô'îth), Josh 21 10; LXX 
Tav-e, Tawû; and in Josh 15 55 AV, LXX 
Irás, Iâdân, A. Iletâ); JUTAH, jô'ta, jî'ta (יוֹתָה, yô'îth), 
yô'dh, Josh 15 55): A town in the hill country of 
Judah, mentioned with Maon, Carmel and Ziph; 
A Levitical city (Josh 21 16). In some VSS of LXX 
it occurs (Iôrâ, Iôdô) in 1 Ch 6 57. In the Onom 
(266 49; 133 10) a large village called "Jutta" is 
described as 18 Rom miles from Eleutheropolis. 
This agrees with the position of Yutta, a large and 
prosperous Moslem village, 3,740 ft. above sea-level, 
54 miles S. of Hebron and 154 miles from Beit 
Jehra (Eleutheropolis). There are many rock-cut 
tombs and ancient winepresses all around the village.

Reland (Pal, 570) suggested (and many others 
have followed him) that the הָוָה לֹוָה, pôlîs 
Iôdôa, tru "city of Judah," in Lk 1 89, should be 
poîta Iôda, "the city of Judah." The tr "city of 
Judah" is suspicious, because Iouda is without the 
article, which is usually put before the name of 
a district; the interchange of i and e is a very common 
one. Dr. Paterson, resident many years in Hebron, 
states that there is a local Moslem tradition in the 
district that Yutta was the home of John the 
Baptist. For Yutta see PEF, III, 310, Sh XXI.

E. W. G. Masterman

K

KAB, kab (קָּב), kabb, "something hollowed out," 
2 K 6 25; AV Cab): A Heb dry measure and 
liquid measure equal to about 2 quarts. See 
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

KABZEEIL, kab'ze'-el, kab'ze-el (קָּבֶּזֶל, kab'ze'el) "[whom] God collects": One of the 
"uttermost cities" of Judah toward the border of Edom in the 
S. (Negbe) (Jos 15 21). It was the native place of 
Bennahia, the son of Jehoahaz, one of David's 
mighty men (2 S 23 20; 1 Ch 11 22). "Jehoah-ageezel and the villages thereof," one of the 
places re-inhabited by the men of Judah (Neh 11 25), 
appears to be the same place. The site is 
unknown.

KADESH, kâ'desh (קָּדֶשׁ, kô'desh); Kâshâs, 
Kadês, Ps 29 8; Jth 1 9). See KADESH-BARNEA.

KADESH-BARNEA, kâ'desh-bâr'ne-a (קָּדֶשׁ בָּרֶנֶא, kô'desh bâr'ne-a), Kâshâs, 
Kadês, Mentioned 
10 t.; called also "Kadesh" simply. The name 
perhaps means "the holy place of the desert of 
wandering." There are references to Kadesh in 
early history. At En-mishpat ("the same is 
Kadesh") Chedorlomer and his allies smote the 
Amaeleite and Amorite. Abraham dwelt near 
Kadesh, and it was at Beersheba between 
Kadesh and Beraed that the Angel of Jehovah 
appeared to Hagar (Gen 14 7; 16 14; 20 1). It was 
an important camp of the Isrealites during their
KADMIEL, kad'mi-el (ךָדָמִי־ל, kadmí'él), "before God," "priest"[7]; "Cadmieel" in II lists in 1 Esd 6 26.58 AV; omitted in LXX B; A reads kal Kadmiel'; A Levite (Ezr 2 40; Neh 7 43), founder of a family whose descendants returned from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 1; Neh 7 43; 12 18). He is named among those who praise God for the return (Neh 9 45; 12 9); of whose the waves of the Lord's house (Ezr 3 9; 1 Esd 2 40; Neh 2 2), and is again named, who "sent" the new Return Covenant (Neh 10 28 ff) after the reestablishment of worship (Neh 10 19).

KADMONITE, kad'mon-it (ךָדָמוֹנִי, kadmóni), "one of the ancient race"; The Kadmonites are mentioned in Gen 15 19 along with the Kenites and Kenizzites of Edom, and are doubtless the same as the "children of the east," whose wisdom was celebrated (1 Ki 4 30). "Kadmoni, the East," was a son of Ishmael (Gen 25 15; cf ver 6). In an Egyptian story describing the adventures of a political refugee who fled from Egypt in the time of the XIIth Dynasty, it is said that he found a refuge in Canaan in the land of Kaduma or Kedem.

KAIN, kain (ךָנָי, ha-kayin; AV Cain): A town in the hill country of Judah (Josh 15 57). There is, too, apparently a reference to this place in Nu 24 21;22.

"And he looked on the Kenite, and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, And thy new moon is set in glory. Nevertheless Cain shall be walked until Assur shall carry thee away captive."

This place has been very doubtfully identified as the ruin Yahk, a place on a lofty hill S.E. of Hebron, overlooking the wilderness of Judah, which is not considerable, a few mud huts are built, occupied today by about 200 souls (Schumacher, Northern 'Ajlan, 137).

KANAH, ka'nah (ךָנָה, bōnāh, "reed"): (1) The name of a "brook," i.e. wady, or "tortent bed," which formed part of the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh (Jos 16 8; 17 9). The border of Ephraim went out westward from Tappuah to the brook Kanah, at the end; the border of Manasseh from Tappuah, which belonged to Ephraim, "went down unto the brook of Kanah, southward of the brook." There seems no good reason to doubt the identification of "the brook Kanah" with the modern Wady Kanah. The transition from the heavy to the lighter k is easy, so the phonetic difficulty is not serious. The stream rises in the S.W. of Shechem, flows through Wady Ishkar, and, joining the 'Avjah, reaches the sea not far to the N. of Jaffa. Guérin, influenced, apparently, by the masses of reeds of various kinds which fill the river argues in favor of Nahr el-Felâk, to the N. of Arvîf. He identifies it with Nahr el-Kusab, "river of reeds," mentioned by Behêd-Din, the Moslem historian. But this last must be identified with Nahr el-Mafjar, 13 miles farther N., too far N. for "the brook Kanah."

(2) A town on the northern boundary of Asher (Jos 19 28), probably identical with the village of Kana, about 7 miles S.E. of Tyre (SWP, I, 51, 64, Sh 1).
KAREAH, ka-re'ah (תֶּご利用), “bald head”): The father of Johanan and Jonathan, who after the fall of Jerus joined Gedaliah at Mizpah (2 K 25 27; Jer 40 6).

KARIATHIARIUS, kà-rí-ath-i-àr-i-us (Kapha-ami, Kariathiarus; B reads Kariaheireus; AV Kiriathiarim) [1 Eed 19])=Kiriath-jearim in Ne2 7 29.

KARKA, kàrk'ka (תֶּ roleId), ha-kar'kadi— with the art. and 5 loc. (AV Karcan): A place in the S. of Judah, between Addar and Wady el Artash (Josh 15 3). Onom speaks of a village in Judah lying toward the wilderness, named Akarka. It cannot now be identified. The name means “the pavement,” or “ground.”

KARKOR, kàrk'kor (מִרְכָּב, karck'or): An unidentified place where Gideon surprised and overwhelmed the remnants of the army of Zeba and Zalmunnah (Jgs 8 10 ff). It probably corresponds to Karkar mentioned by Shalmaneser II, S. of Hamath (KB, 1, 173).

KARTAH, kàr'tta (תֶּ רוּם), kartah: A city in the territory of Zebulun, assigned to the Levites (Josh 21 34). It is not identified. Possibly it is a variant of Kattath, or of Kartan (q.v.).

KARTAN, kàr'ttan (תֶּ רוּם), kattan: A city in the territory of Naphtali, given to the Gershonite Levites (Josh 21 32). It is called Kiriathaim in 1 Ch 6 76. Kartan may be a contraction of this. Cheyne (EB, s.v.) suggests that both names may be corruptions from “Chinnereth.” Neither is mentioned in Josh 19 32 38, in the list of Naphtalite cities, while Chinnereth is.

KATTATH, kat'th (תֶּ רוּם), battath: A city in the territory of Zebulun, named with Itphath-el, Nahalel, and Shimron (Josh 19 15), perhaps to be identified with Kitron (Jgs 1 30), from which Zebulun did not expel the Canaanites; and with Kartah (Josh 21 34), which was given to the Merarite Levites. The Bab Talm (Meg 6a) identifies Kattath with Sephoris, the modern Safrafeh (but see Neubauer, Geographia du Talmud, 191). The Jerus Talm takes it as identical with Ketemeth, Kuteineh, to the W. of Edraion. It should probably, however, be sought near Shimron, the modern Semaniyeh. W. EWING

KEDAR, kè'dar (תֶּרוּם), kethar; Kâdâr, Kâdar: Second in order of the sons of Ishmael (Gen 25 15 1 Ch 1 23). The name occurs as typical of a distant eastern country in opposition to the lands of the Mediterranean (Jer 2 10). The author of Second Isa introduces this tribe in company with Nebaioth, and both are represented as owners of flocks (Isa 60 7). Evidence of their nomadic habits appears in Jer 49 29 29, where they are classed among the Br'ar-Keedim, and mention is made of their flocks, camels, tents, curtains and furniture. They are spoken of (Isa 42 11) as dwelling in hâgerim (“villages”), from which it would appear that they were a somewhat settled tribe, which was later to degenerate into “town-dwellers,” as distinct from wobariya or “nomads.” Ezekiel (27 21) gives another hint of their pastoral nature where, in his detailed picture of the wealth of Tyre, Kedar and Arabia provide the Tyrians with lambs, rams and goats. The fame of the tribe is further reflected in Jer 21 12, as belonging to their might in war), and in the figurative references to their tents (Ps 120 5; Cant 1 5). In this last passage where the tents are made symbolic of dark beauty, the word kethar (“to be black”) may have been in the writer’s mind. The settlements of Kedar were probably in the N.W. of Arabia, not far from the border of Assyria (Isa 16 17). If Assyrian inscriptions have thrown light upon the history of the tribe, where Kedar is mentioned as one of the suzerains of Nebaioth, which decides its identity with Kedar of the OT, and there is found also an account of the conflicts between the tribe and King Assurbanipal (see Margo- liouth in HDB).

Of the Ishmaelite tribes, Kedar must have been one of the most important, and thus in later times the name came to be applied to all the wild tribes of the desert. It is through Kedar (Arab. kaddar) that Muslim genealogists trace the descent of Mohammed from Ishmael.

A. S. FULTON

KEDEMAH, ke'dè-ma, ke'dè'ma (תֶּ רוּם), kethemah, “eastward”): Son of Ishmael (Gen 25 16), head of a clan (1 Ch 3 31). See KADMONITES.

KEDEMOTH, ke'dè-moth, ke'dè'moth (תֶּ רוּם), kethemôth, “eastern parte”): From the wilderness to which this town gave its name, Moses sent messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites in Heshbon (Deut 2 26). It was given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben (Josh 13 18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (21 37; 1 Ch 6 79). It must probably be sought on the upper course of the Arnon. Buhl (GAP, 268) suggests that it may be identified with Umm er-Repis. See JARAH.

KEDESH, ke'dè-sh (תֶּ רוּם), kedesh; Kâsîn, Kâdâs): (1) One of the “uttermost cities” of Judah “toward the border of Edom in the S.” (Josh 15 23). Possibly it is to be identified with Kadas-Arba (q.v.); otherwise it is strange that this latter should be omitted from the list. Dillmann would identify it with Kadâs, to the S. of Hebron, mentioned by Makkaddaša.

(2) A town in the territory of Issachar, given to the Gershonite Levites (1 Ch 6 72). It is called “Kedesh,” simply, in Josh 12 22, etc.; Kadesh- naphthal in Jgs 4 6; Tob 1 2; Kenaphthal in Galilee in Josh 20 7, etc. It was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (1 Ch 6 76). From the name “holy,” we gather that it was a sanctuary from old time. It was therefore a place of asylum, and only preserved its ancient character in this respect when chosen as one of the cities of refuge. It was the home of Barak, and here his host assembled. When the Assyrians invaded the land under Tiglath-pileser, it was among the first cities to be captured, and its inhabitants were deported (2 K 15 29). Near Kedesh was fought the great battle between Jonas than the Maccabees and Demetrius (1 Macc 11 63). Jos says that in his time it belonged to the Tyrians, lying between their land and that of Galilee (Ant, XIII, v. 6; BJ, II, xvii, 1; IV, ii, 3, etc.). Onom places it 20 miles from Tyre, near to Paneas. It is represented by the modern village of Kedesh, which lies on the plateau to the W. of el-Hish. It crowns a tell which runs out in a low ridge into the little plain to the W. Near the fountain, which rises under the ridge to the N., are the most interesting of the ancient remains. There are many tombs in the sarcophagi, so only altarings-troughs, from its lofty situation. The Kedesh commanded a spacious view over a richly varied
landscape, with smiling cornfields, and hills clothed with oak and terebinth.  

W. Ewing


KEDES-NAPHTALI, κῆδεσναπταλί. See Kedes, 3.

KEEPER, κήπερ, KEEPERS (mostly from κῆπον, shāmar; φύλαξ, phulax): The word is used of keepers of sheep, vineyards, doors, prisons (in Gen 39 21 ff, gar; cf Acts 5 23), etc. In Ecc 12 3, "The keepers of the house shall tremble," the allusion is to the decay of bodily powers, the "keepers" being specially the arms, which had become feeble through age.

KEHELATHAH, κῆχελαθάθα, κῆ-χελαθα-θα (κῆχελαθ-, kēhelāthāh, "gathering," "assembly"): A desert camp of the Israelites between Rissah and Mt. Shepher (Nu 33 22.23). Situation is unknown. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

KEILAH, κῆλα (κῆλα, kē’lā; Keilā, Keelān): (1) A city of the Shephelah mentioned (Josh 15 44) along with Nezik, Azekih and Mareshah. Among those who repaired the walls of Jerus was "Hshah-biah, the ruler of half the district of Keilah, for his district. After him repaired their brethren, Bvayv the son of Henadad, the ruler of half the district of Keilah" (Neh 3 17.18).

It is, however, from the story of the wandering of David that we have most information regarding this place. It was a city with gates and bars (1 S 23 7). The Philis and Keilah came against it and commenced robbing the threshing-floors. David, after twice inquiring of Jeh, went down with his 600 men (ver 13) and "fought with the Philis, and brought away their cattle, and caw them with a great slaughter." Saul hearing that David and his men were in a fortified town "summoned all the people to war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men" (ver 8). Then David asked Absiath the priest to bring him an ephod, and he inquired of Jeh whether, if Saul came, the men of Keilah would surrender him to save that city; hearing from Jeh, "They will deliver thee up," he and all his men escaped from Keilah and went into the wilderness. The reputed strength of Keilah is confirmed by its mention in 5 tablets in the Am Tab under the name of Kēłā (qūṭ, Petrie) with Gedor, Gath, Rabbah and Gezer.

Although other identifications were proposed by the older topographers, there is now a general consensus of opinion that the site of this city is Khurbet Kūlā (Jos, Ani, VI, xii., 1, in his account of David’s adventure, names the place "Khī’lā"). It is a hill covered with ruins in the higher part of Wādī es Sūr, 1,575 ft. above sea-level, whose terraced sides are covered with cornfields. The Onom (Lat text) states that it was 5 miles from Eleutheropolis, which is about the distance of Kh. Kūlā from Bejt Jūbrīn. Bejt Nūsb (Nezib) is a couple of miles away, and Tell Sandahannah (Mareshah) but 7 miles to the W. (Josh 15 44). An early Christian tradition states that the prophet Haksak was buried at Keilah.

(2) The Garmithe (q.v.), 1 Ch 4 19; see PEF, 314, Sh XXI.

E. W. G. Masterman

KEILAII, κῆ-λα’-ıα, κῆ-λα-ıα (κῆλα-ıα, kē’lā-ıα, "dwarf"). See Keilah.

KEMUEL, kem’-ul, kem-“u”l (κῆμωλ, kēmōl, "God’s mound"): (1) Nephew of Abraham (Gen 22 21), father of Aram, whom Esawk identifies with Ram of Job 32 2; but cf Gen 10 22, where Aram is described as one of the children of Sheem. They may not be the same person.

(2) Prince of Ephraim, one of the land commissioners who divided Canaan (Nu 34 23). (3) A Levite, father of Hashabiah, one of the tribal princes of David’s time, a ruler among the Levites (1 Ch 27 17).

KENAH, κέναν (κή-ναν, kē’nān; Kénav, Kainān): A son of Enoch, the son of Seth (Gen 5 9.10.12.13. 14; 1 Ch 1 2). AV form (except in 1 Ch 1 2), is "Cainan."

KENATH, κέναθ (κή-ναθ, kē’nath; Kēθū, Kēnāth, Kōnāth in LXX, A): A city in Bashan, taken along with its "daughters," i.e. "villages" from the Amorites by Nobah who gave it his own name (Nu 32 42). It was recaptured by Geshur and Aram (1 Ch 2 23). It is probably identical with the modern Kanaawat, which is built on the site, and largely from the materials of an ancient city. It lies about 16 miles to the N. of Boqra eski Shām, the Bostra of the Romans, on both sides of Wādī Kanaawat, where, descending from the slopes of Jebel Ed-Druz, it plunges over a precipice, forming a picturesque waterfall. On the plateau above the modern village, there is a striking collection of Rom and Christian remains, the shapely forms of many columns lending distinction to the scene. One large building is associated with the name of the patriarch Jeh—Makām Ayāb. The position commands a spacious and interesting view over the whole of the Haurān. The identification has been rejected by Soin (Baederker, Pat., 207), but his reasons are not given. Moore (Jgs, 222) also rejects it, but for reasons that are not convincing. W. Ewing

KENAZ, κένας, KENEZ, κένες (κή-νες, kē’nes, "hunting"): (1) A "duke" of Edom, grandson of Esau (Gen 36 11.15.42; 1 Ch 1 36.53). (2) Father of Othniel (Josh 15 17; Jgs 1 43; 9.11; 1 Ch 4 13). (3) The unidentified κή'νας of 1 Ch 4 15, who appears to be a descendant of (2). There is, however, some difficulty with the passage here.

KENEZITE, κένεζιτ, KENEZITOS, Kenezalos, Kenezitos): AV in Gen 16 19 and RV uniformly, spell "Kenizite." The Kenezites were the clan whose name-father was Kenaz (q.v.). Their land, along with that of their Canaanite tribes, was promised to Abram (Gen 15 19). To this clan belonged Jephunneh, the father of Caleb (Nu 32 12; Josh 14 6.14). It had evidently been absorbed by the tribe of Judah. If the Kenezites went down
with Jacob into Egypt, they may have become identified with his family there.

**KENITES,** kě̀nîts (קניטים, ḫînîṭî̂m, ḫânîṭî̂m, ḫâḇîṭî̂m, ḫâḇîṭî̂m); in Nu 24 22 and Jgs 4 11, ḫâḇîṭî̂m; oi Kĕḇâvo, koi Kenatăo, oi Kĕḇâvâ, koi Kênātō): A tribe of nomads named in association with various other peoples. They are first mentioned along with the Kadmonites and Kenizzites among the peoples whose land was promised to Abram (Gen 15 19). Balaam, seeing them from the heights of Moab, pun upon their name, which resembles the Heb ḥḇn̄, "a nest," prophecying their destruction although their nest was "set in the rock"—possibly a reference to Sela, the city. Moses, father-in-law, Jethro, is called "the priest of Midian" in Ex 3 1; 18 1; but in Jgs 1 16 he is described as a Kenite, showing a close relation between the Kenites and Midian. At the time of Sisera's overthrow, Heber, a Kenite, at peace with Jabin, king of Hazor, pitched his tent far N. of his ancestral seats (Jgs 4 17). There were Kenites dwelling among the Amalekites in the time of Saul (1 S 15 6). They were spared because they had "shown kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt" (Ex 3 8). David, in his answer to Achish, links the Kenites with the inhabitants of the S. of Judah (27 10). Among the ancestors of the tribe of Judah, the Chronicler includes the Kenite Hamath, the father of the Rechabites (1 Ch 2 55). They continued to live in tents, practising the ancient nomadic customs (Jer 35 6 ff).

The word kēnî in Aram. means "smith." Professor Sayce thinks they may really have been a tribe of smiths, resembling "the gipsies of modern Europe, as are the Gipsies or black-smiths of the Middle Ages" (HDB, s.v.). This would account for their relations with the different peoples, among whom they would reside in pursuit of their calling.

In Jos they appear as Kenedites, and in Ant, IV, vii, 3 he calls them "the race of the Shechemites."

W. EWING

KENIZITE, kēn-iz-it. See KENIZITE.

KENOSIS, kēnō-sis (κένωσις, kĕnōsîs) has entered theological language from Phil 2 7, where in the sentence he "emptied himself" the Gr. vb. is ekēnōsen. "Kenesis," then, the covenant, has become a common word for the humiliation of the Son in the incarnation, but in recent years has acquired a still more technical sense, i.e. of the Son's emptying Himself of certain attributes, esp. of omniscience.

(1) The theological question involved was one about as far as possible from the minds of the Christians of the apostolic age and apparently one that never occurred to St. Paul. For in Phil 2 7 the only "emptying" in point is that of the change from the "form of God" to the "form of a servant." Elsewhere in the NT it is usually taken as a matter of course that Christ's knowledge was far higher than that of other men (Jn 24 is the clearest example). But passages that imply a limitation of that knowledge do exist and are of various classes. Of not much importance are the entirely incidental references to the authorship of OT passages where the traditional authorship is considered erroneous, as no other method of quotation would have been possible. But references to the nearness of the Parousia (esp. Mt 10 23; 24 29). But with this it is always a question how far the exact phraseology has been framed by the evangelists and, apart from this, how far Christ may have been consciously using current imagery for the impending spiritual renovation, although knowing that the details would be quite different (see PAROUSIA). Limitation of knowledge may perhaps be deduced from the fact that Christ could be amazed (Mt 8 25) and that He could be really tempted (esp. He 4 15), or that He possessed faith (He 12 2; see comm.). More explicitly Christ is said to have learned in Lk 2 52; He 5 8. And, finally, in Mk 13 32 || Mt 24 36, Christ states categorically that He is ignorant of the exact time of the Parousia.

(2) An older exegesis felt only the last of these passages as a real difficulty. A distinction constructed between knowledge naturally possessed and knowledge gained by experience (i.e. although the child Jesus "knew how to learn the habit of reading," He was obliged to learn it by experience) covered most of the others. For Mk 13 32 a variety of explanations were offered. The passage was trv "neither the Son, except the Father know it," a tr that can be borne by the Gr. But it simply transfers the difficulty by speaking of the Father's knowledge as hypothetical, and is an impossible tr of Mt 24 36, where the word "only" is added. The explanations that assume that Christ knew the day but had no Commission to reveal it are mostly of a similar kind, for they place insincere words in His mouth; "It is not for you to know the day" would have been the inevitable form of the saying (Acts 1 7).

(1) Yet the attempt so to misinterpret the verses is not the outcome of a barren dogmatism, but results from a dread lest real injury be done to the fundamentals of Christian consciousness. Not only does the mind of the Christian revolve from seeing in Christ something less than God, but it revolves from finding in Him two centers of personality—Christ was One. But as omniscience is an essential attribute of God, it is an essential attribute of the incarnate Son. So does not any limitation of Christ's human knowledge tend to vitiate a sound doctrine of the incarnation? Certainly, certain, to say with the uphololders of the kenosis in its "classical" form that the Son, by an exercise of His will, determined to be ignorant as man, is not helpful, as the abandonment by God of one of His own essential attributes would be the preposterous corollary. (2) Yet the Bib. data are explicit, and an explanation of some kind must be found. And the solution seems to lie in an ambiguous use of the word "kenosis" as applied to the relation of God and as man. When we speak of a man's knowledge in the sense discussed in the kenotic doctrine, we mean the totality of facts present in his intellect, and by his ignorance we mean the absence of a fact or of facts from that intellect. Not so, in the older discussions of the subject, this intellectual knowledge was tacitly assumed (mystical theology apart) to be the only knowledge worthy of the name, and so it was at the same time also assumed that God's change was a change of intellect also—"God geometrizes." Under this assumption God's knowledge is essentially of the same kind as man's, differing from man's only in its purity and extent. And this assumption is made in all discussions that speak of the knowledge of the Son as God illuminating His mind as man. (3) Modern critical epistemology has, however, taught man a sharp lesson in humility by demonstrating that the intellect is by no means the perfect instrument that it has been assumed to be. And the faults are by no means limited to its lack of imaginative, evaluative, or desires, etc., but are resident in the intellect itself, and inseparable from it as an intellect. Certain recent writers (Bergson, most notably) have even built up a case of great strength for regarding the intellect as a mere product of utilitarian development, with the defects resulting naturally from such
an evolution. More esp. does this restriction of the intellect seem to be true in religious knowledge, even if the contentions of Kant and (esp.) Ritschl be not fully admitted. Certain it is, in any case, that even human knowledge is something far wider than intellectual knowledge, for there are many things that we know that we never could have learned through the intellect, and, apparently, many elements of our knowledge are almost or quite incapable of translation into intellectual terms. Omniscience, then, is by no means intellectual omniscience, and it is not to be reached by any mere process of expansion of an intellect. An "omniscient intellect" is a contradiction in terms. (4) In other words, God's omniscience is not merely human intellectual knowledge raised to the infinite power, but something of an entirely different quality, hardly conceivable to human thought—_as different from human intellectual knowledge as the Divine omnipotence is different from muscular strength._ Consequently, the passage of this knowledge into a human intellect is impossible, and the problem of the incarnation should be stated as: What effect did Divine omniscience in the person have on the conscious intellect of the manhood? There is so little help from the past to be gained in answering this question, that it must remain open at present—if, indeed, it is ever capable of a full answer. But that ignorance in the intellect of the manhood is fully consistent with omniscience in the person seems to be no merely safe answer to the question as stated, but an inevitable answer if the true humanity of Christ is to be maintained at all.

LITERATURE.—_Sandsay's Christology and Personality, 1911, and La Zouche, The Person of Christ in Modern Thought, 1914_, are among the latest discussions of the subject, with very full references to the modern literature. 

**BURTON SCOTT EASTON**

**KERAS**, ke'ras (Κῆρας, Kîras): In 1 Esd 5 29, the head of a family of temple-servants, called "Keroz" in Ezra 2 44; Neh 7 47.

**KERCHIEF**, ker'chi (περιτόκιον, mispadóth; em-βελα, epibélisa): Occurs only in Ezek 13 18,21, in a passage which refers to some species of divination. Their exact shape or use is unknown. They were apparently long veils or coverings put over the heads of those consulting the false prophets and reaching down to the feet, for they were for "persons of every stature."

**KEREN-HAPPUCH**, ker'en-hap'uk, këren-hap'uk (Προσειματα, Ëkeren hapîkh); "horn of amonmony," i.e. beautifier; LXX _'Aμαλθείας κῆρας, Amâlthéias kéras_ The 3d daughter of Job (Job 42 14), born after his restoration from affliction. Antimony, producing a brilliant black, was used among the Orientals for coloring the edges of the eyelids, making the eyes large and lustrous. Hence the suggestiveness of this name of an article of the ladies' toilet, a little horn or receptacle for the eye-paint.

**KEROIOTH**, kë'ri-o-th, -oth (προσειματα, kérôiôth):
1. A city of Moab, named with Beth-meon and Bozrah (Jer 49 24,41). Here was a sanctuary of Chemosh, under which Mesha says (M S, l. 13) he drugged "the altar hearths of Diblah." It may possibly be represented by the modern Karâidâ, between Dibân and _'Aftârâs._ Some (e.g. Driver on Am 2 2) think it may be only another name for Ar-Moab. Buhl (GAP, 270) would identify it with Kir of Moab (Kerak). No certainty is yet possible.
2. A city of Judah (Josh 15 25; RV Keriôth-hezion, n.v.), possibly the modern el-Kuryatain, to the N.E. of Tell Arad.
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**KEROIOTH-HEZRON**, kë'ro-iôth-hëz'ron (προσειματα, kérôiôth hezôn; Josh 15 25 says, "The same is Hazor"); AV "Kerioth and Hezron which is Hazor"): One of the cities in the "south" of Judah. Robinson (BR, II, 101) identifies it with the ruined site of Kuryatain, 43 miles N. of Tell Arad. It has been suggested that Kerioth was the birth place of Judas Iscariot (q.v.). Cf Kerióth, 2.

**KERNEL**, kûr'nel (ῥωραννήμα, horannîn, EV "kernels"); LXX _stêmphûlon used by Aristophanes as=olives from which oil has been pressed, later, in same, of raiin pulp_; Mentioned in Nu 6 4 along with _zîgh, trd_ "huiske." This tr, "kernel" or "grape stones," is from the Tg and Talm, but is doubtful, and it may be the word should be trd "sour grapes."

**KEROS**, ke'rôs (κῆρος, kërôs, "fortress"?): One of the Nethinim (Ezr 2 44; Neh 7 47), an order appointed to the liturgical offices of the temple. See Nethinim.

**KESIL**, ke'sil (Orion). See ASTRONOMY.

**KESITHAH**, ke'sî-tâ, ke-a'stå (προσειματα, ke'siâ). See PIECE OF MONEY.

**KETAB**, ke'tab (Kerâs, Kêtâd): Ancestor of a family of Nethinim (1 Esd 5 30).

**KETTLE**, ket'1: In EV only in 1 s 2 14 for _dâth, "a vessel for cooking._" The same word in 2 Ch 35 13 is rendered "caldrons," and in Job 41 20 (Heb 12), "pot." Ps 81 6 (Heb 7) (AV "pots") belongs rather to another signification of the word _RV basket," for carrying clay or bricks._

**KETURAH**, ke-tû'râ, ke-tû'rá (προσειματα, ke'turch); Kërôs, Chettarô, "incense": The second wife of Abraham (Gen 25 1; 1 Ch 1 32 f). According to the Bib. tradition, he contracted this second marriage after the death of Sarah (cf Gen 23), and very likely after the marriage of Isaac (cf Gen 24). It is not improbable that, as some writers have suggested, this change in the life of his son prompted Abraham to remarry in order to overcome the feeling of loneliness caused by Isaac's entering the state of marriage.

1. Ch 1 32 (and also Gen 25 6) shows us that K. was not considered to be of the same dignity as Sarah who, indeed, was the mother of the son of promise, and, for obvious reasons, the sons of Abraham's concubines were separated from Isaac. She was the mother of 6 sons representing Arab tribes S. and E. of Pal (Gen 25 1–6), so that through the offspring of Keturah Abraham became "the father of many nations."—WILLIAM BAHR

**KEY**, kë (κλεις, mapîthîn, an "opener"); cf _klês, klês, (that which shuts)_ "Made of wood, usually with nails which fitted into corresponding holes in the lock, or rather bolt (Jgs 3 25). Same is rendered "opening" in 1 Ch 9 27. See HOUSE.

Figurative: Used fig. for power, since the key was sometimes worn on the shoulder as a sign of official authority (Isa 22 22). In the NT it is used several times as such fig.: of Peter: "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 16 19); of Christ, in Rev, having the "keys of death and of Hades" (1 18), also having "the key of David" (3 7). An angel was given "the key of the pit of the abyss" (S
1; 20). Our Lord accused the teachers of the law of His day of taking away "the key of knowl-
edge" from men, that is, locking the doors of truth against them (Lk 11: 52; cf Mt 23: 13).
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KEYS, kēz, POWER OF

I. THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED
1. The Keys: and the Binding and Loosening
2. Meaning of the Statements
3. How Peter Is Related to These Powers
4. Is the Primary Idea That of Position and Authority?

II. VIEWS MAINTAINED
1. Agent of the Power
2. Nature of the Power
3. Scope of the Power

III. DATA FOR DECIDING THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED
1. Passages Employing the Terms "Key," "Binding and Loosening" (vocabulary)
2. Related Passages
3. Examples of Exercise of This Power

IV. CONCLUSION
1. Nature of the Power
2. Agent of the Power
3. Scope of the Power

There is no more stubbornly contested conception in Christian terminology. The thought connects itself immediately with Mt 16: 19, but it is hardly correct to say that it originates there, for the controversy is one that grows out of the conflict of forces inherent in the institutional development of religion and of society. It must have arisen, in any event, if there had been no such word as that in Mt 16: 19, although not in the same terms as it is now found. Since the Reformation it has been recognized, by Catholic and Protestant, that on the interpretation of this passage depends the authority of the Church of Rome and its exclusive claims, so far as their foundation in Scripture is concerned, while on the other hand there is involved the "va-

dility" of the "sacraments," "ordinances" and "orders" of Protestantism and the very hope of salvation of Protestants.

I. THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED.—The crucial passage has two declarations, commonly spoken of as promises to Peter: to him Christ will give the keys of the kingdom of Keys; and heaven; whatsoever he shall bind on the earth shall be bound in heaven, while and Loosening whatever he shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. How are the facts of having committed to him the keys and the function of binding and loosing related? Are they two forms of one declaration? Is the first general, and the second a specific sphere of its application?

Both statements are made in figurative terms. That of the keys is supposed to be drawn from the duties of the chief steward of a house, or establishment. Those of the keys of a city turned over to some distinguished person is advanced, but is hardly to be considered. We need, then, to

know the functions of the chief steward and how they apply to the kingdom of heaven, and to Peter as its steward. What was Peter to do?

2. Meaning bind and loose, men or things, persons or teachings? Numerous examples exist. Statements could be cited of the use of these terms to signify forbidding (binding) and per-
mitting (loosening) conduct as legitimate under the law of the OT (Lightfoot, McClintock and Strong, Schaff-Herzog, Hastings, etc). The strict school of Shammaj bound many things loosed by the laxer school of Hillel (Broadus, Mil). Is this conclusion that Jesus is here giving Peter authority for "lay-
ing down the law for his fellow-disciples," "authority to say what the law of God allows, and what it forbids," "the power of legislation for the church"? (cf Mason in HDB, IV, 30.)

Ecclesiastical contentions turn esp. on Peter's relation to these words of Jesus. Do they signify powers and "privileges" conferred on Peter, exclusively or representatively?

3. How Peter Is Related to These Powers

Are they official or personal? Do they belong to other apostles, and to other officers besides apostles? Can the powers be exercised individually or by the church alone? If any be-

sides Peter have these powers, do they pass to them from Peter, and how?

What seems to the writer a fundamental question here is either passed over very lightly or entirely omitted in the discussions of this sub-
ject. Did Jesus mean by these words to confer on Peter, or on anyone to whom they may apply, authority, or obligation, privilege, or responsibility? Does he impose duty? These alternatives are not necessarily exclusive, but the interpre-

tation of the thought will be determined in no small measure by where the stress is laid.

4. Is the Primary Idea That of Position and Authority?

Or does He impose duty? Does He impose? Does He impose duty? These alternatives are not necessarily exclusive, but the interpre-

tation of the thought will be determined in no small measure by where the stress is laid.

II. VIEWS MAINTAINED.—The possibilities have been exhausted in the interpretations and applica-
tions advocated. It is not possible to classify on lines of the creeds, ex-
cept very generally, for there is little uniformity of view existing within the various communions.

1. Agent of the Power

(1) Generally speaking, the Roman Catholic church gives to Peter a unique position. Her theologians also agree that all the apostles and de-

leges of Peter descend to his successors in the vicarate of Christ. When the question is raised of the extension of these prerogatives beyond Peter and the popes, all sorts of views are held, concern-

ing both the fact and the method of that extension.

(2) Among Protestants there is general agree-

ment that the church is the agent of this power, but there is not uniformity as to the nature of the au-

thority or the manner of its exercise.

(3) Some think that Peter has no peculiar relation to the keys; that these words were spoken to him only as the first who gave expression to that conception and experience, on the basis of which Jesus commits the keys of the kingdom to any be-

liever in Him as the Christ of God.

We may summarize the more important views as to Peter thus: (a) the power committed to him alone and exercised, (i) at Pentecost, or (ii) at Pentecost, Caesarea and other places; (b) the power committed to Peter and to the other apostles, including Paul, discharged by them, and descended to no others; (c) the power conferred on Peter officially and on his official successors; (d) the power conferred on Peter and the other apostles and to such as hold their place in the church; (e) that the power belongs to Peter as representative of the church, and so to the church to be exercised (i) by
the officials of the church, (ii) by the officials and those to whom they commit it, (iii) by all priests and persons allowed to represent the church, de facto, (iv) by the church in its councils, or other formal and official decisions, (v) by the church in a less formal way than (iv), (vi) by all members of the church as representing it with specific commission; (f) that it belongs to the Christian as such, and so is imposed upon, or offered to, all Christians.

There is general—not absolute—agreement that the holder of the keys is to admit men into the kingdom. It had not been agreed that the holder of the keys may, or can, determine who are members of the kingdom.

2. Nature of the Power
Both sides are taken. Some think that the power is that of announcing authoritatively the conditions of entrance, while others insist that the holder of the keys also signifies what individuals have accepted the conditions.

(1) There is strong support for the view that the primary function of the keys lies in determining the teaching of the kingdom, maintaining the authority of doctrinal preaching. Emphasis is laid on the use of the neuter, “whatever”—not “whomsoever”—with the binding and loosing. This would lead, however, to the secondary and implied function of declaring who has accepted the teaching of the kingdom.

(2) In the Roman Catholic church we find insistence on distinguishing between the general authority of the keys in all affairs of the church and religion, and the binding and loosing which they specifically apply to absolution. Only on this last are Catholics in full agreement. That the church administers salvation held by Rom and Gr Catholics and by not a few Protestants, although Protestants do not, as a rule, claim exclusive power in salvation as do the Romanists. Absolution is held to be a general (derived) priestly function, while the authority of the keys resides in the pope alone.

(3) Eminent Catholic authorities admit that the Fathers generally understood the key to signify the power of forgiving sins, and that they seldom make any reference to the supremacy of Peter. But they claim that rarely the Fathers do take “Christ’s promise in the fuller meaning of the gift of authority over the church. Absolution is the first to develop the doctrine that it conferred on Peter and his successors authority in its widest sense, administrative and legislative.

(4) The extension of the authority of the keys to include civil matters is a contention of the Roman church. It is not modified by some Protestants. Indeed the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority must be said still to be awaiting clear definition in Protestantism. Macedo (De Claibus Petri) claims the theologians of the church for the civil authority of the keys. Joyce in the Catholic Enc. affirms that he is unable to verify this claim, but, on the contrary, finds that the opponents of the extension of the authority of the church to civil matters use Mt 16 19 in support of their position on the ground that to Peter were committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, not of the kingdoms of this world.

III. Data for Deciding the Questions Involved.

We must first examine the Scriptures employing the terms "key," "binding," and "loosening."

1. Passages
Mt 16 19, the crucial passage, is part of an employing the terms "key," "binding," and "loosening." The incident at Caesarea Philippi was understood then and afterward to marking an epoch in the life and teaching of Jesus. Having elicited Peter's confession, Jesus pronounces a benediction on him because his insight represented a Divinely mediated experience of fundamental significance in His own plan and mission. Jesus goes on to say: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter ('"a stone"'), and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." (ver 18). The controversy rages about "Peter" (πέτρος, πέτρα) and the "rock" (ράκτα, ράκα), "gates of Hades," and "prevail against it." Are the church to be built on the rock and the kingdom whose keys are to be given to Peter the same? Such a shifting of figure is not conclusive against the thought. Perhaps the church is the organic form of the kingdom, its personal content and expression on earth at any given time. This church exists wherever men consciously accept and are included in the kingdom. The kingdom will always embrace influences, institutions, individuals, not be reckoned in any organized or visible church. The church has never had—in the nature of the case can never have—one complete organization including all the organized life of the kingdom, or even of the church.

Any claims to this are contradicted by facts obvious at every moment of history. The change in figure from ver 18 to ver 19 is not conclusive against supposing the church to be built in him. But it seems far better to understand that Peter is the first stone in the building, whose laying was the giving of the visible experience in which Peter came to know Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. On this is erected the church, out of those living stones (κύλις γρανίτες, κύλινς σόλιδες, 1 Pet 4) that know and confess the Jesus the Christ. The transitional nature of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the reason for giving them to him rather than to any other may be found in the fact that he is now the first so to enter into the kingdom as to be fitted for church functions.

It is not needful to determine, for our purpose, the exact meaning of "gates of Hades" and their not prevailing against the church (of various comms.). It is clear that the church is to persist in the life of the world and so the kingdom will not lack organized and aggressive expression. Nor does the relation of binding and loosing depend at all upon the critical question of reading or omitting "and" between the two parts of the verse. The conviction could hardly be escaped that the two are intimately related to the former, and is either directly or indirectly involved within it.

(2) The pl. "keys," occurs elsewhere only in Rev 1 18, where the Christ represents Himself as holding the keys of death and Hades, and using "Hades" might connect this with Mt 16 10. The immediate occasion for the statement is that He who was dead, is alive; He has not only overcome death in His own person but has conquered it and its realm, so that they can no more have power except as subject to Him, since He holds their keys. Men on earth will either fall under the power of death and Hades or they must enter the kingdom of heaven. If the living Christ has the keys of the kingdom in the hands of Peter, or other friends, and holds the keys of its enemies in His own hands, the work will go on with success. It is not certain that the two passages can properly be so closely connected, but they thus afford just the assurance that is contained for the churches in Rev.

(3) In Rev 3 7 Christ appears in the character, "he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key [sing.] of David, he that openeth and none can shut, and shutteth and none openeth. The idea is not restricted but indicated over all things in the Messianic kingdom, its own operations and all forms of opposition. In the next verse, as a specific instance, He has set before the church at Philadelphia an open door (opportunity and progress) which none can shut. Cf as to this Eph 1 22.
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(4) It seems to be taken for granted that Jesus, in Mt 16 19, had direct reference to Isa 22 22, yet the passage is not Messianic except in a general sense and on the assumption that the power of Jeh over the nation was the power of the Christ in the NT (see Jerovar; Lord). Eliaakin is to have absolute power, holding the key of the house of David. The use of the words "open" and "shut," as well as the general conception, connects the passage rather with Rev 3 7.

(5) Rev 9 1; 20 1 are to be taken together. The key of the pit of the abyss" in the hands of the angel or angels signifies, in these specific circumstances, the same power as that indicated in 1 13.

(6) In Lk 11 52 Jesus pronounces a woze upon the "lawyers" who had "taken away the key of knowledge" from the people, neither entering in nor allowing those about to go in, to enter. The knowledge of God and Divine things was in the control, in great measure, of those who are not permitted to enter the Kingdom of God. Thus Jesus connects the figure directly with the idea of Mt 16 19, and the connection is emphasized by comparing Mt 25 21; and is made definite by the word of Jesus in Mt 15 32 with which Lk 18 9 could not be allowable to suppose that Jesus meant to limit the idea of "the faithful and wise steward" to Peter. This passage with the references seems to be highly important for our subject.

It is to be drawn from several passages that do not use the exact terms of Mt 16 19, but that deal with the same general ideas.

2. Related Passages (1) Mt 18 18 places the responsibility for binding and loosing on the disciples (18 1), and the reason is explained in the assured presence of the Christ Himself in any company of two or three who have come together in prayer touching any matter in His name, i.e. as His representatives. The immediate reference is to matters of discipline in the effort to rescue any "brother" from sin. The passage is to be taken of sin generally, for the reading "against thee" (ver 15) is to be rejected, in spite of both the revised VSS. The reference to binding and loosing here to the man is conclusive against limiting the idea in 16 19 to teaching (cf also Lk 17 1 ff.). It is also to be noted that the responsibility is placed upon the individual Christian to cooperate with others when necessary. Thus it shows that the multitude recognized that God had given power on earth to pronounce forgiveness of sins, and apparently they do not limit this power to the Divine Person, for they do not yet know Him as such.

(3) Jas 5 14 ff recognizes the value of elders, and probably of others also, in securing the forgiveness of their that have sinned.

(4) What one must regard as the proper starting point for studying this subject is Jn 20 19 ff. Appear in ten of the apostles and to others on the first night after the resurrection, Jesus says: "As the Father sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whatsoever sins ye retain, they are retained." By comparing this with the corresponding account in Lk 24 we see that Jesus is directing to his work upon earth. He teaches them as to the nature of His work in the OT, and as to the method of their work is to be preaching repentance and remission of sins in His name among all nations. Significant for our purpose are the presence of others than the apostles, the gift of the Holy Spirit, His own self-projection in His messengers, and the solemn statement that the sins of men will be retained or forgiven as it is done through these followers.

(1) It is remarkable that there is no distinct reference to this authority of the keys in the records of the NT, except by the Church. The point of emphasis in all the various forms and occasions of giving of the commission (see Acts 2 22; 3 15; 4 33; 5 32; 10 39; 11 31; 1 Pet 5 1; cf Carver, Missions in the Plan of the Ages). It is said of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13 17) that after their first mission they were rehearsed to the church at Antioch "all things that God had done with them, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles." At Pentecost and at other times Peter was the chief speaker, and so opened the door of the kingdom. Referring to his preaching to Cornelius and his friends, Peter reminds the saints in the conference at Jerusalem (Acts 15) that God made choice among them, that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of God and believe, but this was before the Gentiles should receive the Jewish party and not as claiming any priority in authority. It was Philip, the deacon-evangelist, who first preached to the Samaritans (Acts 8), and some "men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come unto Antioch, spoke the word of God" (Acts 11 20), the first example of "opening a door of faith" to full heathen. Peter appears in the Jerusalem conference with no authority above that of other apostles and elders. By reference to Gal 2 we seem to see only as a matter of prudence and fraternity, not recognizing any authority to legislate for his churches or his ministry. The decision there reached is promulgated as that of the brethren as a body, losing all the law of Moses save four matters that were "necessary" on account of fundamental morals and of the universal presence of Jews in every city (Acts 15 20 f. 28 f). In the sense of teaching Christian conduct all Paul's letters are examples of binding and loosing.

(2) As to binding and loosing sins Peter speaks in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), Simon Magus (ch 8), and in deciding upon the baptism of Cornelius and his household (10 48). Paul speaks with equal boldness in the judgment of Elymas (13 10), where we are told that 9 8 shows under the Spirit; passes upon the faith of a dozen men at Ephesus, and requires their new baptism after instruction (19 9-7); commands the church at Corinth to turn over to Satan the incestuous man 1 Cor 5 5; cf 1 Tim 1 20), and later urges the man's restoration to loving fellowship, declaring that he has been forgiven (2 Cor 2 5 ff). Obscure men like Philip (Acts 8) and Ananias of Damascus in the case of Paul himself (Acts 9) exercised the same sort of judgment as to the forgiveness and reception of men into the fellowship.

IV. Conclusion.—We sum up what seems to be the teaching of Scripture. We conclude that the power is not a special privilege and extraordinary authority, but a responsibility intrusted by Jesus Christ as the method of extending His work.

There is in it nothing magical, mysterious, or arbitrary; not ecclesiastical or official, but spiritual and in the NT, the kingdom of heaven is first of all the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ. By this means men are admitted into the kingdom. The fully attested method of using the keys is that of witnessing personally to an experience of Jesus Christ. He was conferring power for saving and not for
barring from salvation. Let it be borne in mind always that Jesus was offering Peter not power but duty, not privilege but responsibility. Neither of these terms, “power” and “privilege,” that have come to be associated with the gift of the keys occurs with that gift in the words of the Master. The keys are primarily for admitting to the kingdom of heaven, not for barring from the church.

The holder of the keys is any man with that experience that called forth from Jesus the assurance that Peter should have the keys.

2. Agent of the Power: By Jew, the man who will be in fellowship and cooperation with Jesus, in a church, and the Spirit of Jesus will be present in them, so that their decisions and their testimony will be His as well as theirs. There is a corporate, or church, agency, therefore, and the man who would ignore that lacks the experience or the Spirit needful for the use of the keys. Yet the church is never to overshadow or exclude the individual responsibility and authority.

It is to be understood that the keys of the kingdom of heaven confer no political authority or power, save that of holy and redemptive influence. The kingdom of Jesus is not of this world. Its power is spiritual and is to be exercised always in the saving of men. We do not need to be locked out of the kingdom. They are out, and too contented to remain so. It does happen that evil men seek to take possession of the kingdom for evil ends, and then it is that the authority rests in spiritual men to exclude. Men that are to be brought into the kingdom of heaven are now in sin, and where the duty of releasing them is not discharged by Christians, the sinners are left bound in their sins.

There is also involved of necessity the duty of declaring not only the conditions of entrance into the kingdom, but the courses of conduct appropriate to the kingdom. It is thus that binding and loosing in teaching devolve upon the holders of the keys. To that extent, and in that sense, alone, is there the power of “legislat ing” within the kingdom. This is only interpreting and applying the principles that are given us in the Scriptures. See further An-solution; Imposition of Hands; Peter; Rock. See also Keys to the Kingdom.

KEZIAH, ke'zîa (קְזְיָ֑ה). Compare ke'zîâ, Kezîah. See Emeq-keziz.

KEZIZ, ke'zîz (קְזִ֖יז). See Emeq-keziz.

KHAN, kîn. See Inn.

KIBROTH-HATTAAVAH, kîb-rôth-hâ-tâ'â-va, kîb-rôth- (קִבְרֹוּתָהוֹ הֲדַעַהוֹ, “the graves of greed”): A desert camp of the Israelites, one day's journey of the wilderness of Sinai. There the people rested for flesh to eat, and a great number of quails being sent, a plague resulted; hence the name (Nu 11 34; 33 16; Dt 9 22).

KIBZAIM, kîb-zâ'im, kîb'â-im. See Jokreem.

KICK (lak'tôs, laktáso): In the famous vision on the road to Damascus the unseen voice said to Saul: “Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goad” (Acts 9 41; 26 14). The words are omitted from the best MSS in 9 41. This was a familiar proverb in both Gr and Lat lit., and refers to the severer goading received by an ox which kicks back at the goad used to guide or urge him on. The words seem to mean that Paul’s paroxysm of persecution was a painful as well as profitless resistance to the pricks of conscience by which God was leading him into the light.

KID: (1) ֵקרדיה, kōddîh (Ex 23 19, etc); (2) fem. ֵקרדיה, kōddîyim (Ex 11 5, etc); (3) ֵקרדיה, kōddîh (Lam 4 12). The term is used particularly of the fat of the goats, the fat of the sheep, and the fat of the ox. By kōddîh, lit. “kid of the goats,” AV Vm (Jgs 6 19, etc); (4) רֶ֖ס, ’rās, lit. “goat” (Dt 14 21; 1 K 20 27); (5) דָּ֥שָׁ֖ת, ’dāshat, AV “kid of the goat,” RV “he-goat” (Gen 37 31; Lev 9 3, etc); (6) ָהָ֥רָ֖ף, ’ērāph (Lk 15 29). See Goat.

KIDNAPPING, kid'nap-ning (MANSTEALING): The term itself occurs only in the NT (ἀφαπουργία, andραποδίσεις = “manstealer”) in 1 Tim 1 10. The crime was directly forbidden in the Heb law (Ex 21 16; Dt 24 7), and was made punishable with death.

KIDNEYS, kid'nez (always in the pl. πέρις, kliŏdôth; νήφροι, nephrom; Lat renes, whence the Eng. “reins”): “Reins” and “kidneys” are synonyms, but AV undertook a distinction by using the former word in the figurative and the latter in the literal passages. ERV has followed AV exactly, but ARV has retained “reins” only in Job 15 13; Lam 3 13; Rev 2 23, elsewhere substituting “heart,” except in Ps 139 13, where “inward parts” is used. AV and ERV also have “reins” for רֶ֖ס, kōddî̂qain, in Isa 11 5 (ERV “reins”). The physiological function of the kidneys is not referred to in the Bible, but has been introduced (quite wrongly) by AVm to Lev 15 22; 22 4. (1) The kidneys owe their importance in the Bible partly to the fact that they are imbedded in fat, and fat of such purity that “fat of the kidneys” was a proverbial term for surpassing excellence (Dt 32 14 m). For the visceral fat was the part of the animal best adapted for sacrificial burning, and hence came to be deemed particularly sacred (Lev 7 22-25; 1 3 10). Accordingly, the kidneys with the fat surrounding them were burned in every sacrifice in which the entire animal was not consumed, whether in peace (Lev 3 4.10.15; 9 19, sin (Ex 29 13; Lev 4 9; 8 10; 16 9), or trespas-ses (Lev 4 7) offerings (cf. Lev 6 29); (2) “Kidneys” is a term of medical usage, and in a certain sense is worded by the Bible. For instance, the terms used for the kidneys and their ailiments are, as a rule, based on the Gr term for kidneys Νέφρον, in spite of the fact that the anatomy of the kidneys is not correctly represented. However, it is true that the kidney is a peculiarly inaccessible organ, and in cutting an animal they are the last organs to be reached. Consequently, they were a natural symbol for the most hidden part of a man (Ps 139 13), and in Job 16 13 to “cleave the reins under” is to effect the total destruction of the individual (cf 19 27; Lam 3 13). This hidden location, coupled with the sacred sacrificial use, caused the kidneys to be thought of as the seat of the innermost moral (and emotional) impulses. So the psalmist instruct (Ps 16 7) or are “pricked” (Ps 33 21), and God can be said to be far from the reins of sinners (Jer 12 2). In all of these passages “conscience” gives the exact meaning. So the reins rejoice (Prov 23 16), cause torment (2 Esd 6 34), or tremble in wrath (1 Mac 2 24). And to “know” or “try the reins” (usually joined with “the heart”) is an essential power of God’s, denoting His complete knowledge of the nature of every human being (Ps 7 9; 26 2; Jer 11 20; 17 10; 20 12; Wis 1 0; Rev 2 23). See Paraclete; stomach; organs; organ. Cf RS, 379-80, and for Gr sacrificial parallels Journal of Philology, XIX (1890), 46. The anatomical relations are well exhibited in the plate in SBOT, “Leviticus.”

BURTON SCOTT EASTON
KIDRON, kid'ron (Κιδρών, Kidrōn; AV Cedron): A place which, in obedience to Antiochus Sidetes, Cendebeaeus fortified (1 Mac 16 39 ff), to which, when defeated, he fled, hotly pursued by John and Judas, sons of Simon the Macabeus, who burned the city (16 4 ff). It is named along with Jarmnia (Yebna) and Azotus (Esdah). It is possibly identical with kâtarah, a village about 3 miles S.W. of lákir (Ekron).

KIDRON, THE BROOK (נָהֲלוֹלֵלֶד, nahal kidhron; in Jn 18 1 [AV Cedron], גִּדְדְרֹן, gidderōn, ho cheimárrhous tòn Kídrôn, according to RVm, the last two words are to be considered as meaning "of the cedars.

The Heb word has been very generally accepted as from "עָלָלֶד, alalad, "to become black," but it is an attractive suggestion [Cheyne] that it may be a phonetic variant of נהל, nahal, "a spot for inclosures for cattle," of which latter there must have been many around the now buried caves which lay at the base of the cliffs around the spring Gilon.

The Nahal Kidron is the valley known today as the Wady Sitti Miriam, which lies between the eastern walls of Jerus and the Mount Sitti Miriam making a wide sweep S.E., under the name Wady el Jōz ("Valley of the Walnuts"), passes S. until level with the southeastern corner of the temple-area where its bed is

[Image: Kidron, Looking S.E. from the Wall of Jerusalem.]

spanned by an old bridge; here the bottom of the valley, 40 ft. beneath the present surface level, is 400 ft. below the temple-platform. From this point it narrows and deepens gradually, bending slightly W. of S., and, after receiving the Tyropean valley, joins a little farther S.W. with the Valley of Hinnom to form the Wady en Nār, which winds on through the "wilderness of Judaea" to the Dead Sea. Where the three valleys run together is a large open space filled with gardens (the King's Gardens, q.v.), which are kept irrigated all the year round by means of the overflow waters from the 'Ain Sūlām (see SILOAM).

It is where the Hinnom valley runs into the Kidron that some would locate Topišet (q.v.). Except at the irrigated gardens, the ravine is a dry valley containing water only during and immediately after heavy rain, but in ancient times, the rocky bottom—now buried beneath many feet of rich soil—must have contained a little stream from Gilon for at least some hundreds of yards. This was the "brook that flowed through the midst of the land" (2 Ch 32 4). The length of the valley from its head to Bír Eyyūb is 21 miles.

Since the 4th cent. AD, this valley has been known as the VALLEY OF JEHOASHAPAT (q.v.), and from quite early times it was a favorite situation for interments (2 K 23 4.6.15; 2 Ch 34 4.5); it is by Moslem and Jewish tradition the scene of the last judgment, and was known to the Moslems in the Middle Ages as Wady Jehannum; see GEHENNA. It is probable that the "graves of the common people," which King Jehoshakim cast the body of the prophet Uriah, were here (Jer 26 23), and it has been suggested, with less probability, that here too may have been the scene of Ezekiel's vision of the "valley of dry bones" (Ezk 37; cf Jer 31 40).

The Fields of Kidron (2 K 23 4), though generally identified with the open, lower part of this valley, where it is joined by the Tyropean valley, may possibly have been in the upper part where the wide expanded valley receives the name Wady el Jōz; this part is actually on the road to Bethel.

The most dramatic scene associated with the Kidron is that recorded in connection with its earliest Scriptural mention (2 S 15 34), when David, flying before his rebellious son Absalom, here stood on an inclosure the Jews side of the valley while all his adherents passed over and the whole country wept with a loud voice, and all the people passed over: the king also himself passed over the brook Kidron... toward the way of the wilderness. The passing over this brook appears to have been viewed as the solemn abandonment of the Jews territory (cf 1 K 2 37). In 1 K 15 13; 2 Ch 16 16, we read that Ass burnt at the brook Kidron an abominable image for an Asherah which Maacah, his mother, had set up.

In the reforms of Hezekiah, all the uncleannesses that they found in the temple of Jeh was carried by the Levites to the brook Kidron (2 Ch 29 16); "All the altars for incense took they away, and cast them into the brook Kidron" (30 14). This locality was again used in the reformation of Josiah when the king "brought out the Asherah from the house of Jeh, without Jerus, unto the brook Kidron, and burned it at the brook Kidron, and beat it to dust, and cast the dust thereof upon the graves of the common people" (2 K 23 6). The same treatment was given to the vessels made for Baal, the Asherah and the host of heaven (ver 4), and the two idolatrous altars of Manasseh (ver 12). Jos (Ant IX, 73) states that Athaliah was slain in the valley of Kidron, but this does not quite tally with the text account (2 K 11 16). It was a valley associated with graves and the ashes of abominations, but it was prophesied that it should be "holy unto Jeh." (Jer 31 40). Twice it is mentioned simply as "the valley," nahal (2 Ch 36 14; Neh 2 15). Very different from these earlier scenes is the last Scriptural reference (Jn 18 1), when Jesus "went forth with his disciples over the brook Kidron" for His last hours of spiritual struggle and prayer before the turmoil of the end.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

KILAN, klān (Κιλάν, Kilan; AV Ceilan): Mentioned with Azotas in 1 Esd 5 15; their sons returned among the exiles with Zerubbabel. The names do not appear in the lists of Ezra and Neh.

KIMAH, kl'ma (Pleisades). See ASTRONOMY.

KIN. See KINDRED.

KIN, NEXT OF. See KINSMAN.

KINAH, kl'nah (קינאה, kināh): An unidentified town on the southern boundary of Judah, toward Edom (Josh 15 22). The word kināh means "elegy," "dirge," "lament for the dead." The name, however, may have been derived from the
KINDRED, kin'dred: Several words are rendered "kinred" in AV. פָּדַּיָּה, "brother," was used loosely among Hebrews for a member of the same tribe or family, a relative; and is once "kindred" (1 Ch 12 29 AV). Once also somewhat loosely as the tr of בָּנָא, מִדֶּה, "brotherhood," "love of brethren," for "kindred" (Ruth 3 2; cf same root in 2 1, rendered "kinsman"); once, for the figurative expression, "men of thy redemption" (Rom 8 28), g'dolah, referring to the law of the redemption of land by kinsmen, Lev 25 25).

The two most common words for kindred are: (1) פּוּדַיָּה, מִדֶּה, "related by birth" (Gen 12 24; 33 19; Num 10 30; Est 2 10, 20; 8 6); (2) מִשְׂפָּה, מִשְׁפָּה, "family" (Gen 24 38, 40, 41; Josh 6 23; Ruth 2 3; 1 Ch 16 28; Job 32 2; Ps 22 27; 96 7).

In the NT (several times), γενεά, γένος, "kindred by birth," so, of same family, tribe or race (Acts 4 6; 7 13; RV "race"); so also συγγένες, συγγενής (7 14). In AV φαῦλα, χήρα, "tribe," rendered "kindred" (Rev 1 7; 5 9; 7 9; 11 9; 13 7; 14 6), but better "tribe" as in RV, παρεχόμενοι, παρεχόμενος, rendered "kindred" in Acts 3 25, is better "families," as in RV.

KINE, kin: (1) בּוּדַּיָּה, כָּעָר, pl. of בּוּדַּיָּה, כָּעָר, "cows," ARV "cattle" AV and ERV "kine" (Dt 7 13; 28 4 18.51); (2) בּוּדַּיָּה, בּוּדַּיָּה, "ox," or "cow," ARV "cattle" AV and ERV "kine" (Dt 7 13; 28 4 18.51); (2) בּוּדַּיָּה, בּוּדַּיָּה, "beef," or "cow," ARV "beef," AV and ERV "kine" (Dt 32 14; 28 17 29); (3) בּוּדַּיָּה, בּוּדַּיָּה, "young cow" or "heifer," RV "kine" in Gen 41 2 27; 1 6 7 14; Am 4 1; in Gen 32 15, ARV has "cows." See CATTLE; Cow.


1. King. —The Hebrew word for king is בּוּדַּיָּה, melekh; its denominative בּוּדַּיָּה, malkhúth, "to reign," "to be king." The word is apparently derived from the root הָלַךְ which denotes "to go," "to reign," inasmuch as the possessor is also lord and ruler; (2) in the Aramaic (בּוּדַּיָּה), and Assyr "counsel," and in the Syrian "to consult"; of Lat. consilium. If, as has been suggested, the root idea of "king" is "counselor" and not "ruler," then the rise of the kingly office and power would be due to intellectual superiority rather than physical prowess. And since the first form of monarchy known was that of a "city-state," the office of king may have evolved from that of the chief "elder," or intellectual head of the clan.

The first king of whom we read in the Bible was Nimrod (Gen 10 8, 10), who was supposedly the founder of the Bab empire. Historical research regarding the kings of Babylonia and Egypt corroborates this Bib statement in so far as the ancestry of these kings is traced back to the earliest times of antiquity. According to Isa 19 11, it was the pride of the Egyptians that they could trace their lineage to most ancient kings. The Canaanites and Philist had kings as early as the times of Abraham (Gen 14 2; 20 2). Thus also the Edomites, who were related to Israel (Gen 36 31), the Moabites, and the Midianites had kings (Nu 22 4; 31 8) earlier than the Israelites.

In Gen 14 18 we read of Melchisedek, who was a priest, and king of Salem. At first the extent of the dominion of kings was often very limited, as appears from the story of the Egyptian princes that they could trace their lineage to most ancient kings. The Canaanites and Philist had kings as early as the times of Abraham (Gen 14 2; 20 2). Thus also the Edomites, who were related to Israel (Gen 36 31), the Moabites, and the Midianites had kings (Nu 22 4; 31 8) earlier than the Israelites.

The earliest Bib. usage of this title "king," in consonance with the general oriental practice, denotes an absolute monarch, who exercised unchecked control over his subjects. In this sense the title is applied to Jeh, and to human rulers. No constitutional obligations were laid upon the ruler nor were any restrictions put upon his arbitrary authority. His good or bad conduct depended upon his own free will.

The title "king" was applied also to dependent kings. In the NT it is used even for the head of a province (Rev 17 12). To distinguish him from the smaller and dependent kings, the king of Assyria bore the title "king of kings."
wealth, having Jeh Himself as the Head and Ruler. The theocracy is not to be mistaken for a hierarchy, nor can it strictly be identified with the centralized power, constituting Israel a nation. In lieu of a strong political center, the unifying bond of a common allegiance to Jeh, i.e. the common faith in Him, the God of Israel, kept the tribes together. The consciousness that Jeh's kingship as Israel's was national feeling, and the inspiration of a true patriotism (Ex 15 18; 19 6; Jgs 5). Jeh's kingship is evinced by the laws He gave to Israel, by the fact that justice was administered in His name (Ex 22 28), and by His leading and aiding Israel in its wars (Ex 14 14; 15 3; Nu 21 14; 1 S 18 17; 25 28). This decentralized system which characterized the early government of Israel politically, in spite of some great advantages, proved advantageous for Israel on the whole and served a great providential purpose. It safeguarded the individual liberties and rights of the Israelites. When the monarchy was established, they enjoyed a degree of local freedom and self-control that was unknown in the world. There was freedom for every community, which admitted the untrammelled cultivation of their inherited religious and social institutions.

From the political point of view Israel, through the growth of the people's development, was at a great disadvantage, making almost impossible its development into a world-empire. But this barrier to a policy of self-aggrandizement was a decided blessing from the viewpoint of Israel's providential mission to the world. It made possible the transmission of the pure religion instilled to it, to later generations of men without destructive contamination from the ungodly forces with which Israel would inevitably have come into closer contact, had it not been for its self-contained character, resulting from the fashion of a state it was providentially molded into. Only as the small and insignificant nation that it was, could Israel perform its mission as "the depository and perpetuation of the principle of humanity." Thus its religion was the central authority of this nation, supplying the lack of a centralized government. Herein lay Israel's uniqueness and greatness, and also the secret of its strength as a nation as long as the loyalty and devotion to Jeh lasted. Under the leadership of Moses and Joshua who, though they exercised a royal authority, acted merely as representatives of Jeh, the influence of religion which of these leaders were a personal embodiment was still so strong as to keep the tribes united for common action. But when, after the removal of these strong leaders, Israel no longer had a standing representative of Jeh, these changes took place which eventually necessitated the establishment of the monarchy. In the absence of a special representative of Jeh, His will as Israel's King was divined by the use of the holy lot in the hand of the highest priest. But the lot would not supply the place of a strong personal leader. Besides, many of the Israelites came under the deteriorating influence of the Can. worship and began to adopt heathenish customs. The sense of religious unity weakened, the tribes became disunited and ceased to act in common, and as a result the people was in a condition of necessity came to their assistance by sending them leaders, who released the regions where they lived from foreign attacks. But these leaders were not the strong religious personalities that Moses and Joshua had been; besides, they had no official authority, and their rule was only temporary and local. It was now that the need of a centralized political government was felt, and the only type of permanent organization of which the age was cognizant was the kingship. The crown was offered to Gideon, but he declined it, saying: "Jeh shall rule over you" (Jgs 8 22.23). The attempt of his son, Abimelech, to establish a kingship over Shechem and the adjacent country, after the Canaanite fashion, was abortive.

The general political condition of this period is briefly and pertinently described by the oft-recurring statement in Jgs: "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

Not until the time of Samuel was a formal kingdom established over Israel. An attempt to ameliorate conditions by a union of civil and religious functions in the hands of Eli, the priest, had failed through the corruption of his sons. Similarly the hopes of Israel in a hereditary judgship had been disappointed through the corruption of the sons of Samuel. The Philis were threatening the independence and hope of Israel. Its internal weakness and consequent political instability revealed the necessity for a monarchy, and moreover the people expressed a desire for a king originated from a purely national and not from a religious motive, the unwillingness of Samuel, at first, to comply with the demand for a king is not surprising. Even Jeh declared: "They have not rejected thee but they have rejected me," etc. Instead of recognizing that they themselves were responsible for the failures of the past, they blamed the form of government they had, and put all their hopes upon a king. That it was not the monarchy as such that was objectionable to Jeh and His prophet is evidenced by the fact that to the patriarchs the promise had been given: "Kings shall come out of thy loins" (Gen 17 6; 35 11). In view of this Moses had made provision for a kingship (Dt 17 14-20).

According to the Mosaic charter for the kingship, the monarchy when established must be brought into consonance with the fact that Jeh was Israel's king. Of this fact Israel had lost sight when it requested a kingship like that of the neighboring peoples. Samse loyalty and glories were perfectly justified in view of such a kingship as they desired, which would inevitably tend to selfish despotism (1 S 8 11 f.). Therefore God directs Samuel to give them a king—since the introduction of a kingship typifying the kingship of Christ lay within the plan of His economy—not according to their desire, but in accordance with the instructions of the law concerning kings (Dt 17 14-20), in order to safeguard their liberties and prevent the forfeiture of their mission.

According to the Law of Moses Jeh was to choose the king of Israel, who was to be His representative. The choice of Jeh in the case of Saul is implied by the anointing of Saul by Samuel and through the confirmation of the Israelites in the lot (1 S 10 1-20). This method of choosing the king did not exclude the people altogether, since Saul was publicly presented to them, and acknowledged as king (1 S 10 24). The participation of the people in the choice of the king is more pronounced in the case of David, who having been designated as Jeh's choice by being anointed by
Samuel, was anointed again by the elders of Israel before he actually became king (2 S 2 4).

The anointing itself signified the consecration to an office in the theocracy. The custom of anointing kings was an old one, and by no means peculiar to Israel (Jos 7 14). The hereditary kingship began with David. Usually the firstborn succeeded to the throne, but not necessarily. The king might choose as his successor from among his sons, the one whom he thought best qualified.

The king of the constitutional monarch in the modern sense, nor was he an autocrat in the oriental sense. He was responsible to Jeh, who had chosen him and whose viceroy and servant he was. Furthermore, his authority was more or less limited on the religious side by the prophets, the representatives of Jeh, and in the political sphere by the "elders," the representatives of the people, though as king he stood above all. Rightly conceived, his kingship in relation to Jeh, who was Israel's true king, implied that he was Jeh's servant and His earthly substitute. In relation to his subjects his kingship demanded of him, according to the Law, "that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren" (Dt 17 20). The kingship was also in a way the summus episcopus in Israel. His very kingship was of an entirely religious character and implied a unity of the heavenly and earthly rule over Israel through him who as Jeh's substitute sat "upon the throne of the kingdom of Jeh over Israel" (1 Ch 17 14; 28 5; 29 23), who was "Jeh's anointed" (1 S 24 10; 25 1), and also the title of "Jeh" and "the first-born," the same as Israel did (Ex 4 22; Hos 11 1; 2 S 7 14; Ps 89 27; 2 7). Thus a place of honor was assigned to the king in the temple (2 K 11 4; 23 3; Ezk 46 12); besides, he officiated at the national sacrifices (esp. mentioned of David and Solomon). He prayed for his people and blessed them in the name of Jeh (2 S 6 18; 24 25; 1 K 3 4 8; 8 14.55.62; 9 25). Apparently it was the king's right to appoint and dismiss the chief priests at the sanctuaries, though in his choice he was doubtless restricted to the Arahites (1 Ch 16 37.39; 2 S 8 17; 1 K 2 27.35).

The priesthood was under the king's supervision to such an extent that he might concern himself about its organization and duties (1 Ch 15 23.24; 16 4-6), and that he was responsible for the purity of the cult and the maintenance of the order of worship. In general he was to watch over the religious life and conduct of his people, to eradicate the high places and every form of idolatry in the land (2 K 18 4). Ezk 46 22 demands that he shall provide at the Passover a bullock for a sin offering for all the people.

The marks of royal dignity, besides the beautiful robes in which the king was attired (1 K 22 10), were: (1) the diadem (תָּֽאֶשֶׁר, nezer) and the crown (יְהֵֽנֶּשֶׁר, šārāq), 2 S 1 10; 2 K 11 12; 2 S 13 30), the headcloth; (2) the scepter (כְּפֶר, šeḇēḥet).

originally a long, straight staff, the primitive sign of dominion and authority (Gen 49 10; Nu 24 17; Isa 14 5; Jer 48 17; Ps 7 10). It is elsewhere called "the staff of my father" (Gen 49 18; 18 32; Deut 33 17).

The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6). The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6). The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6).

The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6). The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6). The scepter was also called "the rod of my father" (Ps 70 3; Ps 2 6; 45 6).
possible even without a monarchical form of government. Though a kingdom was established again under the Maccabees, as a result of the attempt of Antiochus to extinguish Israel's religion, this kingdom was neither as perfectly national nor as truly religious in its character as the Davidic. It soon became evident that the kingship of Herod was entirely alien to the true Israelish conception. It remains to be said only that the final attempt of Israel in its revolt against the Rom Empire, to establish the old monarchy, resulted in its downfall as a nation, because it would not learn the lesson that the future of a nation does not depend upon political greatness, but upon the fulfilment of its Divine mission.

**LITERATURE.**—J. P. McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Jews, London 1913; Bibl. Altertums; HDB; Klinck, Bibl. AT.
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**KING, CHRIST AS:**

1. **The Reality of Christ's Kingship.**

1. The OT Foreshadowings

In the Psalms and Prophets

2. The Gospel Presentations

(1) Christ's Claim to Be King
(2) Christ's Acceptance of the Title
(3) Christ Charged and Condemned as King
(4) The Priority of the Resurrection and Apostolic Preaching
(5) The Testimony of the Epistles and Apocalypse

II. Christ's Title to Kingship

1. By Right of Birth
2. By Divine Appointment
3. By Conquest

By the Free Choice of His People

III. The Nature of Christ's Kingship

1. Spiritual
2. Universal
(1) Kingdom of Grace, of Power
(2) Kingdom of Glory
3. Eternal

**I. The Reality of Christ's Kingship.**—There can be no question but that Christ is set before us in Scripture as a king. The very title Christ or 'Messiah' suggests kingship, for though the priest is spoken of as "anointed," and full elucidation of the title as applied to Jesus must take account of His threecold office of prophet, priest, and king, yet generally in the OT it is the king to whom the epithet is applied.

We may briefly note some of the OT predictions of Christ as king. The first prediction which represents the Christ as having dominion is that of Jacob concerning the tribe of Judah: "Unto Shiloh shall he come, and unto him shall the assembly be gathered: and they shall be unto him, 'themselves,' sons of Jacob" (Ps 110:1); then kingly dignity and dominion are suggested by the star and scepter in Balaam's prophecy (Nu 24:17). As yet, however, Israel has no king but God, but when afterward a king is given and the people become familiar with the idea, the prophecies all more or less have a regal tint, and the coming one is preeminently the coming king.

In the Ps and Prophets.—We can only indicate a few of the many royal predictions, but these will readily suggest others. In Ps 2 the voice of God is heard above all the tumult of earth, declaring, "Yet I have set him upon my holy hill of Zion." So in Ps 24, 45, 75, 89 and 110 we have special foreshadowings of the Messianic king. The babe that Isaiah sees born of a virgin is called "the Prince of Peace" (Isa 9:6,7), of the increase of whose knowledge there shall be no end, and as the prophet gazes on him he joyfully exclaims: "Behold, a king shall be established in righteousness" (Isa 32:1). Jeremiah, the prophet of weeping, catches bright glimpses of his coming Lord, and with rapture intensified by the surrounding sorrow cries: "Behold, the days come, saith Jah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land" (33:5). Ezekiel, dwelling amid his wheels, sees in the course of Providence many revolutions roll to bring about the dominion of Christ: "I will overturn, overturn, overturn, until it is no more; and I will give Israel her fathers." (21:27). Daniel sees the rise and progress, the decline and fall of many mighty empires, but beyond all he sees the son of man sitting on an everlasting kingdom (7:14). Hosea sees the repentant people of Israel in the last days seeking and finding their God (23:7). Micah sees the everlasting Ruler coming out of Bethlehem clad in the strength and majesty of Jah, who shall "be great unto the ends of the earth" (3:5). Zecharias, excelling in His near approach, cries: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee; the righteousness and strength is gone before him, and the king of glory followeth after him." (9:9), and he follows His varied course through gloom and glory, until the strong shall become as a child, and the child as a mighty man before Jah, and the heart and the exclaiming in the glowing words: "Jeh shall be King over all the earth" (14:9). The more extreme and higher critics would, of course, deny the predictions of Jesus Christ, but most, if not all, would admit that they are real representations which were only fully realized in Jesus of Nazareth.

The Gospel presents Christ as king. Mt, tracing His genealogy, gives special prominence to His royal lineage as son of David. He tells of the visit of the Magi who inquire for the newborn king of the Jews, and the scribes answer Herod's question by showing from Micah's prophecy that the Christ to be born in Bethlehem would be a "governor," and would rule, 'be shepherd of my people Israel" (1:16). Lk's account of the Nativity contains the angel's declaration that the child to be born and named Jesus would occupy the throne of David and reign upon the house of Jacob forever (1:32,33). In John's account of the beginning of Christ's ministry, one of His early disciples天然地 calls him "King of Israel" (1:49), and Jesus does not repudiate the title. If Mark has no such definite word, he nevertheless describes the message with which Jesus opens His ministry as "the kingdom of God" (1:15). The people nurtured in the prophetic teaching expect the coming one to be a king, and when Jesus seems to answer to their ideal of the Messiah, they propose taking Him by force and making Him king (Jn 6:15).

(1) Christ's claim to be king. Christ Himself claimed to be king. In claiming to be the Messiah He tacitly claimed kingship, but there are specific indications of the claim besides. In all His teaching of the kingdom it is implied, for though He usually calls it the "kingdom of God" or "of heaven," yet it is plain that He is the administrator of its affairs. He assumes to Himself the highest place in it. Admission into the kingdom or exclusion from it depends upon men's attitude toward Him. In His explanation of the parable of the Tares, He distinctly speaks of His kingdom, identifying it with the kingdom of God. "The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them which do iniquity," (Mt 13:41). The righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Mt 13:41-43). He speaks of some seeing "the Son of man coming in His kingdom" (Mt 18:28), of the regeneration, "when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory" (Mt 19:28), of Himself under the guise of a nobleman who goes "into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom," and does receive it (Lk 19:12-15).

(2) Christ's acceptance of the title.—When the mother of John and James comes asking that her two sons may occupy the chief places of honor in His kingdom, He does not deny that He is a king and has a kingdom, while indicating that the places on His right and left hand are already determined by the appointment of the Father (Mt 20:21-23). He deliberately teaches to be King (Jn 5:39). The prediction of Zec: "Behold, thy king cometh," and He accepts, approves and justifies the hosannas and the homage of the multitudes (Mt 21:1-16; Mk 11:10; Lk 19:12). In His great picture of the coming judgment (Mt 25), the son of man sits upon the throne of His glory, and it is as the 'king' that He blesses and condemns. The dying thief prays, "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" (Lk 23:42), and Jesus gives His royal response which implies full acceptance of the position.
(3) Christ charged and condemned as king.—His claim throughout had been so definite that His enemies made this the basis of their charge against Him before Pilate, that He said that "he is himself Christ a king," and when Pilate asks, "Art thou the King?" He answers, "Thou sayest," which is equivalent to "yes" (Lk 23:23). In the fuller account of Jn, Jesus speaks to Pilate of "my kingdom," and says "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born" (Jn 18:37). His claim is epitomized in the superscription of the cross in the three languages: "This is the King of the Jews," and although the priests wished it to be altered so as to detract from His claim, they yet affirm the fact of that claim when they say: "Write not, The King of the Jews; but, that he said, I am King of the Jews." (Jn 19:21). The curtain of His earthly life falls upon the king in seeming failure; the taunt of the multitude, "Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross" (Mk 16:32), meets with no response, and the title on the cross seems a solemn mockery, like the elaborate, cruel jest of the brutal soldiers clothing Him with purple, crowning Him with thorns and hurling Him King of the Jews.

(4) The witness of the resurrection and of apostleship.—But the resurrection throws new light upon the scene, and fully vindicates His claims, and the sermon of Peter on the day of Pentecost proclaims the fact that the crucified one occupies the throne. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified! (Acts 2:36). The early preaching of the apostles, as recorded in the Acts, emphasizes His lordship, His kingship; these men were preachers in the literal sense of the word.

(5) The testimony of the Epistles and Apocalypse.—We need not consider in detail the testimony of the Epp. The fact that Christ is king is everywhere implied and not infrequently asserted. He is "Lord of both the dead and the living" (Rom 14:9). He is risen "to rule over the Gentiles" (Rom 15:12). "He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet" (1 Cor 15:25). He is at the right hand of God "above all rule, and authority, 20-22; of God the Father "the inheirance in the kingdom of Christ and God" (Eph 5:5), and believers are "translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col 1:13). He has been given the name that is above every name "that in him all the heavenly hosts, and every name, etc (Phil 2:9-11). Those who suffer with Christ are to "reign with him" (2 Tim 2:12), at "his appearing and his kingdom" (2 Tim 4:1), and He will save them "unto his heavenly kingdom" (2 Tim 4:18); "the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet 1:11). Of the Son it is said: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (He 1:8), and He is a King-Priest "after the order of Melchizedek" (He 7:17). In the Apocalypses, appropriately, the predominating aspect of Christ is that of a king. He is the "ruler of the kings of the earth" (Rev 1:5), "King of the ages" (Rev 15:3), "King of kings" (17:14; 19:16), "and he shall reign for ever and ever" (11:15). The reality of Christ's kingship is thus placed beyond all doubt.

II. Christ's Title to Kingship.—After the analogy of earthly kingdoms it might be said that Jesus Christ is a king by birth. He was 1. By Birth a king. His mother, like His spiritual being, was of the house and family of David (Lk 2:4). The angel in announcing His birth declares that He will occupy the throne of His father David. The Pharisees have no hesitation in affirming that the Christ would be Son of David (Mt 22:43; Mk 12:35; Lk 20:41). Frequently in life He was hailed as "Son of David," and after His ascension, Peter declares that the promise God had made to David that "of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne" (cf. 2 Sam 7:14) was fulfilled in Him (Acts 2:30). So that on the human side He had the title to kingship as Son of David, while on the Divine side as Son of God He had also the right to the throne.

David was king by Divine choice and appointment, and this was the ideal in the case of his successors. The figure of "Divine right"—by virtue of which modern kings have claimed to rule—was, in the first instance, a reminiscence of the Bib. ideal. But the ideal is realized in Christ. Of the coming Messianic King, Jehovah said: "Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion" (Ps 2:6), and the great proclamation of Pentecost was an echo of that decree: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified!" (Acts 2 36), while the apostle Paul says that "God highly exalted him and gave unto him the name which is above every name" (Phil 2:9), and again and again the great OT word of Jehovah is applied to Christ: "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet" (He 1:13).

Often in the olden times kingship was acquired by conquest, by superior prowess. According to one etymology of our word "king," it means the "able man," the one who could do what others could not do, and every reference to Carlyle's fine passage thereon. In the highest sense, this is true of Christ, who establishes His sway over men's hearts by His matchless prowess, the power of His infinite love and the charm of His perfect character. Except in the most autocratic form of kingship, some place has been given to the suffrage of the people, and the other phases of the title have been confirmed and ratified by the free exercise of the franchise. In the case of Christ, "God save the king!" and no king is well established on the throne if he is not supported by the free homage of his subjects. Christ as king wins the love of His people solicited and won by His sway. They are of one heart to make Him king.

III. The Nature of Christ's Kingship.—We know that the Jews expected a material kingdom, marked by earthly pomp and state; a kingdom on the lines of the Davideic or Solomonic kingdom, and others since have made the same mistake.

The Scriptures plainly declare, Christ Himself clearly taught, that His kingship was spiritual. "My kingdom," said He, "is not of this world." Granted that the proposition indicates origin, it still leaves the statement an assertion of the spirituality of the kingdom, for if it is not from this kosmos, from this earthly state of things, it must be from the other world—not the earthly but the heavenly; not the material but the spiritual. The whole context shows that origin here includes character, for Christ adds, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." Because it is of an unworldly origin, it is not to be propagated by
worldly means, and the non-use of worldly means declares it to be of an unworlty character. So that to assert that Christ means that His kingdom was to arise out of the world, but to come down from heaven, is not at all to deny, but rather, indeed, to declare its essential spirituality, its unworllyness, its otherworldliness.

Throughout the NT, spirituality appears as the prevailing characteristic of Christ’s reign. Earthly kingdoms are based upon material power, the power of the sword, the power of wealth, etc., but the basal factor of Christ’s kingdom is righteousness (Mt 5 20; 6 33; Rom 14 17; He 1 8, etc.). The ruling principle in earthly kingdoms is selfish or sectional or national aggrandizement; in the kingdom of Christ it is truth. Christ is king of truth.

"Art thou a king then?" said Pilate. "I am," said Christ (for that is the force of “thou sayest that I am a king”). "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," and He adds, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (Jn 18 37). Elsewhere He says: "I am the truth" (Jn 14 6), and at the head of the armies of heaven He still bears the title "Prestigious and True" (Rev 19 11); but if righteousness and truth occupy such a prominent place in His kingdom, it follows that it must be distinguished by its spirituality. His immediate subjects are spiritual men and women, not worldly, but spiritual. Its work is spiritual; all the forces emanating from it, operating through it, centering in it, are spiritual.

The Jewish idea of the Messiah’s reign was a narrow national one. For them it meant the glorification of the nation and the renewal or establishment of the supranationalism of Judaism over all forms of faith and all systems of philosophy; the subjection to Jewish sway of the haughty Roman, the cultured Greek and the rude barbarian. The Messiah was to be a greater king than David or Solomon, but still a king after the same sort; much as the limits of the kingdom might extend, it would be but an extension on Jewish lines; others might be admitted to a share in its privileges, but they would have to become naturalized Jews, or occupy a very subordinate place. The prophetic ideal, however, was a universal kingdom, and that was the conception inscribed and emphasized (For the prophetic ideal such passages may be noted as Ps 2, 22, 72; Is 11 10; Ps 7 13 14, etc.). Of course, the predictions have a Jewish coloring, and people who did not apprehend the spirituality might well construe this amiss; but, clearly examined, it will be found that the prophets indicate that men’s position in the coming kingdom is to be determined by their relation to the king, and in that we get the preparation for the full NT ideal. The note of universality is very marked in the teaching of Christ. All barriers are to be broken down and Jewish and Gentile alike in the privileges of the new order. "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 8 11), and stranger still to the Jewish ear: “The sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness" (Mt 8 12). In the parables of the kingdom (Mt 13), the field, in which is sown the good seed of the kingdom, is the world, and the various other figures give the same idea of unlimited extent. As is suggested by the declaration, “Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold” (Jn 10 16), also by the confident affirmation: “I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself” (Jn 12 32), and so with many other statements of the Gospels.

The terms of the commission are enough to show the universal sovereignty which Christ claims over men: “Go ye therefore,” He says, as possessing all authority in heaven and on earth, “and make disciples of all nationalities” (Mt 28 19), coupled with the royal assurance, “Ye shall be my witnesses unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1 8). The Book of Acts shows, in the carrying out of the commission, the actual widening of the borders of Christ’s kingdom to include believers of all nationalities. Peter is taught, and announces clearly, the great truth that Gentiles are to be received upon the same terms as the Jews. But through Paul as the apostle of the Gentiles this glorious truth is most fully and jubilantly made. In the apologetic and the dogmatic teaching of his Ep, he shows that all the barriers are broken down, the middle wall of the fence between Jew and Gentile no longer exists. Those who were aliens and strangers are now made nigh in Christ, and “are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God” (Eph 2 19). That household, that commonwealth, is, in Pauline language, equivalent to the kingdom, and in the same Ep, he describes the same privileged position as being an “inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God” (5 5). The Saviour’s kingdom cannot be bounded by earthly limits, and all attempts to map it out according to human rules imply a failure to recognize the true Scriptural idea of its universality.

1. Kingdom of grace—There is, first of all, the kingdom of grace. The description of the kingdom of grace is one of the most difficult and least understood of any NT passage. The word is used in the NT in four different senses. (1) Kingdom of grace—There is also another phase called the kingdom of power. Christ is in a special sense king in Zion, king in His church—that is universal in conception and destined to be so in reality—but He is also king of the universe. He is “head over all things”; Eph 1 22; Col 1 18, and other passages clearly intimate this. He rules over all. He does so not simply as God, but as God-man, as mediator. It is as mediator that He has the name above every name; it is as mediator that He sits upon the throne of universal power.

(2) Kingdom of glory—There is also the phase of the kingdom of glory. Christ’s reign now is truly glorious. The essential spirituality of it implies its glory, for as the spiritual far surpasses the material in value, so the glory of the spiritual far transcends the glory of the material. The glory of worldly pomp, of physical force, even of right human prowess, is but a memory, a memory forever pale before the glory of righteousness, truth, spirituality. But Christ’s kingdom is glorious in another sense; it is a heavenly kingdom. It is the kingdom of grace into which saved sinners now enter, but it is also the kingdom of heavenly glory, and in it the glorified saints have a place. Entrance into the kingdom of grace in this earthly state secures entrance into the kingdom of glory. Rightly does the church confess: “Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ! O Christ! O Christ!” But the glory of the kingdom is only revealed in the heavenlies, in the age to come, the age of glory.

(3) Eternal Kingdom—There is also the greater and most extensive kingdom, that is, the kingdom which is to come. It is the kingdom of glory, but not only of glory. It includes all the other kingdoms in supreme glory. It is a kingdom which is to come. Its degree and glory are beyond the comprehension of men. A great man once said, “The kingdom is not of this world; if it were, then the believers would fight amongst themselves, but now are they divided amongst the nations.” The kingdom of glory is divinely described by the angel’s announcement: “He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end” (Lk 1 33). The reign of 1,000 years which so greatly occupies the thoughts of so many brethren, whatever we may
decide as to its nature, is but an episode in the reign of Christ. He is reigning now, He shall reign forever. Rev 11 15, 16. It is quoted, in its simplest meaning, as applying to the millennium, but it goes on to say and shall reign as long as the heavens shall last. The interpretation of the verse is dependent upon the interpretation of the heavens. So, of the glowing predictions of the OT, which are often assigned to the millennium, indicate no limit, but deal with the enduring and eternal.

The difficult passage in 1 Cor 15 24-28 must be interpreted in the light of these declarations concerning the eternity of Christ's reign. It is evident as mediator that He delivers up the kingdom to the Father; He dispenses of mediator comes to an end. All has been done according to the purpose of redemption. All the ransomed are finally gathered home. He sees of the travail of His soul, and is satisfied. Obdurate enemies are subdued. God's glory has been fully vindicated. The Son becomes the subject of the Father, God governs directly and is all in all. But the Son in some sense still reigns and through Him God's glory will ever shine, while the kingdom eternally rests upon redemption.

We may summarize by saying that Christ is the Son of the Virgin Mary, and of the House of David. He reigns as King, king of kings, and kingdom, kingdom of God, and kingdom of heaven, by both right and title, and is the representative of the heavenly Jerusalem. He is the King of kings, and His kingdom is the kingdom of heaven. He reigns as the New Adam, and His kingdom is the New Jerusalem.

KING OF THE JEWS: The title applied in mockery of Jesus, and put by Pilate on His cross (Mt 27 39-43; Mk 15 26, etc.). See Jesus Christ, King, Christ as.

KINGDOM OF GOD (OF HEAVEN), THE
(α βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν—τοῦ δυν, hé basileia tôn ouranôn—lóú theô):

I. MEANING AND ORIGIN OF THE TERM
1. Place in the Gospels
   1. Kingdom of Heaven
   2. Kingdom of God
   3. Relation to the OT (Daniel, etc.)

II. ITS USE BY JESUS—CONTRAST WITH JEWISH CONCEPTIONS
   1. Current Jewish Opinions
   2. Misinterpretation of Jesus to Same
   3. Growing Divergence and Contrast
   4. Prophetic Character of the "Temptation"
   5. "A Futuristic" Hypothesis (J. Welcker, Schweitzer)
   6. Weakness of This View
   7. Positive Conceptions of Jesus

III. THE IDEA IN HISTORY
   1. Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age
   2. Early Christian Centuries
   3. Reformation Period
   4. Later Ideas

IV. PLACE IN THEOLOGY
   1. Danger of Exaggeration
   2. Elements of Living Power in Idea

LITERATURE

The "kingdom of God" is one of the most remarkable ideas and phrases of all time, having begun to be used very near the beginnings of history and continuing in force down to the present day.

1. Meaning and Origin of the Term.—Its use by Jesus is by far its most interesting aspect; for, in the Synoptists, at least, it is His usual expression for His teaching. Of this the ordinary reader of Scripture may hardly be aware, but it becomes evident and significant to the student. Thus in Mt 4 17, the commencement of the ministry is described in these words, "And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people"; and, somewhat later, in Lk 4 18, the expansion of His activity is described in the following terms, "And it came to pass soon afterwards, that He went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve." When the Twelve are sent forth by themselves, the purpose of their mission is, in Lk 9 2, given in these words, "And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick." In Mt 13 11, the parables, which formed so large and prominent a portion of His teaching, are denominated collectively "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven"; and it will be remembered how many of these commence with the phrase, "The kingdom of heaven is like..."

In these quotations, and in others which might easily be adduced, it will be observed that the phrases "the kingdom," "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven" are used interchangeably.

2. "King-
   dom of
   Heaven"

   The last of the three, "the kingdom of God" and "King-
   dom of Heaven" are confined to the First Gos-
   pel, which does not, however, always make use of it; and it is not certain what may have been the reason for the substitution. The simplest explanation would be that kingdom is a name for God, as, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the penitent says, "I have sinned against heaven," and we ourselves might say, "Heaven forbid!" It is, however, improbable that the true meaning has to be learned from two petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the one of which is epexegetic of the other, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

   Here the disciples are instructed to pray that the kingdom of God may come; but this is equivalent to the petition that the will of God may be done on earth; Jesus is, however, aware of a region in the universe where the will of God is at present being perfectly and universally done, and, for reasons not difficult to surmise, He elevates thither the minds and hearts of those who pray. The kingdom of heaven would thus be so entitled because it is already realized there, and is, through prayer and effort, to be transferred thence to this earth.

   Although, however, the phrase held this master-
   position in the teaching of Jesus, it was not of His invention. It was employed before Him by the Baptist, of whom we are told, in Mt 3 1, "And in those days (Daniel, etc.) cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Indeed, the phrase is far older; for, on glancing toward the OT, we come at once, in Dn 2 44, to a passage where the young prophet, explaining to the monarch the image of gold, silver, iron and clay, which, in his dream, he had seen shattered by a stone cut out without hands, interprets it as a succession of world-kings, destined to be destroyed by "a kingdom of God," which shall last forever; and, in his famous vision of the "son of man" in 7 14, it is said, "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

   These passages in Dn 2 form undoubtedly the proximate source of the phrase; yet the idea which it represents mounts far higher. That first the Jewish state was governed by laws believed to be derived directly from heaven; and, when the people demanded a king, that they might be like other nations, they were reproached for desiring any king but God Himself. With the con-
   ception the actual monarchy was only a com-
  promise, the reigning monarch passing for Jeh's representative on earth. In David, the man after
God's own heart, the compromise was not satisfactory; in Solomon it was still tolerable; but in the majority of the kings of both Judah and Israel it was a dismal and disastrous failure. No wonder that Hosea, in his prophetic prayer, rebuked and charged Jehovah with taking to Himself His great power and reign, or that the prophets predicted the coming of a ruler who would be far nearer to God than the actual kings and of whose reign there would be no end. Even when the political kingdom perished and the people were carried away into Babylon, the intelligent and truly religious among them did not cease to cherish the old hope, and the very aspect of the world-powers then and subsequently menacing them only widened their conceptions of what that kingdom might be which could overcome them all. The return from Babylon seemed a miraculous confirmation of their faith, and it looked as if the day long prayed for were about to dawn. Alas, it proved a day of small things. The era of the Maccabees was only a transitory gleam; in the person of Herod the Great a usurper occupied the throne; and the eagles of the Romans were hovering on the horizon. Still Messianic hopes flourished, and Messianic language filled the mouths of the people.

II. Its Use by Jesus—Contrast with Jewish Conceptions.—Schürer, in his History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, gives (11, 128 ff.), has drawn up a kind of chronology of messianic ideas, and has the following eleven articles, which believes was extensively diffused at this period. The Sadducees, indeed, had no participation in these dreams, as they would have called them, being absorbed in money-getting and courtship; but the Pharisees cherished them, and the Zealots received their name from the adorers with which they embraced them. The true custodians, however, of these conceptions were the Proschechomenoi, as they have been called, from what is said of them in the NT, that they “waited for the kingdom of God.” This class belonged such men as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea (Lk 23, 51), but it is in the beginning of the Gospel of Lk that we are introduced to its most numerous representatives, in the groups surrounding the infant Baptist and the infant Saviour (Lk 2.25,38); and the truest and amplest expression of their sentiments must be sought in the inspired hymns which rose from them on to the centre of their aspirations, but as described, as described, is a kingdom of God—not, however, of worldly splendor and force, but of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost; beginning in humility, and passing exaltation only through the dark valley of contrition.

Such was the circle in which both the Baptist and Jesus were reared, and it was out of this atmosphere that the conception of the kingdom of God came into their minds. It was essentially the same, making use of this term, Jesus accommodated Himself to the opinions and language of His fellow-countrymen; and there is truth in this, because, in order to secure a footing on the solid earth of history, He had to connect His own activity with the world in which He found Himself. Yet the idea was native to His home and His race, and therefore to Himself; and it is not improbable that He may at first have been unconscious of the wide difference between what He was used in different senses; and this contrast went on increasing until there was a great gulf fixed between Him and them. The difference cannot better be expressed than by saying, as is done by B. Weiss, that He said "kingdom," while they referred to it as "the kingdom" and He of God.

3. Growing Divergence.—In the phrase of the prophets, "the kingdom of God," and "kingdom," and "the kingdom and God of God," and "of God," and "kingdom of God," and the phrase of the Romans of a Jewish king and court, and of a world-wide dominion going forth from Mt. Zion; He was bound to differentiate between the idea of world-power and peace, of the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. So earthly and fantastic were the expectations of the Jewish multitude that He had to escape from their hands when they tried to take Him by force and make Him a king. The authorities never acknowledged the pretensions of One who seemed to them a religious dreamer, and, as they clung to their own conceptions, they grew more and more bitter against One who was turning the most cherished hopes of a nation into ridicule, besides threatening to bring down on them the heavy hand of the Roman. And at last they settled the controversy between Him and them by nailing Him to a tree.

At one time Jesus had felt the glamor of the popular Messianic ideas, and at all times He must have been under temptation to accom-

4. Prophetic modulate His own ideas to the prejudices of those on whose favor His acceptance depended. The struggle of His mind and will with such solicitations is embodied in what is called the Temptation in the Wilderness (Mt 4.1-11). There He was tempted to accept the dominion of the world at the price of compromise with evil; to be a bread-king, giving panem et circenses; and to curry favor with the multitude by some display, like springing from the pinnacle of the temple. The incidents of this scene look like representative samples of a long experience; but they are placed before the commencement of His public activity in order to show that He had already overthrown them; and throughout His ministry He may be said to have been continually declaring, as He did in so many words at its close, that His kingdom was not of this world.

It is very strange that, in spite of this, He should be believed, even by Christian scholars, to have held a purely futuristic and apocalyptic view of the coming of the kingdom of God. The time, however, of worldly splendor and force, of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost; beginning in humility, and passing exaltation only through the dark valley of contrition. The contest between Him and them was as to whether Jehovah would intervene on His behalf or not; and, when no intervention took place, they believed they were justified in condemning Him. The promise being conceded, it is difficult to deny the force of their argument. If Jesus was all the time looking out for an appearance from heaven which never arrived, what better is He than a dreamer of the cosmos? It was by Johannes Weiss that this hypothesis was started in recent times; and it has been worked out by Schwitzer as the final issue of modern speculation on the life of Christ (see his ness of the schweitzer). But in The Quest of the Historical Jesus). In opposition to it can be quoted not a few sayings of Jesus which indicate that, in His view, the kingdom had already begun and was making progress during His earthly ministry, and that it was destined to make progress not by mathematical growth and development, but by the embrace of the course of Providence, but, as the grain grows—first the blade, then the ear, and after that the full ear in the car (Mk 4.26—29). Of such saying the most remarkable is Lk 17.20f., “And being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, He answered and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, lo, the kingdom of God is within you.” “Observation, in this quotation, is an astronomical term, denoting exactly such a manifestation in the physical
heavens as Jesus is assumed to have been looking for; so that He denies in so many words the expectation attributed to Him by those representatives of modern scholarship.

In the nature of the case the kingdom must have been growing from stage to stage during His earthly ministry. He Himself was there, 7. Positive embodying the kingdom in His person; Conceptions and the circle gathered around Him of Jesus parable of the blessings of the kingdom. This circle might have grown large enough to be coextensive with the country; and, therefore, Jesus retained the consciousness of being the Messiah, and offered Himself in this character to His fellow-countrymen by the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. But the citizens of the kingdom had to enter it one by one, not in a body, as the Jews were expecting. Strait was the gate; it was the narrow gate of repentance. Jesus began by repeating the initial word of the teaching of His forerunner; and He had too much reason to continue repeating it, as the hypocrisy and worldliness of Pharisees and Sadducees called for denunciation from His lips. To the frailties of the publicans and sinners on the contrary, He showed a strange mildness; but this was because He knew the way of bringing such sinners to His feet to confess their sins themselves. To the penitent He granted pardon, claiming that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins. Then followed the exhortation of righteousness, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a perfect specimen. Yet it commences with another watchword—that of blessedness, the ingredients of which are set forth in all their comprehensiveness. In the same way, in other passages, He promises “rest,” “peace,” and the like; and again and again, where He might be expected to employ the term “kingdom of God,” He substitutes “life” or “eternal life.” Such were the blessings He had come into the world to bestow; and the most comprehensive designation for them all was “the kingdom of God.”

It is true, there was always imperfection attaching to the kingdom as realized in His lifetime, because He Himself was not yet made perfect. Steadily, from the commencement of the last stage of His career, He began to speak of and to rise again. To those nearest Him such language was at the time a total mystery; but the day came when His apostles were able to speak of His death and ascension as the crown and glory of His whole career. This phrase was like the precipice, its course was so diverted by the providence of God that, by dying, He became the Redeemer of mankind and, by missing the throne of the Jews, attained to that of the universe, becoming King of kings and Lord of lords.

III. The Idea in History.—After the death of Jesus, there soon ensued the destruction of the Jewish state; and then Christianity was forced upon the world, where to have spoken of it as a kingdom of God would have been unnecessary, provoked hostility and called forth the accusation of treason against the powers that be. Hence it made use of other names and let “the kingdom of God” drop. This had commenced even in Holy Scripture, where, in the later books, there is a growing infrequency in the use of the term. This may be alleged as proof that Jesus was being forgotten; but it may only prove that Christianity was then too much alive to be trammeled with words and phrases, even those of the Master, being able at every stage to find new language to express its new experience.

In the early Christian centuries, “the kingdom of God” was used to designate heaven itself, in which from the first the development of the kingdom was to issue; this, in fact, being not infrequently the meaning of the phrase even in the

2. Early Christian Century

2. Early Christian thinkers brought back the phrase to designate the rule of God in the conscience of men. St. Augustine's great work bears a title, De Civitate Dei, which is a tr of our phrase; and to him the kingdom of God was the church, while the world outside of the church was the kingdom of Satan. From the time of Charlemagne there were in the world, side by side, two powers, that of the emperor and that of the pope; and the history of the Middle Ages is the account of the conflict of these two for predominance, each pretenting to struggle in the name of God. The approaching termination of this conflict may be seen in Wycliffe's great work De Domini Divino, this title also being a tr of our phrase.

During the struggles of the Reformation the battles of the faith were fought out under other watchwords; and it was among such sectaries as the Baptists, that names like Fifth Monarchy and Rule and near, then and subsequently in the minds of men's thoughts about authority in church and state came to the language of the Gospels could easily be demonstrated, for example, from the Confessions and Books of Discipline of the Scottish church.

The very phrase, "the kingdom of God," reappeared at the close of the Reformation period among the Pietists of Germany, who, as their multiplying benevolent and missionary activities overflowed the narrow boundaries of the church, was then understood, spoke of themselves as working for the kingdom of God, and found this more to their taste than working for the church. The vague and humanitarian aspirations of Rationalism sometimes assumed to themselves the same title; but it was by Ritschl and his followers that the phrase was brought back into the very heart of theology. In the system of Ritschl there are two poles—the love of God and the kingdom of God. The love of God is a point of departure for all purposes, which was to be realized in time; and this progressive realization is the kingdom of God. It fulfills itself esp. in the faithful discharge of the duties of everyone's daily vocation and in the recognition that in the course things are working together for good to them that love God.

IV. Place in Theology.—There are those to whom it appears self-evident that what was the leading phrase in the teaching of Jesus was Exag of Evangelizationation; while others think this to be a return from the spirit to the letter. Even Jesus, it may be claimed, had this phrase imposed upon Him quite as much as He chose it for Himself; and to impose it now on theology would be to entangle the movements of Christian thought with the ceremonies of the dead.

This is an interesting controversy, on both sides of which much might be said. But in the phrase "the kingdom of God" there are ele-

2. Elements of living power which can never pass away. (1) It expresses the social Power in idea of Christianity. A kingdom implies multitude and power, and though religion begins with the individual, it must aim at brotherhood, organization and expansion. (2) It expresses loyalty. However much kings and kingdoms may fail to touch the imagination in an age of the world when many
countries have become or are becoming republican, the strength to conquer and to endure will always have to be derived from contact with personalities. God is the king of the kingdom of God, and the love of God is His vineyard; apart from the love of God the Father and the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ no progress can be made with the Christianization of the world. (3) It keeps alive the truth, suggested by Jesus in the Lord's Prayer, that the dominion of the will of God on earth is the one thing needful. This is the true end of all authority in both church and state, and behind all efforts thus directed there is at work the potency of heaven. (4) It reminds all generations of men that their true home and destiny is heaven. In not a few of Our Lord's own sayings, as has been remarked, our phrase is obviously only a name for heaven; and, while His aim was that the kingdom should be established on earth, He always promised to those aiding in its establishment in this world that their efforts would be rewarded in the world to come. The constant recognition of a spiritual and eternal world is one of the unfailing marks of genuine Christianity.

LITERATURE.—See the works on NT Theology by Weiss, Boyschaigl, Holtzmann, Feine, Schlatter, Weinel, Feine, Sheldon; and on the Teaching of Jesus by Weinel, Rapp, Cohen; Candid, The Kingdom of God; Robertson, Kingdom Del.; Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus.

JAMES STALKER

KINGDOM OF ISRAEL. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

KINGDOM OF JUDAH. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

KING'S DALE. See DALE, KING'S.

KING'S GARDEN (גֵּן הָ֭-מֶלֶךְ, gan-ha-melek): In Neh 3 15, mention is made of "the pool of Shelah by the king's garden"; in 2 K 25 4; Jer 52 7, "All the men of war fled by night by the gate of the two walls, which was by the king's garden"; see also Jer 39 4. The "king's winepresses" (Zec 14 10), which must have been to the extreme S. of the city, were clearly in this neighborhood. The references all point to the one situation in Jerus where it is possible for gardens to flourish all the year round, namely, the part of the Kidron valley below the Tyropoeon which is watered by the overflow from the Pool of Siloam (see above). The vegetable gardens of the peasants of Siloam present an aspect of green freshness unknown elsewhere in Jerus.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

KING'S MOTHER: The queen-dowager occupied a very important position at the court of the kings of Israel, e.g. Bathsheba (1 K 2 19); Maacah (15 13); Athaliah (2 Ch 22 2); and Nehushta (2 K 24 8; Jer 13 18). See QUEEN; QUEEN MOTHER.

KING'S POOL (גַּֽהֲנֵי הָ֭-מֶלֶךְ, brakkhat ha-melekh): This is possibly the Pool of Siloam (Neh 2 14), and may have been so named as being near to the "king's garden." Erected for himself a marble pillar in the king's dale, two furlongs [stadiam] from Jerus, which he named Absalom's Hand. In all probability this "pillar" was a rough upright stone—a mastaba—but its site is lost. The traditional Gr.-Egypt tomb of perhaps 100-200 years BC which has been hewn out of the rock on the eastern side of the Kidron valley is manifestly named "Absalom's pillar," and the Kidron ravine (nahal) cannot be the king's Vale (vemeh).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

KINGS, BOOKS OF:

I. TITLE.

II. SCOPE.

III. CHARACTER OF BOOKS AND POSITION IN HEBREW CANON.

1. Purpose.

2. Character of Data.

IV. HISTORICAL VALUE.

1. Treatment of Historical Data.

2. Chronology.


4. Phases.

V. COMPOSITION.


2. Sources.

3. Kent's Scheme.

4. L. J. and E.

VI. DATE.

LITERATURE.

I. Title.—The Heb title reads, דַּקְלִים, mekalhim, "kings," the division into books being based on the LXX where the Books of Kings are numbered 5d and 4th the Books of Kingdoms (Bashileion, Basileton), the Books of Samuel being numbered respectively 1st and 2d. The separation in the Heb into 2 Books of Kings dates to the rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg (Venice, 1516-17), which adds in a footnote, "Here the non-Jews [i.e. Christians] have divided the 4th Book of Kings." The Heb Canon treats the 2 Books of S as one book, and the 2 Books of K as one. Hence both AV and RV read incorrectly, "The First Book of Kings," even the use of the article being superfluous.

II. Scope.—The Books of K contain 47 chs (1, 22 chs; II, 25 chs), and cover the period from the conspiracy of Adonijah and the accession of Solomon (975 BC) to the liberation of Jehoiachin after the beginning of the Exile (561 BC). The subject-matter may be grouped under certain heads, as the last days of David (1 K 1-2 11); Solomon and his times (1 K 2 12-11 45); the Northern Kingdom to the coming of Assyria (1 K 12 16-2 K 17 41) (937-722 BC), including 9 dynastic changes; the Southern Kingdom to the coming of Babylon (1 K 12 1-2 K 26 21), the annals of the two kingdoms being given as || records until the fall of Israel (937-586 BC), during which time but one dynasty, that of Jehoash, occupied the throne; the period of exil to 561 BC (2 K 26 22-30). A simpler outline, that of Driver, would be: (1) Solomon and his times (1 K 1-11); (2) Israel and Judah to the fall of Israel (1 K 12-2 K 17); Judah to the fall of Jerus (586 BC), and the captivity to the liberation of Jehoiachin (561 BC) (2 K 18-25).

"Above all, there are three features in the history, which, in the mind of the author, are of prime importance as shown by the prominence he gives them in his narrative. (1) The dynasty of David is invested with peculiar dignity. This has two aspects. It pointed back to the Divine election of the nation in the past, and gave the guarantee of indefinite national perpetuity in the future. The promise of 'the sure mercies of David' was a powerful uniting influence in the Exile. (2) The temple and its service, for which the writer had such special regard, contributed greatly to the phase of national character of subsequent times. With all the drawbacks and defects of pure worship there was the stated regular performance of sacred rites, the development and regulation of priestly order and ritual law, which stamped themselves so firmly on later Israel that (3) Above all, this was the period of bloom of OT prophecy. Though more is said of men like Elijah and Elisha, who have left no written words, we must not
IV. Historical Value.—These books contain a large amount of authentic data, and, along with the other books of this group which constitute a contemporaneous narrative, the Books of Kings and Chronicles are considered among ancient documents.

Data To be sure the ethical and religious value is first and highest, nevertheless the historical facts must be reckoned at their true worth. Discrepancies and contradictions are to be explained by the subordination of historical details to the moral and religious purpose of the books, and to the diversity of sources whence these data are taken, that is, the compilers and editors of the Books of K as they now stand were conscious of a certain historical narrative, but for a great ethical and religious treatise. The historical material is only incidental and introduced by way of illustration and confirmation. For the oriental mind these historical examples rather than the rigor of modern logic constitute the unanswerable argument.

There cannot be as much said relative to the chronological value of the books. Thus, e.g., there is a question as to the date of the close of Ahaz’s reign. According to 2 K 18 10, Samaria fell in the 6th year of Hezekiah’s reign. But in 2 K 18 13 it is said that Sennacherib’s invasion came in the 14th year of Hezekiah’s reign. Then 701-11-715. With this last agrees the account of Sennacherib’s sickness (2 K 20). In explanation of 2 K 18 13, however, it is urged by some that the writer has subordinated the invasion of 701 to 20 years of Hezekiah’s reign. Again, e.g., in 1 K 6 1, we learn that Solomon began to build the temple at the age of 40 years, which is 40 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Hebrews were out of Egypt (LXX here reads 440 years). This would make between 960 and 1550 B.C. the date of the building of the temple.

But counting the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah, 1225-1215 BC, and the beginning of the occupation of the land of Canaan, 1450 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, we should have 1550 as the date of the building of the temple; or, if we count the period of 200 years after the death of Moses and Joshua as 400 years, which would be the 20th year of Hezekiah’s reign.

Thus in the case of Hezekiah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Israel, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah there are included also the age of the kings.
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III. Character of Books and Position in Hebrew Canon.—The Books of K contain much historical material, yet the historical is not their primary purpose. What in our Eng. Bible pass for historical books are in the Hebrew Canon prophetic books.

The chief aim of these books is didactic, the imparting of great moral lessons backed up by well-known illustrations from the nation’s history and from the lives of its heroes and leaders. Accordingly, we have here a sort of historical archipelago, more continuous than in the Pent, yet requiring much bridging over and conjecture in the details.

2. Character of Data at the date of accession, the name of the king, the length of the reign, whether he is of Judah or Israel. The beginnings of the reigns in each case are dated from a point in the reign of the contemporary ruler, e.g., 1 K 18 1: “Now in the 18th year of king Jeroboam the son of Nebat began Abijam to reign over Judah.”

IV. Historical Value.—These books contain a large amount of authentic data, and, along with the other books of this group which constitute a contemporaneous narrative, the Books of Kings and Chronicles are considered among ancient documents.

Data To be sure the ethical and religious value is first and highest, nevertheless the historical facts must be reckoned at their true worth. Discrepancies and contradictions are to be explained by the subordination of historical details to the moral and religious purpose of the books, and to the diversity of sources whence these data are taken, that is, the compilers and editors of the Books of K as they now stand were conscious of a certain historical narrative, but for a great ethical and religious treatise. The historical material is only incidental and introduced by way of illustration and confirmation. For the oriental mind these historical examples rather than the rigor of modern logic constitute the unanswerable argument.

There cannot be as much said relative to the chronological value of the books. Thus, e.g., there is a question as to the date of the close of Ahaz’s reign. According to 2 K 18 10, Samaria fell in the 6th year of Hezekiah’s reign. But in 2 K 18 13 it is said that Sennacherib’s invasion came in the 14th year of Hezekiah’s reign. Then 701-11-715. With this last agrees the account of Sennacherib’s sickness (2 K 20). In explanation of 2 K 18 13, however, it is urged by some that the writer has subordinated the invasion of 701 to 20 years of Hezekiah’s reign. Again, e.g., in 1 K 6 1, we learn that Solomon began to build the temple at the age of 40 years, which is 40 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Hebrews were out of Egypt (LXX here reads 440 years). This would make between 960 and 1550 B.C. the date of the building of the temple.

But counting the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah, 1225-1215 BC, and the beginning of the occupation of the land of Canaan, 1450 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, we should have 1550 as the date of the building of the temple; or, if we count the period of 200 years after the death of Moses and Joshua as 400 years, which would be the 20th year of Hezekiah’s reign.

Thus in the case of Hezekiah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Israel, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah there are included also the age of the kings.
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3. Value of Assyrian Records

The Babyloniasts and Assyriologists were more fortunate in their work, and it is by reference to their accounts of the events of contemporary events that a sure footing is found. Hence the value of such monuments as those of Shalmaneser and Sennacherib—here mention should be made also of the Moabite Stone.

The plan of the books is prevalently chronological, although at times the material is arranged in groups (e.g., 2 K 2 1-8 15, the Egyptian prophecies of Ahimose). The chief aim of these books is didactic, the imparting of great moral lessons backed up by well-known illustrations from the nation’s history and from the lives of its heroes and leaders. Accordingly, we have here a sort of historical archipelago, more continuous than in the Pent, yet requiring much bridging over and conjecture in the details.

2. Character of Data at the date of accession, the name of the king, the length of the reign, whether he is of Judah or Israel. The beginnings of the reigns in each case are dated from a point in the reign of the contemporary ruler, e.g., 1 K 18 1: “Now in the 18th year of king Jeroboam the son of Nebat began Abijam to reign over Judah.”

IV. Historical Value.—These books contain a large amount of authentic data, and, along with the other books of this group which constitute a contemporaneous narrative, the Books of Kings and Chronicles are considered among ancient documents.

Data To be sure the ethical and religious value is first and highest, nevertheless the historical facts must be reckoned at their true worth. Discrepancies and contradictions are to be explained by the subordination of historical details to the moral and religious purpose of the books, and to the diversity of sources whence these data are taken, that is, the compilers and editors of the Books of K as they now stand were conscious of a certain historical narrative, but for a great ethical and religious treatise. The historical material is only incidental and introduced by way of illustration and confirmation. For the oriental mind these historical examples rather than the rigor of modern logic constitute the unanswerable argument.

There cannot be as much said relative to the chronological value of the books. Thus, e.g., there is a question as to the date of the close of Ahaz’s reign. According to 2 K 18 10, Samaria fell in the 6th year of Hezekiah’s reign. But in 2 K 18 13 it is said that Sennacherib’s invasion came in the 14th year of Hezekiah’s reign. Then 701-11-715. With this last agrees the account of Sennacherib’s sickness (2 K 20). In explanation of 2 K 18 13, however, it is urged by some that the writer has subordinated the invasion of 701 to 20 years of Hezekiah’s reign. Again, e.g., in 1 K 6 1, we learn that Solomon began to build the temple at the age of 40 years, which is 40 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Hebrews were out of Egypt (LXX here reads 440 years). This would make between 960 and 1550 B.C. the date of the building of the temple:

But counting the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah, 1225-1215 BC, and the beginning of the occupation of the land of Canaan, 1450 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, we should have 1550 as the date of the building of the temple; or, if we count the period of 200 years after the death of Moses and Joshua as 400 years, which would be the 20th year of Hezekiah’s reign.

Thus in the case of Hezekiah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Israel, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah there are included also the age of the kings.
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ISAIAH 18:10 Syriac *° Moab.

Luke 13:14-17 (KJV)

KIR, kir (κήρ, kér): The meaning of Kir is "inclosure" or "walled place," and it is therefore doubtful whether it is a place-name or a term for a region. In 2 K 16:9 it is mentioned as the place whither Tiglath-pileser IV carried the Syrian (Aramaean) peoples who deported from Damascus after he had taken that city. In Am 1:5 the prophet announces that the people of Syria (Aram) shall go into captivity unto Kir, and in 9:7 it is again referred to as the place whence the Lord had brought the Syrians (Aramaenae) as Israel had been brought out of Egypt, and the Philis from Captor.

Except in one MS (LXX, A), where it appears as the Libyian Cyrene (2 K 16:9), it is never rendered in the LXX as a place-name.

2. How the Place whence the Syrians were brought (Am 9:7) is not Kir, but a place rendered in the LXX but "the deep" or "the dry." Kir (κήρ), e^k b^thov, ek b^thov, "pit), probably a tr of some variant rather than of the word "Kir itself. Comparing the Assyry-Bab kiru (for giru), "wall, "inclosure," "interior," or the like, Kir might have the general meaning of a place parted off for the reception of exiled peoples. Parallels would be Kir Moab, "the inclosure of Moab." Kir Heres or Kir Hareseth, "the inclosure of brick" (LXX hoi lithoi tou telouou). It seems probable that there was more than one place to which the Assyrians transported captives and exiles, and if their practice was to place them as far as they could from their native land, one would expect, for Palestinian exiles, a site or sites on the eastern side of the Tigris and Euphrates.

In Isa 22:5 occurs the phrase, "a breaking down of the walls, and a crying to the mountains" (mekar-^fark kir w-sho^a el ha-h^ar, "is surrounding of the wall," etc., would be better), Emendation and the mention of the name of one of the Bibles of the Jews was caused Fried. Delitzsch to suggest that we have to read, instead of kir, ^fark, combined with sho^a, as in Ezk 23:23. Following this, but retaining kir, Cheyne translates "Kir underminton, and Sho^a is at Kir, and the name of the place, though it might better be the Assyrians transported captives and exiles, and if their practice was to place them as far as they could from their native land, one would expect, for Palestinian exiles, a site or sites on the eastern side of the Tigris and Euphrates.

In the next verse (Isa 22:6) Kir is mentioned with Elam—a position which a city for western exiles would require. The mention is Elam as taking the quiver, and Kir as uncovering the shield, apparently against Kir in Assyrian Army

The name, at least in this form, appears only once (Isa 18:1) as that of a city in Moab. It is named with Az of Moab, with which possibly it may be identical, since yir or 'tr is the Heb equivalent of kir.
the Moabite Kir. The Tg hence reads “Kirak in Moab.” There can be no doubt that the Kerak here intended is represented by the modern town of that name, with which, consequently, Kerak Moab is almost universally identified. It must always have been of great importance. It is mentioned as Charakmeha (Xarākmē'ah) in the Acts of the Council of Jerusalem (536 AD) and by the early geographers. It dominated the great caravan road connecting Syria with Egypt and Arabia. The Crusaders therefore directed attention to it, and held possession of it from 1107 till it fell again into the hands of the Moeslems under Saladin, 1188. The Chroniclers speak of it as in al Belkha, and the chief city of Arabia Secunda. Under the title of Petra Deserti the Crusaders found here a bishop’s see. The Gr bishop of Petra still has its seat in Kerak.

Kerak stands upon a lofty spur projecting westward from the Moab plateau, with Wādy ‘Atīn Franjī on the S., and Wādy el-Kerak on the N., about 10 miles from the Dead Sea. The sides of the mountain sink sharply into these deep ravines, which unite immediately to the W., and, as Wādy el-Kerak, the great hollow runs northwestward to the sea. It is a position of great natural strength, both as regards the approach from the uplands to the E. only by a narrow neck. It is 3,370 ft. above the level of the sea. The mountains beyond the adjacent valleys are much higher. The place was surrounded by a strong wall, with five towers, which can still be traced in its general height. The most northerly tower is in very poor condition. The most interesting building at Kerak is the huge castle on the southern side. It is separated from the adjoining hill on the right by a large artificial moat; and it is provided with a reservoir. A moat also runs across the northern side of the fortress, and on the E. the wall has a sloped or battered base. The castle is then separated from the town. The walls are very thick, and are well preserved. Beneath the castle is a chapel in which traces of frescoes are still visible. In days of ancient warfare the place must have been practically impregnable. It could be entered only by two roads passing through rock-cut tunnels. The main danger must always have been failure of water supply. There are springs immediately outside the city; but those alone would not be sufficient. Great cisterns were therefore constructed in the town and also in the castle. The half-nomadic inhabitants of Kerak today number some 1,140 families (Muml. Arabia Petraea, III, 97). The Gr church claims about 2,000 souls; the rest are Moeslems. They are wild and fearless people, not greatly inclined to treat strangers with courtesy and kindness. In the spring of 1911 the town was the center of a rising against the government, which was not quelled until much blood had been shed.

W. EWING

KIRAMA, kir-rama, kir-rma (Karama, Kiram; AV Cirama): The people of K. returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esd 5 20); the “Ramah” of Ear 2 23 (q.v.).

KIR-HARESETH, kir-hare-seth, ha-re’seth (חירשעם, kir-hareseth, Isa 16 7; in 2 K 3 25 AV reads Kir-hareseth [paulaform]); KIR-HERES (חירחissance, kir heres, Jer 48 31 36; in Isa 16 11 AV reads Kir-hares [paulaform]): Modern scholars unanimously identify this city with Kir of Moab. In Jehoram’s invasion of Moab it lay along his line of attack; and on the city wall the king of Moab sacrificed his son (2 K 3 25ff). It was obviously the capital, i.e. Kir Moab. The name is generally taken to mean “city of the sun.” Cheyne, however, points out (EB, s.v.): (1) that this explanation was unknown to the ancients; (2) that “kir” is nowhere supposed to mean “city,” except in the compound names Kir-heres, Kir-hareseth, and Kir Moab; (3) that heres, “sun,” nowhere has a fem. ending, and (4) that Isa 16 7 (LXX and Aqu.) indicates it and not not the second part of the name (Jerés, Désés). He suggests, therefore, that we should possibly read kirúath ḫród, kiruth hódáhákah, “new city.” W. EWING

KIRIATH, kir-i-ath (עירת, kiryth, “city”; AV Kirjath): Mentioned (Josh 18 28) as a city of Benjamin; has been identified with Kirieth el-Eloah, “town of grapes,” a prosperous town on the highroad between Jerus and Jaffa; it is sometimes spoken of by the inhabitants as Kirieth. It is, however, generally thought that Kiriath here stands for Kirjath-Jearim (q.v.). See PBF, III, 132, SH VII.

KIRIATHAIM, kir-i-athaim (עיריתאימ, kiráthayím, “two cities”; AV Kirjathaim):
(1) A city in the uplands of Moab formerly held by Sihon, and given by Moses to Reuben, who is said to have fortified it (Nu 32 37; Jos 13 10). It is named along with Elealeh and Nebo in the former passage, and with Sihmah in the latter. It was in the hands of Moab in Mesha’s time, and he claims to have fortified it (MS, i. 10). For Jeremiah (48 1 23) and Ezekiel (26 9) it is a Moab city on the W. Under Onom it identifies it with Coritha; a Christian village 10 Rom miles W. of Madaba. This is the modern Karaytab, about 11 miles W. of Madaba, and 5 miles E. of Machaerus. This, however, may represent Kerioth, while the towns with which it is named would lead us to look for Kirjathaim to the N. of Wādy Zerbā Ma’tim. From this city was named Shaveh-kirjathaim, “the plain of Kirjathaim” (Gen 14 5).

(2) A city in the territory of Naphtali, assigned to the Gershonite Levites (1 Ch 6 70), corresponding to “Kartan” in Josh 21 32. W. EWING

KIRIATH-ARBA, kir-i-ath-ar’ba. See HEBRON.

KIRIATH-ARIM, kir-i-ath-ar’im (Eer 2 25). See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

KIRIATH-BAAL, kir-i-ath-b’al. See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

KIRIATH-HUZOOTH, kir-i-ath-húzoth, k-u’zoth (עיריתאזוות, kirynth húzoth, “city of streets”; LXX reads ἔκτεσες ἐκτέσεως, politeis epagōlēn, “city of villages,” from which we may infer a reading ἐκτεστά, ἐκτέσθη, for ἔκτεσι, ἐκτέσθη; AV Kirjath-huzoth): A place to which, after their meeting, Balak and Balaam went together (Nu 22 39). They met at “the City of Moab” (ver 30), which is probably identical with Kir of Moab (q.v.). Kirjath-husoth was probably therefore not far from that city. Some would identify it with Kirjathaim; some with Kerioth; as yet there is no certainty.

KIRIATH-JEARIM, kir-i-ath-jé-rim, k-jär’im (עיריתא׳ירימ, kirynth-yarîm, “city of thickets”; LXX ἔκτεσες ἐκτέσεως, politeis Iarōm, ἐκτέσθη, politeis earōm; AV Kirjath-jearim): One of the four chief cities of the Gibeonites (Josh 9 17); a city of Judah (Josh 16 60), evidently an ancient Sem “high place,” hence the name “Kiriath-Baal” (ib); it was one of the places on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (Josh 18 14 15; 16 11 where it is called “Baslah); cf 1 Ch 13 6). It is mentioned as in Judah (Josh 15 60; 16 15; Jgs 18 12), but if Kirjath (q.v.)
Kiriath-jearim
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is identical with it, it is mentioned as belonging to Benjamin (Josh 18:28): in 2 S 6 2, Baale-judah.

Jgs 18:12 records that the men of Dan set forth out of Zorah and Eshtaol and encamped in Mahan-
neh-dan behind (W. of) Kiriath-jearim.

(1.) Scripture References

In Jgs 13:25 Mahaneh-dan ["the camp of Dan"] is mentioned as between Zorah and Eshtaol; see Mahaneh-dan.) To this sanctuary the ark of Jeh was brought from Beth-shemesh by the people of Kiriath-jearim, and they "brought it into the house of p"Arim="thickets"). This village is commonly known as Abu Ghosh, from the name of a robber chieftain who, with his family, flourish ed there in the first half of the last century. Medieval ecclesiastical tra

dition has made this place the Anathoth of Jer, and a handsome church from the time of the Crusades, now thoroughly repaired, exists here to mark this tradition. This site suits well as regards the border line, and the name Kuriet is the exact equivalent of Kiriath; it also fits in with the distance and direction given in the Onom, but it cannot be called satisfactory in all respects. Soba, in the neighborhood, has, on account of its commanding position, been suggested as Kuriet, but except for this one feature it has no special claims. The late Colonel Conder has very vigorously advocated the claim of a site he discovered on the south side of the rugged Wady Isma'el, called Khurbet 'Erma, pointing out truly that 'Erma is the exact equivalent of 'Arim (Ezr 2:25). Unfortunately the 2d part of the name would appear from the references in 1 Esd and in Onom to be that part which was forgotten long ago, so that the argument even of the philologists who see a site in the foreground cannot be of much value. The greatest objections in the minds of most students are the unsuitability of the position to the requirements of the Judah-Benjamin frontier and its distance from the other Gibeonite cities.

The present writer suggests another site which, in his opinion, meets at least some of the require-
ments better than the older proposals. Standing on the hill of Beth-shemesh and looking N.W., with all the cities of Zorah (Sue'ah) and Eshtaol (Eshu'a) in full view, a lofty hill crowned by a considerable forest catches the eye. The village a little below the summit is called Beth Makhr, and the hilltop itself is the shrine of a local saint known as Sheikh el Ajin. So "holy" is the site, that no trees in this spot are ever cut, nor is fallen brushwood removed. There is a Wely or sanctuary of the saint, and round about are scores of very curious and apparently ancient graves. Southward from this site the eye follows the line of Jewish hills—probably the Mt. Jearim of Josh 15:10—until it strikes the outstanding point of Kesla (Chesslon), some 2 miles to the S. If the ark was taken here, the people of Beth-shemesh could have followed its progress almost the whole way to its former home. Although the name, which appears to mean "besieged" or "confined," in no degree helps, in all the other respects (see 2 above), this site suits well the condi tions of Kiriath-jearim.

LITERATURE.—See PEF, 1878, 166-99; PEF, III, 43-52; HGL, 225 f.; BE, II, 11 f.; Buhl, GAP, Index.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

KIRIATH-SANNAH, kir-i-a-th-sannah (Kiriath-sannah). AV Kiriath Sannah). In Josh 15:49 it is called "Dagon," and is identical with Kir sustainability.

KIRIATH-SEPHER, kir-i-a-th-sapher (Kiriath-sepher). Kiriath-sepher; ter by many, as it was Heb, as "town of books," as "city of books," as "city of instruction," and that it occurs in the Am Tab in the form "Bit san".

The first suggested identification was that of Robinson (BE, 11, 12), viz. Kuriet et Enab, the "town of grapes," a flourishing little town about 9 miles W. of Jerus on the carriage road to Jaffa. The district around is still fairly well wooded (of

Ruined Church at Kuriet.
Mordecai, and 31 (Aaron By 31 Ch pass) passage K 2, the (Samuel easy the Ch Mahli 39, fare- 1. mentioned S 1 Absalom common before Esd 19 largely by Springs rising at the base of Carmel, on the edge of the plain of Acre. From Jenin in the S.E., the deep torrent bed falls a westerly direction, with numerous windings cutting the plain in two, until it reaches the pass at the northeastern base of Carmel. Through the gorge between the mountain and the hills of Galilee it reaches the plain of Acre. From Sa'da’iyeh it flows in a deep sluggish stream through the marsh-land to the sea near Haifa. In this part the crocodile is said to have been seen at times.

In the summer season the water from the springs is largely absorbed by irrigation, and the upper reaches of the river are soon dry. The bed runs along the bottom of a trench some 20 ft. deep through the plain. It is easily crossed at the ports by those who know how to avoid the localities of the spring. In case of heavy rains the trench is swiftly filled, and the soft soil of the plain is made to plum. Remembering this, it is easy to understand the disaster that befell the army when the well-armed trench was swiftly filled. The chief ford for long was to the W. of the town where the stream issues into the plain of Acre, on the highway from Haifa to Nazareth. Here it is now spanned by a substantial bridge, while elsewhere it remains a swollen track.

At the mouth of the river it is generally easily fordable over the sand bank thrown up by the waves beating against the current of the stream. The main traffic here is now carried by a wooden bridge.

The phrase nähāl uthānim in Jgs 5 21 is not easy of interpretation. EV translates, "(that ancient river)"; G. A. Smith, "trench or watercourse"; while others think it may refer to a stream other than the Kishon. Guthe suggests that both names may be derived from those of places adjoining the river. Kishôn may possibly mean the "tortuous" stream, referring to the windings of its course.

KISLEV, kîs’lēv (ךֵיֶלֶב), kislev; AV Chisleu, RV "Chislev": The 9th month of the Jewish year, corresponding to December. The word is found in Neh 1 1 and Zec 7 1. The derivation is uncertain. See CALENDAR.

KISS (ךִּסֶּס, nāshak; φίλεις, philēs, κατακλύσις kataklȳsis, φωτεινά, phōteina) The kiss is common in eastern lands in salutation, etc., on the cheek, the forehead, the beard, the hands, the feet, but not (in Pal) the lips (Cheyne, Eiriath-jearim; Jenin, Eiriath-jearim; Jenin, Eiriath-jearim). In the Bible there is no sure instance of the kiss in ordinary salutation. We have in the OT nāshak, "to kiss," used (1) of relatives (which seems the origin of the practice of kissing; of Cant 8 1, "Oh that thou wert as my brother . . . I would kiss thee; yes, and none would despise me"); Gen 27 26-27 (Isaac and Jacob); 29 11 (Jacob and Rachel); 33 4 (Esau and Jacob); 46 15 (Joseph and his brethren); 48 10 (Jacob and Joseph’s sons); 50 1 (Joseph and his father); Ex 27 12 (Aaron and his sons); Ezek 18 (Moses and Jethro, united with obedience); Ruth 1 9-14 (Naomi and her daughters-in-law—a farewell); 2 S 14 33 (David and Absalom); 1 K 19 20 (Elisha and his parents—a farewell); see also Gen 29 13; 31 28,55; Tob 7 6; 10 12. (2) Of friendship and affection; of 1 S 20 41 (David and Jonathan); 2 S 15 6 (Absalom and those who came to him); 19 39 (David and Barzillai—a farewell); 20 9 (Joab and Amasa); Prov 27 6 ("the kisses nāshak is of an enemy"); Esa 4 47 ("the king stood up, and kissed him"). (3) Of love; Cant 1 2, "Let him kiss me with the kisses nāshak is of his mouth"); Prov 7 13 (of the feigned love of "the strange woman"). (4) Of homage, perhaps; of 1 S 10 1 (Samuel after anointing David king).
Gen 41.40, "Unto thy word shall all my people be ruled," RVm "order themselves," or "do homage," AVm "Heb be armed or kiss" (nāšak); Ps 2.12, "Kiss the son" (ARV), ERVm "Some versions read the [latter] word as instruction; others, 'Worship in purity'"; some ancient VSS give 'Kiss [or, do homage] purely.' (5) Of idolastrous practices; cf 1 K 19.18; Hos 13.2 (cf 8.5.6; 10.5); Job 31.27, probably, "kissing the hand to the sun or moon" (cf ver.26.57). See ADORATION. (6) A figurative use may be seen in Ps 85.10; Prov 24.26; Ezek 3.13, where "touched" is nāšak (see AVm).

(7) In Ad Est 13.1 we have "I have had content . . . to kiss the soles of his feet," and in Exodus 29.5 , "I will be bath received, he will kiss a man's hands"—marks of self-humiliation or abase-ment.

In the NT we have phileó, "to kiss," "to be friendly," and kataphileó, "to kiss thoroughly," "to be very friendly"—the first in Mt 25.48; Mk 14.44; Lk 22.47, of the kiss with which Judas betrayed his Master. This was probably meant to be taken as an expression of special regard, which is expressed by the kataphileó of Mt 26.49; Mk 14.48; Lk 22.48, which is used of the woman who kissed the feet of Christ (Lk 7.38.45); of the father's greeting of the returning prodigal (15.20); and of the farewell to Paul of the Ephesian Christians (Acts 20.37); philéma, "a kiss," a mark of friendship. Used by our Lord as that to which Simon was omitted to give (which may refer to ordinary hospitality), but which the woman had bestowed so impressively (Lk 7.45); of the kiss of Judas (Lk 22.48); and of the "holy kiss" wherein Christians greet each other, which, according to the general usage we have seen, would be as the members of one family in the Lord, or as specially united in holy love (Rom 16.16; 1 Cor 16.20; 2 Cor 13.12; 1 Thess 5.28; 1 Pet 5.4). This is reason to believe that, as a rule, men only thus greeted men, and women, women. In the Apos Const (3d cent.) it is so enjoined.

W. L. Walker

KITE, kit (κῆτος, ʿawqah; kēroos, kitōn; Lat Mitisus cetinum or regalis): A medium-sized member of the hawk tribe (see HAWK). This bird is 27 in. long, of bright reddish-brown color, has sharply pointed wings and deeply forked tail. It is supposed to have exceptionally piercing eyes. It takes moles, mice, young birds, carrion, frogs, and grasshoppers, and also carrion for food. Its head and facial expression are unusually eagle-like. It was common over Pal in winter, but bred in the hills of Galilee and rough mountainous places, so it was less conspicuous in summer. It is among the lists of abomina-tions (see Lev 11.14 and Dt 14.13). It is notable that this is the real bird intended by Job to be used as that whose eye could not trace the path to the silver mine:

"That path no bird of prey knoweth, Neither hath the falcon's eye seen it" (Job 28.7).

The word used here in the original Heb is ʿawqah, which was the name for kite. Our first translators used "vulture"; our latest efforts give "falcan," a smaller bird of different markings, not having the kite's reputation for eyesight.

Gene Stratton-Porter

KITHLISH, kithlish (κῆθλος, kithlé). See CHITLISH.

KITRON, kit'on (κῆτρον; ʿwtērōn): An unidentified place in Zebulun, not possessed by the tribe (Jgs 1.30). It may be identical with Kattath of Judges 8.11. The Tell Taim site is identified with Sepphoris, which is represented by the modern village of Seffārīyeh.
makes it that of “the rising sun”—i.e. the Pers Gulf. Be this as it may, General Censola discovered at Curium, in Cyprus, a seal-cylinder apparently inscribed “Mār-Istar, son of 11u-bani, servant [worshipper] of Masters Nām-Sin, who bore the name bearing his defiled son of Sargon. In the 16th cent.

BC, Cyprus was tributary to Thothmes III. About the year 708 BC, Sargon of Assyria received the submission of the kings of the district of Yâ’, in Cyprus, and set up at Citium the stele bearing his name, which is now in the Royal Museum at Berlin. Esarhaddon and his son Aṣûr-bani-āpil each received tribute from the 10 Cyprian princes who acknowledged Assyr supremacy. The island was conquered by the Egypt king Amasis, and later formed part of the Pers empire, until the revolt of Evagoras in 410 BC. The Assyrians knew the island under the name of Yā’d(a)name, the “Wedan” (Vedan) of Ezek 27:19 RV (Sayce, PSBA, 1912, 26).

If the orthodox date for the composition of Gen be accepted, not only the Phoenicians, but also the Greeks, or a people of Gr-Lat stock, must have been present in Cyprus, Races before the time of Moses, in sufficient number to make them the predominant population of the island. Paphos, where they had built a temple to Ashthoreth and set up an ‘āšērāh (a pillar bearing the name of the goddess); was one of their principal settlements. The rest of the island was apparently occupied by the Aryans, whose presence there caused the name of Kittim to be applied to the Gr and Phoen countries of the Mediterranean. Gr and Phoen were the languages spoken on the island, as was proved by George Smith’s demonstration of the nature of the non-Phoen text of the inscription of King Melekh-yathon of Citium (370 BC). The signs used in the Gr-Cyprian inscriptions are practically all syllabic.

The many influences which have modified the Cyprian race are reflected in the ancient art, which shows the effect of Bab, Egypt, Phoen., and Gr contacts. Specimens of the finest collection of the art can be found in many museums, but the best of the full-length figures are life-size, and the better class of work is exceedingly noteworthy. See Cyprus. T. G. Pinches

KNEADING, nêding. See Bread, III, 2.

KNEE, nê, KNEEL, nêl (“knee,” 713; berekh; Aram. 111178, “arkhubbah; yow’u, gôn; “kneel”; 733, bêrak; Aram. 111173, bêrak; 7111173, bêrak; gôwerwâ; gôverpê tô;): Most of the uses are obvious, and the figurative use of “knee” as the symbol of strength (Job 4:4; Prov 12:16, etc) needs no explanation. The disease of the knees mentioned in Dt 28:35 is perhaps some form of leprosy. In Job 3:12 the “knee” seem to be used for the kop, as the place where a child receives its first care. Three times in Gen the knees appear in connection with primitive adoption customs. In 30:3 a fiction is enacted that purports to represent Rachel as the actual mother of Bilhah’s children. By a somewhat similar rite in 48:12, Jacob (the “knees” here are Jacob’s, not Joseph’s) adopts Reuben and Manasseh, so that the single patriarchs and not as members of a single Joseph tribe. In the same way Machir’s children are adopted by Joseph in 50:23, and this is certainly connected with the counting of Machir (instead of Manasseh) as one of the tribes in Jgs 5:14. See THROES; and for the idea underlying this paternal adoption, of THRON. From among classical instances of the same custom compare Homer, Odyssey, xix. 401ff, where Autolokos, grandfather of Ulysses, receives the newborn grandchild on his knees and gives him his name. Thus also we have to understand the numerous representations in Egypt sculpture, showing the king as an infant on the knees or the lap of a goddess.

Kneeling was less common an attitude of prayer among the Jews than was standing, but references to kneeling are of course abundant. For kneeling (or prostrating one’s self) before a superior, see ATTITUDE, 2; SALUTATION.

KNIFE, mif, nîq, ma’aškeleth, lit. an instrument for eating; but used of large knives for slaying animals, cutting up a carcass or a sacrificial victim (Gen 22:6; Jgs 19:29; Prov 30:14). (2) 7133, berenb, rendered generally “sword,” but “knife,” or “sword-knife” (cf Ex 4:25), probably of similar knives in 1 K 18:28, used by Baal prophets in gashing themselves. In Ezek 5:12 AV, “knife,” probably better RV, “sword.”

Egyptian Stone Knives. Assyrian Bronze Knives. (Br. Mus.)

(3) 7133, ta’ar, usually rendered “razor,” in combination with 7133, ha-gôpher, “knife of the writer,” or “penknife” (Jer 36:23). (4) 7133, mahalaphlm, “slaughter-knives” (Ex 1:9). (5) 7133, sokkin, Aram., “knife” (Prov 23:2). Early knives were commonly made of sharp stones, esp. of flint, later of bronze and iron. The former remained in use in religious ceremonies long after the latter were in common use. Knife was generally used at meals, meats being cut into bits before served, and bread being broken into fragments. Herod used a knife for paring apples, and attempted suicide with the instrument (Jos, Ant, XVII, vii, 1; BJ, I, xxiii, 7). EDWARD BAGBY POLLARD

KNOCK, nôk (kroô, kroua): The oriental house was fitted with heavy doors which were bolted and locked with wooden keys too large to be carried about, so that even a member of the household could not secure entrance until in response to his knock or call the door should be opened by someone within. At night the delay would be increased by the difficulty of arouses for innumerable sleeping within the inner chambers. To persons familiar with such experiences, the words of Jesus concerning a higher entrance, “Knock, and it shall be opened unto you” (Mt 7:7; Lk 12:36), would have a unique force not easy for us to appreciate.

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

KNOP, nôp: In Ex 25:31 ff; 37:17 ff (kophôr), part of the ornaments of the golden candlestick, in 1 K 6:18; 7:24 (ʼphôlim), gold-like ornaments of the lining of Solomon’s temple, and of the brazen sea (in 1 K 6:18, RV “gourds”). See CANDLESTICK, GOLDEN; TEMPLE; SEA, THE MOLZEN.

KNOW, nô, KNOWLEDGE, nôl’ej, nôl’îj (in Heb chiefly 771, yôḏaḥa, noun 7717, dâ’âh, in Gr 1111173, 11111173, 111111173, oida; “to know fully,”
KOAH, kô'â (Kôô), kô'âth (Kôô'áh): A people named with Pekod and Shoa as enemies of Jerus (Ezk 23 23). Their location was probably N.E. of Babylonia.

KOAHITH, kô'hâth, KOHANITES, kô'hâth-si (Kôô'áth, Kôô'áh, Kôô'hâth, Kôô'âth): Second son of Levi, and ancestor of Moses and Aaron (Gen 46 11; Ex 6 16–20; Nu 3 17; 1 Ch 6 1, etc.). The Kohanites formed one of the three divisions of the tribe of Levi; the other two being the Gersonites and the Merarites (Nu 3 17 ff.). The Kohanites consisted of four families, the Amramites, the Izharites, the Hebronites, and the Uzzielites (Nu 3 19–27, etc.). Their place in the wilderness was on the southern side of the tabernacle (Nu 3 29), and their number is given (from a month old) as 8,600 (ver 25). Their special charge was the ark, and the table and the candlestick, and the altars, and the vessels of the sanctuary wherewith they minister, and the screen, and all the service thereof (ver 31; cf 7 9). After the conquest 23 cities were assigned them by lot (Josh 21 4–5 f.). In David’s time and after, Heman, a Kohanite, and his family had a prominent place in the service of the music of the sanctuary (1 Ch 25 3 ff; 16 41 ff; 25 1 ff); David likewise divided the Levites into courses (the Kohanites, 33 12–20; 24 20–25). We read of the Kohanites in the reign of Jehoshaphat at Engedi (2 Ch 20 19), and in connection with the cleansing of the temple under Hezekiah (2 Ch 29 12–14).

JAMES OHR

KOHELETH, kô-hô'lêth (Hôô'lêth). See Ecclesiastes.

KOLAIH, kô-lî'â (Hôô'îâ), Kôlâdá'â, "voice of Jeh." (1) A Benjamite, son of Masseiah (Neh 11 7). (2) Father of Ahia, a false prophet and a lecherous man (Jer 29 21–23).

KÔNÉ, kô'nê (Kôô'dâ, Kôô'dâ): Some MSS have wâsân, kônem, from which we have AV *(the) villages.* The name occurs in the account of the measures taken to secure the country against Holophernes (Jjh 4 4). If Kôna be correct, we may possibly identify the place with Cyammon.

KÔPH, kôf (Côôf), Kôfâ (Kôôf): The 19th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as k (intense k). It came also to be used for the number 100. For name, etc, see Alphabet.

KOR, kôr. See Cor.

KORAH, kô'ra (Kôô'râ), kô'rah, "baldness," possibly; Kô'râ (Kôô'râ): (1) One of the 3 sons of Oholibamah, Esau’s Hivite wife. The account says that the 3 were born in Canaan before Esau withdrew to the Seir mountain country. They are mentioned 3 t in the brief account from 3 points of view (Gen 36 5–14; 1 Ch 1 33), the 9d mention being in the list of “chiefs.”

(2) One of the sons of Eliphaz, the son of Adah, Esau’s Hittite wife (Gen 36 16). He is mentioned as one of the Edomite “chiefs.” If one has the habit, finding a statement anywhere, of thinking that the statement ought to be changed into something else, he will be interested in the attempts to identify these Edomite Korabs with Korah (3).

(3) A son of Hebron (1 Ch 2 43), the son of Marshealah, mentioned in the Caleb group of families in Judah.

(4) The son of Ishar the son of Kohath the son of Levi (Ex 6 16 ff; Nu 16 1; 1 Ch 6 18–31–38), a younger contemporary of Moses. There may have been generations, omitted in the record, between Ishar and K.; that is a natural way of accounting for Amminadab (1 Ch 6 22–30). This Korah is best known as the man whom the opening earth is said to have swallowed up along with his associates. They were challenging the authority of Moses. The catastrophe and Aaron in the wilderness (Nu 16, in the 17). K. is presented as the principal wilderness in the affair. The company is spoken of as his company, and the 4 who were swallowed up as being *all the men* the apper-
Korahites, kôrâh-îts (kôrâ’îts, korâ’îts), sons of Korah (kôrâ’ôth; korâ’ôth; "brâk kôrâh; in AV appears also as Kohath, Kohathite, Kore); this phrase is used to denote Asir and Elkanah and Abiasaph, Korah's 3 individual sons (Ex 6:24; of Nu 25:11). But its more frequent use, and that which interest attaches, is in the titles of some of the Psalms.

The genealogical details concerning K. are rather full. In 3 places we find the list of the 7 successive generations closing with the prophet Samuel and his son Joel (1 Ch 6:5-17; 25:1-22; 25:1-20). They mention all of the generations between K. and Joel. The genealogical list is in 1 Ch 25:20 connected with the 4 generations following Joel (1 Ch 6:33; 5:19-31; 6:6), and with 22 generations in the very latest Bible times (1 Ch 9:31).

The adj. "Korathite" appears also in AV as "Korathite; Kore; and Korahite;" the latter two words are frequently rendered in E RV: it is used 4 times in the sing. Once it designates an individual (1 Ch 9:31: 2: it denotes the successors of K. taken collectively in Nu 25:58; 1 Ch 26:19); 4 t it is used in the pl. denoting the number of the K. families in Nu 26:6; 26:1; 2 Ch 20:19). As variants of this use, the "sons of the Korahites" appears once, and "the children of the Kohathites" once (1 Ch 26:19; 2 Ch 20:19).

In these various passages the K. families are counted like the other Levitical families. In 1 Ch 12:6 we have an account of 5 men who are designated as the "Korahites," who joined David when he was at Ziklag—Elkanah, Isaiah, Azarel, Joesar (Yashebome). They are described as "Korahites," and esp. with the bow and sling, and as being "of Saul's brethren of Benjamin." Some of them may plausibly be identified with men of the same name mentioned elsewhere. These Korahites may have been cousins of the Samuel family, and they may have resided not very far apart.

The record speaks with some emphasis of a line of K. doorkeepers.

In the latest O.T. times one Mattithiah, "the first-born of Shammuel the Korahite," held "the office of trust over the things that were baked in pans" (1 Ch 3:31). Shammuel was "the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah." In this expression 15 or more generations are omitted between Ebiasaph and Kore, and perhaps as many between Kore and Shammuel. The record speaks to supply one of the omitted links—Kore and Shammuel. The representative of the line in David's time was "Zechariah, the son of Mattithiah" (2 Sam 6:19). In all periods the Korahites were "keepers of the thresholds of the tent." Back in the time of Phinehas the son of Eleazar, "their fathers had been over the camp of Joth" (1 Ch 19:20). Zechariah was, in his time, "porter of the door of the tent of meeting" (ver 21), and Shammuel was still the chief of the porters (ver 17). The record for David's time supports and supplements this. It says that the doorkeepers of the tent of meeting were"appointed by David, included a K. contingent, its position most being in the north between the son Zechariah (1 Ch 16:3.12.15.14), and that Meshelemiah was the son of Kore, the son of the sons of Asaph. Adopting the common conjecture that Asaph is the line of the Syrian Asaph, we have here the same abridgment of the genealogical list as in 1 Ch 9.

More interesting, however, than the fighting Korahites of Benjamin, or the doorkeeping Kora-
hites who claimed succession from Moses to Nehemiah, are the "sons of Korah" who were somehow connected with the service of song. One of the genealogies introduced by the Chronicler, reads: "These are they whom David set over the service of song in the house of Jeh, after that the ark had rest. And they ministered with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting, until Solomon had built the house of Jeh in Jerusalem." (1 Ch 6:31,32). Then the writer proceeds to mention first "Heman the singer, the son of Joel, the son of Samuel," and so on, carrying the genealogy back to Korah and Levi. After thus mentioning Heman, he speaks of "his brother Asaph, who stood on his right hand," and traces Asaph's descent back to Gershom the son of Levi; and then says, "and on the left hand their brethren the sons of Merari." Of these the principal leader is Ethan (otherwise called Jeduthun), and his descent is here traced back to Levi.

In this way we are introduced to David's 3 great leaders in choral and orchestral music. Among them Heman the Korahite has at first the place of primacy, though Asaph, later, comes to the front. The events just referred to are mentioned again, more in detail, in the account of David's death, bringing the ark to Jerusalem. The Chronicler is said that at the suggestion of David "the Levites appointed Heman the son of Joel, and also Asaph and Ethan, and with them several others, their brethren of the second degree" (1 Ch 15:17,18). The record proceeds to speak of the services of "the singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, and their associates, in the pageantry of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem. After that, it says, Asaph had charge of the services of thanksgiving and praise before the ark in Jerusalem, while Heman and Jeduthun served in the high place at Gibson (1 Ch 15:4 ff. 37,39-42). Later, the record says (1 Ch 25), David made an elaborate organization, under Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun, for prophesying with song and instrumental music.

As the records of David's time, according to the Chronicler, thus attribute to him great achievements in sacred music and song, so the records of subsequent times reiterate the same thing. David's interest in sacred music is mentioned in connection with Solomon's temple, in connection with the times of Joash and Hezekiah and Josiah, in connection with the institutions and exploits of the times after the exile (e.g. 2 Ch 7:6; 23:18; 29:25 ff; 35; 15; Ezr 3:10; Neh 12:24,36,45,46). Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun led the magnificent choir and orchestra at the dedication of the temple (2 Ch 5:12). One of the sons of Asaph prophesied, and the Korahites sang at the crisis in the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 20:14-19). The sons of Asaph and the sons of Heman and the sons of Jeduthun were present, and there was instrumental music and loud singing, according to the appointment of David and his associates, at the time of Hezekiah's Passover (2 Ch 30:13 ff). Singing, and Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun and David have an important place in the record concerning Josiah. And the records of the post-exilic times mention "the singers and the sons of Asaph" and the arrangements of David as conspicuous as the law of Moses itself.

Add to this that the names Asaph or Heman or Ethan or Jeduthun, or the designation "the sons of Korah" are attached to 25 or more of the Ps (e.g. Ps 42-49, 50, 62, 72-86), and we have a body of testimony that is at least abundant and intelligible. It is to the effect that there was elaborate organization, on a large scale, in connection with the musical services of the temple at Jerusalem; that this began in the time of David, as a part of the preparation for building the temple, under the influence of the family traditions of the prophet Samuel; and that the movement continued in the generations following David, either surviving the exile, or being revived after the exile. In connection with this movement, the phrase "sons of Korah," "sons of Asaph," "sons of Heman," "sons of Jeduthun" denote, in some cases, merely lineal descent; but in other cases they denote each an aggregate of persons interested in sacred song and music—a guild or society or group—arising out of the movement which originated in David's time. See, for example, "sons of Asaph" (1 Ch 25:1-2; 2 Ch 20:14; cf. ver 19; 29:13; 36:15; Ezr 2:41; 3:10; Neh 7:44; 11:22) and "sons of Korah" in the titles of Ps 42-49 and 84, 86, 87-89. Traces of these aggregates appear in the times of Solomon, of Jehoshaphat, of Joash, of Hezekiah, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel, of Ezra and Nehemiah.

If a person holds that the mention of an event in Ch is to be regarded as proof that the event never occurred, that person will of course deny that the testimony thus cited is true in fact. He is likely to hold that the guilds of singers arose in the exile, and that, some generations after Nehemiah, they fabricated for themselves the ecclesiastical and physical pedigrees now found in the Books of Ch. If, however, we accord fair play to the Chronicler as a witness, we shall be slow to discredit the minute and interfitting testimony which he has placed before us.

WILLIS J. BERCHER

KORAHITES, kōrāh'-its: In AV for "Korahites," Nu 36:58. See Korah, 4.

KORE, kōrē (ךָּוָּרֶץ). kōré'-law, "one who proclaims":
(1) A Levite of David's time, descended from Kohath and Korah. See Korah, 4. Shallum, chief doorkeeper in the latest Bible times, is described as "the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah," (1 Ch 9:19). This expression omits the generations between Shallum and K., and those between K. and Ebiasaph, perhaps 15 generations or more in each case. The context supplies two of the omitted names, of the time of David, Meshelemiah and his son Zecchariah (1 Ch 9:21,22). The record for the time of David mentions these two, with some particulars, calling Meshelemiah the son of K. (1 Ch 26:1,2,9,14). It describes them as "Korahites" or the sons of Asaph. It is usual to regard this last clause as a variant for "the son of Ebiasaph," thus making the description identical with that in 1 Ch 9:19. With this understanding, the text claims that "the Korahites," K. and Meshelemiah and Zecchariah, come midway in a line of sanctuary ministers, extending continuously from Moses to Nehemiah.
(2) "The son of Imnah the Levite, the porter at the east gate," who "was over the freewill-offerings," in the time of Hezekiah (2 Ch 31:14). Very likely in the same line with (1) above.
(3) In 1 Ch 26:1 AV for Korahites (q.v.).

WILLIS J. BERCHER

KORHITES, kôr'hīts: In AV for "Korahites" in Ex 6:24; 1 Ch 12:6; 26:1; 2 Ch 20:19. See Korah, 3.

KÖZ, kôz. See Hakköz.

KUSHALIAH, kū-shā'-yā, kū-shā'-yāh, "bow of Jeh"; A Merarite Levite (1 Ch 15:17), called in 1 Ch 6:44 Kish (q.v.).
LAADAH, lā'a-da (לֹאָדָה): A descendant of Judah (1 Ch 4:21).

LAADAN, lā'a-dan. See LADAN.

LABAN, lāb'ān: The person named Laban (לָבָן; lābān; Labān, Laban), possibly connected with the "V meaning "to be white," from which in Heb the adj. meaning "white" has just this form) is first introduced to the reader of Gen in the story of the wrong of Rebekah (ch 24). He belonged to that branch of the family of Terah that was derived from Abraham's brother Nahor and his niece Milcah. The genealogy of this branch is traced in Gen 22:20-24, but, true to its purpose and the place it occupies in the book, this genealogy brings the family down to Rebekah, and there stops without mentioning Laban. Accordingly, when Rebekah is introduced in the narrative of ch 24, she is referred to (vs 15-24) in a way that recalls to the reader the genealogy already given; but when her brother Laban is introduced (ver 29), he is related to his sister by the express announcement, "And Rebekah had a brother, and his name was Laban." In this ch he takes an important part in the reception of Abraham's servant, and in the determination of his sister's future. That brothers had an effective voice in the marriage of their sisters is evident, not only from extra-bib. sources, but from the Bible itself; see e.g. Gen 24:8. In Gen 24, however, Laban is perhaps more prominent than even such custom can explain (cf vs 31.50.55), and we are led to see in him already the same forcefulness and egotism that are abundantly shown in the stories from his later life. The man's eager hospitality (ver 31), coming immediately after his mental inventory of the gifts bestowed by the visitor upon his sister (ver 30), has usually, and justly, been regarded as a proof of the same greed that is his most conspicuous characteristic in the subsequent chapters.

The story of that later period in Laban's life is so interwoven with the career of Jacob that little need here be added to what is said of Laban in Jacob, III, 2 (q.v.). By the time of Jacob's arrival he is already a very old man, and 30 years had elapsed since Rebekah's departure. Yet even at the end of Jacob's 20 years' residence with him he is represented as still energetic and active (31:19,23), not only ready for an emergency like the pursuit after Jacob, but personally superintending the management of his huge flocks. His home is in Haran, "the city of Nahor," that is, the locality where Nahor and his family remained at the time when the rest of Terah's descendants emigrated to Canaan (11.31; 12.5). Since Haran, and the region about it where his flocks fed, belonged to the district called Aram (see PADDAN-ARAM; MESOPOTAMIA), Laban is often called "the Aramaean" (EV "the Syrian," from LXX Ἀράμεας, ho Árämēas) see 25:20; 26:5; 31.20.24. It is uncertain how far racial affinity may be read into this term, because the origin and mutual relationships of the various groups or strata of the Sem family are not yet clear. For Laban himself it suffices that he was a Semite, living within the region early occupied by those who spoke the Aramaic dialect that we call Aramaic. This dialect is represented in the narrative of Gen as already differentiated from the dialect of Canaan that was Jacob's mother-tongue; for "the heap of witness," erected by uncle and nephew to the memory of Gen, is called by the one Jegar-saha-elah and by the other Geled—phrases which are equivalent in meaning, the former Aram, the latter Heb. (Ungnad, Hebräische Grammatik, 1912, §6, puts the date of the differentiation of Aram. from "Amurritic" at "about 1500 BC"); Skinner, "Genesis," ICC, argues that ver 47 is a gloss, following Wellhausen, Dillmann, et al.)

The character of Laban is interesting to observe. On the one hand it shows a family likeness to the portraits of all his relations in the patriarchal group, preeminently, however, to his daughter Rebekah, his daughter Rachel, and his nephew Jacob. The nearer related to Laban such figures are, the more conspicuously, as it is fitting, do they exhibit Laban's mingled cunning, resourcefulness, greed and self-complacency. And, on the other hand, Laban's character is sui generis; the picture we get of him is too personal and complex to be denominated merely a "type." It is impossible to resolve this man Laban into a mythological personage—he is altogether human—or into a tribal representative (e.g. of "Syria" over against "Israel") with any degree of satisfaction to the world of scholarship. Whether a character of reliable family tradition, or of popular story-telling, Laban is "a character"; and his intimate connection with the chief personage in Israel's national myth, and the marks this makes it highly probable that he is no more and no less historical than Jacob himself (cf Jacob, VI).

LABANA, lab'a-na (Laḇănā, Labana, 1 Esd 6:29): Called Lebanon in Ezr 2:45.

LABOR, lāb'ār (לָבָר, ḫārā'āh, ḫārā', 'āmal; kōpōs, kōpos): The word (noun and vb) denoting hard work or "toil" (thus in RV of Dt 26:7; Josh 7:3; Rev 2:2) represents several Heb and Gr words, chiefly those above. Occasionally, as in Hab 3:17 (μα'άσθε), it stands for "fruit of labor." Sometimes, in conjunction with "travel," it refers to childbirth (Gen 35:16.17, γαλάδθ; cf 1 Thess 2:9; 2 Thess 3:8). Examples of the word in the ordinary sense are: of ḫārā', Gen 31:42; Job 39:11.16; Ps 128:2; of 'āmal, common in Ecc 3:8; 2:11.18, etc.; of ḫopos, 1 Cor 15:58 ("your labor is not vain, etc"); 1 Thess 1:3 ("work of faith and labor of love"). He refers to (10) "labour" ("labor in the word and in teaching"). See WORK; SLAVERY.

JAMES ORR

LACCUNUS, lac'ō-nus (Lakaκονος, Lakkoünos; AV Lacanus): One of the sons of Addi who returned with Ezra and had married a foreign wife (1 Esd 9:31). The name does not, as might have been expected, occur in Ezr 10:30. See note on the passage in Lange's Comm.) as to the reconciliation of the lists in 1 Esd and Ezr.

LACE, lās (λάσι, pāthil, variously rendered in Gen 38:18.25; Ex 39:3; Nu 16:38; 19:15; Jgs 16:9; Ezk 40:3). In modern Eng. the noun, the "lace" usually denotes a delicate ornamental fabric, but in the word in the sense of "that which binds" is still in perfectly good use, esp. in such combinations as "shoelace," etc. It is this latter significance that is found in Ex 28:28 ("They shall bind it with a lace, a lace of blue"); 1 Kgs 21:31, and 2 Kgs 6:30 AV, κόθανα κόθανα (RV "riband").

LACEDAEMONIANS, las'-ē-kō-mē'-ni-ans (Σπάρτιατοι, Spartanoi; once only Λακεδαμιόνοι, Lakedsamniōn, 2 Macc 5:9): The inhabitants of Sparta or Lacedaemon with whom the Jews claimed some kinship and formed alliances (1 Macc 12
2.5.6.20.31; 14 20.23; 15 23; 2 Mace 5 9). The alliance mentioned in 1 Macc 12 5-23 is based, among other grounds, on that of a common descent of Jews and Lacedaemomians from Abraham, for which the only probable presumption is the similarity of names. "Pelagi" and Peleg son of Eber (Gen 10 25; 11 16). This has been reasonably objected to, and perhaps the most that can be said on this point is that the belief in some relationship between the Jews and the Lacedaemonians seems to have prevailed when 1 Macc was written. The alliance itself is said to have been formed (1 Macc 12 20) between Areus, king of the Lacedaemomians and Omis the high priest; but it is not easy to make out a consistent chronology for the transaction. For the renewal of the alliance (c 144 BC) by Jonathan (1 Macc 12 5-18) and again by Simon (1 Macc 14 16-23), something can be said, as the Greeks had finally been deprived of independence in 146 BC, and Sparta was only obliged to lend assistance to Rome and may be supposed to have been doing so in helping the Jews against Syria. It is possible, too, that as against Syrian Hel lenism the Jews were anxious to show that they had the assistance of distinguished Greeks, though the actual power of Sparta was much reduced from that of former times. The facts, at least of the alliance and the correspondence, seem to be sufficiently attested, though it is not easy to reconcile all the particulars. Jos (Ant, XII, iv, 10; 13, v; XIV, xii-23) gives the correspondence at greater length than the writer of the Mac cabees.

J. HUTCHISON

LACHISH, lāushing (לָחש), läkhtish; LXX Ἰακεθ, Lachts [Josh 15 39], Māx(e), Machē): A town in the foothills of the Shephelah on the border of the Phil plain, belonging to Judah, and, from the mention of Eglon in connection with it, evidently in the southwestern portion of Judah’s territory. Orom locates it 7 miles from Eleuthropolis (Beth Jibrin) toward Daroma, but as the latter place is uncertain, the indication does not help in fixing the site of L. The city seems to have been abandoned about 400 BC, and this circumstance has rendered the identification of the site difficult. It was formerly fixed at Umm Lakis, from the similarity of the name and because it was in the region that the Bib. references to L seem to indicate, but the mound called Tell el-Hesy is now generally accepted as the site. This was first suggested by Conder in 1877 (PEFS, 1878, 20), and the excavations carried on at the Tell by the Pal Exploration Fund in 1890-93 confirmed his identification. Tell el-Hesy is situated on a wady, or valley, of the same name (Wady el-Hasy), which runs from a point about 6 miles W. of Hebron to the sea between Gaza and Askelon. It is a mound on the very edge of the wady, rising some 120 ft. above it and composed of débris to the depth of about 60 ft., in which the excavations revealed the remains of distinct cities which had been built, one upon the ruins of another. The earliest of these was evidently Amorite, and could not have been later than 1700 BC, and was perhaps two or three centuries earlier (Bliss, Mound of Many Cities). The identification rests upon the fact that the site corresponds with the Bib. and other historical notices of L., and esp. upon the discovery of a cuneiform tablet in the ruins of the same character as the Am Tab, and containing the name of a king who is known to have been at one time Egypt governor of L. The tablets, which date from the latter part of the 15th or early part of the 14th cent. BC, give us the earliest information in regard to L., and it was then an Egypt dependency, but it seems to have revolted and joined with other towns in an attack upon Jerus, which was also an Egypt dependency. It was perhaps compelled to do so by the Khbiri who were then raiding this region. The place was, like Gaza, an important one for Egypt, being on the frontier and on the route to Jerus, and the importance is seen in the fact that it was taken and destroyed and rebuilt so many times.

We first hear of it in the history of Israel when Joshua invaded the land. It was then an Amorite city, and its king, Jarchia, joined the confederacy formed by Adonizedek, king of Jerus, to resist Joshua. They were defeated in the remarkable battle at Gibeon, and the five confederate kings were captured and put to death at Makkodah (Josh 10 24, 29; 12 11). L. was included in the lot of Judah (15 39), and it was rebuilt, or fortified, by Rchobam (2 Ch 11 5.9). It was besieged by Sennacherib in the reign of Hezekiah and probably taken (2 K 18 13) when he invaded Judah and besieged Jerus, but the other references to the siege leave it doubtful

(2 K 18 14.17; 19 8; 2 Ch 32 9; Isa 36 2; 37 8). The Assyrian monuments, however, render it certain that the place was captured. The sculptures on the walls of Sennacherib’s palace picture the storming of L. and the king on his throne receiving the submission of the captives (Bal’ Light from the East, 190-91). This was in 701 BC, and to this period we may assign the etymological reference to L. in Mic 1 13, “Bind the chariot to the swift steed, 0 inhabitant of Lachish: she was the beginning of sin to the daughter of Zion.” The cause of the invasion of Sennacherib was a general revolt in Phoenicia, Pal, and Philistia, Hezekiah joining in it and all asking Egypt for aid (Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World, ch ix). Issiah had warned Judah not to trust in Egypt (Isa 20 5.6; 30 1-5; 31 1), and as L. was the place where communication was held with Egypt, being a frontier fortress, perhaps even having an Egypt garrison, it would be associated with the “sin” of the Egypt alliance (HGHIL, 234).

The city was evidently rebuilt after its destruction by Sennacherib, for we find Nebuchadnezzar fighting against it during his siege of Jerus (Jer 34 7). It was doubtless destroyed by him, but we are informed by Nehemiah (11 30) that some of the returned Jews settled there after the captivity. It is very likely that they did not reoccupy the site of the ruined city, but settled as peasants in the territory, and this may account for the transfer of the name to Umm Lakis, 3 or 4 miles from Tell

Sennacherib on His Throne before Lachish. (Kouyunjik.) Layard’s Monuments of Nineveh.
el-Hesy, where some ruins exist, but not of a kind to suggest Lachish (Bliss, op. cit.). No remains of the fort were found by the Tell indicating its occupation as a fortress or city later than that destroyed by the king of Babylon, but it was occupied in some form during the crusades, Urnun Lakis being held for a time by the Hospitaliters, and King Richard is said to have made it a base of operations in his war with Saladin (HGHL). The Tell itself, if occupied, was probably only the site of his camp, and it has apparently remained since that time without inhabitants, being used for agricultural purposes only. See further, PALESTINE (RECENT EXPLORATION), III, 1.

H. PORTER

LACK (forms of הָלַכְתָּה, הָלָכָה, "to lack, absence," הָלָךְ, " OV, 'agin, 'nought"): This word in its various forms has the usual meaning of "want," "need," "deficiency." There is but little change in the use of the word in the different VSS. Sometimes one of the common synonyms is exchanged for the word itself, e.g. in the OT, 1 S 21 15 RV has "lack" ("Do I lack madmen?") where AV has "need of." Prov 5 23, "lack," instead of "without," is an unusual word for "lacketh;" 10 21, "lack" for "want;" 31 11, "lack" for "need;" Isa 59 15, "lacketh" for "faileth.

In the NT 'lack' is the tr of ὑπερθεῖν, ὑποτεθεῖν, lit. "to be behind," and ὄφθαλμον, endeiis, "in want." In Lk 8 6, AV reads "had no" instead of "lacketh" in AV. In 2 Cor 11 9, RV gives "my want" for "lacketh" in AV; in Col 1 24 "is that which is lack" for "lacketh;" Jas 2 15 "lack of" for "lacketh;" Jas 3 17 "lacketh" to be "lacketh;" Jas 5 13 "lacketh" to be "lacketh.

It readily be seen that sometimes the slight variation helps to explain the meaning.

G. H. GERBERDING

LACUNUS, la-kù'nus. See LACUNA.

LAD: In the OT this word occurs as the tr of נָעָר, "young person," "child," "servant." RV properly substituting 'servant' in 2 K 4 19; Jgs 16 26 is another passage where either sense of the original word may be intended. The word occurs in the NT in Jn 6 9 as the tr of παιδία, παιδανία; in Acts 20 12, παι, παις (AV "young man").

LADAN, la'dan (תְּדָן, la'dân; AV Laadan): (1) A descendant of Ephraim, and an ancestor of Joshua (1 Ch 7 26).

(2) A Levite of the family of Gershon (1 Ch 23 7.9; 26 21), also called Libni (q.v.).

LADANUM, lad'a-num (לָדָן, lōg): Gen 37 25 RVm; elsewhere MYRAH (q.v.).

LADDER, lad'ér. See SIEGE, 4, (c).

LADDER OF TYRE (ץִיוֹם תָּרֹע, lit. "the Ladder"); Térou, Ἰτέρος, Ἰτέριος (ἡ τάξις τῶν ἱκανῶν): Not mentioned in the OT or the NT, but in Apoc (1 Mac 11 59), where it is said that Antiochus VI, after having confirmed Jonathan in the high-priesthood, appointed his brother Johnadan captain over the territory point out between the Ladder of Tyre and the borders of Egypt. The Ladder has been located at different points on the coast between Tyre and Acra, such as the Ras el-Abiyad ("Promontorium Album" of the ancient geographers), about 7 miles S. of Tell el-Abiyad, about 6 miles farther S., and Ras el-Musheiref, a little farther on. These are capes jutting westward into the sea from the ridge which runs parallel to the general line of the coast. These capes project more than a mile into the sea, and present a very bold and precipitous front from 200 to 300 ft. in height. The ascent on either side of the promontory is very steep, and at Ras el-Abiyad steps were cut in the white rock, which led to the identification of this point with the Ladder, but a reference to Jos (11, II, I, 2) leads to a different conclusion. He locates it 100 stadia N. of Acra, which corresponds fairly well with the southern limit of the whole promontory, which is about 12 miles N. of Acra, but not at all with Ras el-Abiyad. The altitude of el-Musheiref is greater than that of el-Abiyad and may have had steps cut in it similar to the latter.

It is more probable that the L. was here, or at Naafsarah, but the term applied to the whole promontory, which offered a secure passage to the passage of armies, or even caravans, since the approach is precipitous on either side, and at Ras el-Abiyad the road skirts the edge of a sheer precipice, where a misstep would hurl one into the sea some 200 ft. below. The application of the term to the whole promontory seems to be indicated by Jos, since he speaks of it as one of the mountains which encompass the plain of Ptolemais (Acra) and the highest of all. This would not be true of any one of the three capes mentioned, but would be if the hills behind, which form the base, were included.

That it was designated as the Ladder of Tyre rather than of Acra was probably due to the fact that the promontory is nearer the city (see Thomson, LB, II, ed 1882; SWP, name-lists, s.v.).

H. PORTER

LAD, lad, LADING, lading: "To lade" in the sense of "to load" is retained by RV in nearly all passages where the word occurs in AV (but AV and RV reading of Ps 65 19; Isa 46 1). "They laded us with such things" (Acts 28 10; AV). אֲשִׁרּוּת, epiltethem, "to put on," is rendered by RV, "They put on board such things." Lk 11 46 RV reads "ye load" instead of AV "ye lade.

Lading (ἀποστροφία, phorton) is found in Acts 27 10 in its usual meaning, "the lading of a ship.

LADY, la’di: This word should be taken in the sense of "mistress" in Isa 47 5.7 (Heb gôbereth (so ARV)). In Jgs 5 29; Est 1:16 it is the tr of another Heb word (שׁוֹפֵר), best rendered "princess" (so RV in Est, but not in Jgs). In 2 Jn 1.5 it is the tr of κυπτις, κυπτις, which some interpreters regard as a proper name. See CYRIA; JOHN, EPISTLES OF; ELECT LADY.

LAEL, la’el (לֵאֵל), "belonging to God"): Father of Eliashaph, the prince of the father’s house of the Gershonites (Nu 3 24).

LAHAD, la’had (לָהָד), lāhath): A descendant of Judah (1 Ch 4 2).

LAHAI-ROI, la-b’roi, la-mi’roi, la-thi’roi (לָהַי, "living", lahay ro’d): See BEER-LAHAI-ROI.

LAHAMM, la’mam (לָהָמ, lahamm): A town in the Judaean Shephelah (Josh 15 40, RVm "Laham"), possibly the modern el-Laham, 2 miles S. of Bed Jidrin.

LAHMAN, la’mas. See LAHAMM.

LAHMI, la’缅 (לָהָמי, lahami): According to 1 Ch 20 5, the brother of Goliath of Gath. See ELHANAN.

LAISH, la’ish (לָיִש, layish): (1) A city in the upper Jordan valley, apparently colonized by the Sidonians, which was captured by the Danites and called DAN (q.v.) (Jgs 18 7, etc;
Laishah

Lamech

Isa 10 30 AV). In Josh 19 47 the name appears as “Lehem.”

(2) A Benjamite, father of Palti or Paltiel, to whom Michal, David’s wife, was given by Saul (1 S 25 44; 2 S 3 15).

LAISHAH, la-ša’ha, la-šis-a (רָלִישָׁה, rlîshāh, AV Laish): A place named in Isa 10 30 with Gallim and Anaithoth. It should apparently be sought on the N. of Jerus. Some would identify Gallim with Beil Jala, near Bethlehem. Conder suggests 4bātr-yeh on the eastern slope, to the N.N.E. of the Mount of Olives.

LAKE, lāk (אַהֲרָם, āhāram): The word is used (33x; Gen 19 20; 20 10.14.15; 21 8) of the “lake of fire and brimstone.” Lakes are not abundant in Syria and Pal. The Dead Sea, which might be called a lake, is in most places in KJV called a sea. Salt-sea and is called the sea of Araba Bahr Lót, Sea of Lot. It is a question whether the Waters of Merom (Josh 11 5.7) can be identified with the Hâlek, a marshy lake in the course of the Upper Jordan, N. of the Sea of Galilee. E. of the Dead Sea on the edge of the desert there are salt lakes in which the water of the rivers of Damascas (see 2 K 5 12) is gathered and evaporates. In the Lebanon W. of Batelbîk is the small lake Yammâneh, which is fed by copious springs, but whose water disappears in the latter part of the summer, being drained off by subterranean channels. The Lake of Hûmûn on the Orontes is artificial, though ancient. On the lower Orontes is the Lake of Antioch.

ELFRED EAT DAY

LAKE OF FIRE (אַהֲרָם תּוֹ וָרֶדֶס, āhāram to varēdes): Found in Rev 19 20; 20 10.14 (Rev 114). Rev 21 8 has “the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.” So the brimstone in connection with “the lake of fire” occurs also in Rev 19 20 and 20 10, the latter being a backward reference to the former passage. In Rev 20 14 the words, “This is the second death, even the lake of fire,” are either intended to elucidate and to extend a reference to 15 through a reference to 16, or, if part of the text, formed originally the close of ver 15, whence they became displaced on account of the identity of the words once immediately preceding them in ver 15 with the words immediately preceding them in ver 14. Though “the lake of fire” can be called “the second death” only with reference to the lost among men (ver 15), not with reference to death and Hades (ver 14). In all the above references “the lake of fire” appears as a place of punishment, of perpetual torment, not of annihilation (20 10). The beast (20 19): thepseudo-prophet (19 20; 20 10); the devil (20 10); the wicked of varying description (20 13; 21 8), are cast into it. When the same is affirmed of death and Hades (20 14), it is doubtful as to whether they are meant as a mere figure for the cessation of these two evils personified, or has a more realistic background in the existence of two demon-powers so named (cf Isa 25 8; 1 Cor 15 25.54; 2 Ed 7 31). The Scriptural source for the conception of “the lake of fire” lies in Gen 19 24, where already the fire and the brimstone occur together, while the locality of the catastrophe described is the neighborhood of the Dead Sea. The association of the Dead Sea with this fearful judgment of God, together with the distinctive shape of the place, rendered it a striking figure for the scene of eschatological retribution. The two other OT passages which have “fire and brimstone” (Ps 11 6; Ezek 38 22) are dependent on the Gen passage, with which they have the figure of “training” in common. In Rev 21 8, “their part” seems to allude to Ps 11 6, “the portion of their cup.” In 67 4 ff the Dead Sea appears as the place of punishment for evil spirits. Of late it has been proposed to derive “the lake of fire” from “the stream of fire” which destroys the enemies of Ahura in the Zoroastrian eschatology; so Boussert, Die Offenbarung Johannes, 1906, 433, 434. But the figures of a stream and a lake are different; cf 13 9–11, where a stream of fire proceeds from the mouth of the Messiah for the destruction of his enemies. Besides, the Pers fire is, in part, a fire of purification, and not of destruction only (Boussert, 442), and even in the apocalyptic Book of En, the fires of purification and of punishment are not confounded (cf 67 4 with 50 20). The OT fully explains the entire conception.

GREGORIUS VON

LAKE OF GENNESARET, ge-nēs’a-ret. See Galilee, Sea of.

LAKKUM, la-kum (לַקְקָם, lâqkâm; AV Lakum): An unidentified town on the border of Naphtali, named with Adami, Nekeb and Jabeed, apparently nearer the Jordan (Josh 19 33).

LAMA. See Eli, Eli, LAMA SABACHTHANI.

LAMB, lam: (1) The most used word is בְּרָאָם, bērā‘ām, kebhash, “a young ram”; cf Arab. کَسْم, kâsm, “ram”; often of sacrifices; (fem.) בְּרָאָנה, bērā‘ānāh, kebhāth, “ewe lamb” (2 S 12 3); by transposition בְּרָא, bērā‘; kibshāh, “ewe lamb” (Gen 30 40; Lev 3 7; 5 6). (2) כְּרָן, kārān, “lamb” (Dt 32 14; 1 S 16 9; 2 K 3 4). (3) כָּרָה, kārah, “one” of the flock (Gen 22 7; Lev 5 7). (4) כָּרָה, kārah, “sheep,” “goats,” “flock”; cf Arab. [esp. كَسْرَة, kāsarah, “flock” (Ps 114 4). (5) כְּרָה, kārah, “lamb”; cf Arab. كَلِيَّة, kāli‘ah, “lamb”; and כָּרָה, kārah, “sheep,” “goats,” “flock” (Ps 114 4). (6) כְּרָה, kārah, “lamb”; cf Arab. כָּרָה, kārah, “sheep,” “goats,” “flock” (Ps 114 4). (7) כְּרָה, kārah, “lamb”; cf Arab. כָּרָה, kārah, “sheep,” “goats,” “flock” (Ps 114 4).

ELFRED EAT DAY

LAMB OF GOD (דָּבָר תּוֹ הַדָּבָר, dâvar to dâvar): This is a title specially bestowed upon our Lord by John the Baptist (Jn 1 29–30), “Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!” In XIII F—an apocryphal book, probably of the 2d cent.—we have the term used for the Messiah, “Honor Judah and Levi, for from them shall arise for you the Lamb of God, saving all nations by grace.” But the term does not seem to have been of any general use until it received its distinctly Christian significance. It has been generally understood as referring to the prophetic language of Jer 11 19, and Is 53 7.

It is far more probable, however, that the true source of the expression is to be found in the important place which the “lamb” occupies in the sacrifices, esp. of the PC. In the Special Sense there was the lamb of the daily of the Term morning and evening sacrifice. How far the future appearance of the lamb to be the Baptist, being a member of a priestly family! On the Sabbath the number of the offerings was doubled, and at some of the great festivals a still larger number were laid upon the altar (see Ex 29 38; Nu 28 39.13). The lamb of the Passover would also occupy a large place in the mind of a devout Israel-
ite, and, as the Passover was not far off, it is quite possible that John may have referred to this as well as to other suggested ideas connected with the lamb. The sacrificial significance of the term seems to be far more probable than the mere comparison of the character of Our Lord with gentleness, as suggested by the words of the prophets, although these contain much more than the mere reference to character (see below). That this became the clearly defined conception of apostolic teaching is clear from passages in Paul and Peter (1 Cor. 5:7; 1 Pet. 2:8). In the Book of Rev the reference to the Lamb occurs 27 times. The word here used differs from that in Jn. The αἷμας of the Gospel has become the ἀρμόσια of the Apocalypse, a diminutive form suggestive of affection. This is the word used by Our Lord in His rebuke and forgiveness of Peter (Jn 21:15), and is peculiarly touched therefore with an added meaning of pathetic tenderness. Westcott, in his Comm. on Jn 1:29, refers to the conjecture that there may have been footprints of lambs passing by on their way to Jerus to be used at the feast. This is possible, but fanciful. As applied to Christ, the term certainly suggests the meekness and gentleness of Our Lord's nature and work, but could not have been used by John without containing some reference to the place to which the lamb bore in the Jewish ritualism.

The significance of the Baptist's words has been variously understood. Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, among the ancients, Luke, DeWette, Meyer, Ewald, Alford, among the Variously moderns, refer it to Isa 53:7; Grotius, Understood Bengel, Hengstenberg, to the paschal lamb; Baumgarten-Crusius, etc., to the sin offering; Lange strongly urges the influence of the passage in Is. 53:7, and refers to John's declaration of our own mission under the influence of the second part of Isa., in which he is supported by Schaff. The importance of the Isa-thought is found in Mt 8:17; Acts 8:32; 1 Pet 2:22-25.

It is to be observed that the LXX in Isa 53:7 translates the Heb word for sheep (σκυρό), by the Gr word for lamb. In ver 10, the prophet's "suffering one" is said to have "made his soul an offering for sin," as in ver 4 "he hath borne our griefs," where bearing involves the conception of sin offering, and as possessing justifying power, the idea of "taking away." John indeed uses not the LXX word φθέγγεσθαι (pherein), but αἰματεῖ (airtein), and some have maintained that this simple means "put away," or "support," or "endure." But this surely loses the suggestion of the associated term "lamb," which John could not have employed without some reference to its sacrificial and therefore expiatory force. What Lange calls a "gem perception" of atonement must certainly have been in the Baptist's mind, esp. when we recall the Isa-passages, even though there may not have been any complete dogmatic conception of the full relation of the death of Christ to the salvation of man. Even the idea of the bearing of the curse of sin may not be excluded, for it was impossible for an Israelite like John, and esp. with his surroundings, to have forgotten the significance of the paschal lamb, both in its memorial of the judgment of Egypt, as well as of the deliverance of Israel. Notwithstanding every effort to take out of this striking phrase its deeper meanings, which involve most probably the combination of all the sources above described, it must ever remain one of the richest mines of evangelical thought occupied in the doctrine of atonement, a position analogous to that brief word of the Lord, "God is a Spirit" (Jn 4:24), in relation to the doctrine of God. The Lamb is defined as "of God," that is, of Divine providing. See Isa 53; Rev 5:6; 13:8. Its emphatic and appointed office is indicated by the definite article, and whether we refer the conception to a specific sacrifice or to the general place of a lamb in the sacrificial institution, they all, as being appointed sacrifice, suggest the close relation of Our Lord to the Divine Being, and particularly to His expiatory sacrifice.

LAMEH, lám (לָעַם, lā̂meḥ; ἀ SEEK, ἀσόμα; chōlos, chōlos). (1) The condition of being unable or imperfectly able to walk, which united any descendant of Aaron so afflicted for service in the priesthood (Lev 21:18), and rendered an animal unsuitable for sacrifice (Dt 15:21). The offering of animals so blemished was one of the sins with which Malachi charges the negligent Jews of his time (Mal 1:8-13).

(1) Those who suffered from lameness, such as Mephibosheth, whose limbs were injured by a fall in childhood (2 S 4:4; 9:3). In the prophetic description of the completeness of the victory of the returning Israelites, it is probable they shall be made whole and shall leap like a hart (Jer 31:8; Isa 35:6). The unfitness of the lame for warfare gives point to the promise that the lame shall take the prey (Isa 33:23). Job in his graphic description of his helplessness concludes, his calamity says, "And feet was I to the lame" (Job 39:15). The inequality of the legs of the lame is used in Prov 26:7 as a similitude of the inaptness with which a fool uses a parable.

In the enigmatical and probably corrupt passage describing David's capture of Jerus, the lame and blind are mentioned twice. In 2 S 6:6 it was a taunt on the part of the Jebusites that a procession of cripples would suffice to keep out the Israelites. The allusion in ver 8 may be read, "Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites and him, . . . slay both the blind with the lame, and David's soul," as it is in LXX. The Vulg says, "David had offered a reward on that day to the man who should smite the Jebusite and reach the water-pipes of the house, and remove the blind and lame who hated David's soul." It is possible, however, that Budde's emendation is more correct and that it is a threat against the indiscriminate slaughter of the Jebusites: "Who's slayeth a Jebusite shall bring his neck into peril; the lame and blind are not hated of David's soul." The proverbial saying quoted above is rendered in AV "he hath borne our griefs," as rendered in V., for we read in Mt 21:14 that the lame came to Our Lord in the temple and were healed.

The healing of the lame by Our Lord is recorded in Mt 14:16; 15:30-31; 21:14-16; Lk 17:17-19. For the apostolic miracles of healing the lame see Cripples. In He 12:13 the Christians are counselled to courage under chastisement, lest their despair should cause that which is lame to be "turned out of the way." ALEX. MACALISTER.

LAMECH, lámek (לָאַמֵּק, lemech; ἀσάγχ, Lamech, "a strong youth"?): (1) The name is first mentioned in Gen 4:18-24. Here L., the son of Methusael, is named as the last of the descendants of Cain. He was the father of Jabel, Jubal, and the father of the artificer Abel, the husband of two wives, zizah and Zillah, he furnishes the first recorded instance of polygamy. It is very instructive to note that this "father of polygamy" at once becomes the first blustering tyrant and a braggart; in order to draw this conclusion from his so-called "swordlay" (Gen 4:23f). He does not put his trust in God, but in the weapons and implements invented by his sons, or rather these instruments, enhancing the physical and material power of man, he glorifies in them and misconstrues the Divine kindness which insured to Cain freedom from the revenge of his fellow-men.

(2) Another L. is mentioned in Gen 5:25:28 (cf 1 Ch 1:3; Lk 3:36), the son of Methuselah.
and the father of Noah. His words (Gen 5:29) show the great difference between this descendant of Seth and the descendant of Cain. While the one is stimulated to a song of defiance by the worldly inventions of his sons, the other, in prophetic mood, expresses his auraire belief in the coming of better times, and calmly and prayerfully awaits the period of comfort and rest which he expected to be ushered in by his son Noah.  

WILLIAM BAUR

LAMEDH, lâmèth (5): The 12th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as l. It came also to be used for the number 30. For name, etc, see ALPHABET.

LAMENT, la-ment'. See MUSIC.

LAMENTATION, lam-en-à'shun. See BURIAL, III, 2; IV, 4, 5, 6.

LAMENTATIONS, lam-en-à'shun. BOOK OF

—The Lamentations of Jeremiah: This is a collective name which tradition has given to 5 elegies found in the Heb Canon that lament the fate of destroyed Jerusalem. The rabbis call this little book 'Ekkah (אֶֽכֶּה, "now"), according to the word of Lament with which it begins, or kînath (כִּנָּת). On the basis of the latter term the LXX calls it θραυσα, θρησοι, or Lat. Threni, or "Lamentations."

The little book consists of 5 lamentations, each one forming the contents of a chapter. The first 4 are marked by the acrostic use of the letters of these hymns, in which a longer line (3 or 4 accents) is followed by a shorter (2 or 3 accents). In chs 1 and 2 the acrostic letters begin three such double lines; in ch 4, however, two double lines. In ch 3 a letter controls three pairs, but is repeated at the beginning of each line. In ch 5 the alphabet is wanting; but in this case too the number of pairs of lines agrees with the number of letters in the Heb alphabet, i.e. 22. In chs 2, 3, and 4, the letter 'aqin follows pê, as is the case in Ps 34. Ch 1, however, follows the usual order.

These 5 hymns all refer to the great national catastrophe that befell Jerusalem and its capital city, Jerusalem, through the Chaldaeans, 587-586 BC. The sufferings and the anxieties of the city, the destruction of the sanctuary, the cruelty and taunts of the enemies of Israel, esp. the Edomites, the disgrace that befell the king and his nobles, priests and prophets, and that, too, without their own guilt, the devastation and ruin of the country—all this is described, and appeal is made to the mercy of God. A careful sequence of thought can be expected in the lyrical feeling and in the alphabetical form. Repetitions are found in large numbers, but each one of these hymns emphasizes some special feature of the calamity. Ch 3 is unique, as in it one person describes his own peculiar sufferings in connection with the general calamity, and then too in the name of the others begins a psalm of repentance. This person did not suffer so severely because he was an exceptional sinner, but because of the unrighteousness of his people. These hymns were not written during the siege, but later, at a time when the people still vividly remembered the sufferings and the anxieties of that time and when the impression made on them by the fall of Jerusalem was still as powerful as ever.

Who is the author of these hymns? Jewish tradition is in a miasma in saying that it was Jeremiah. The hymns themselves are found anonymously in the Heb text, while the LXX has in one an additional statement, the Heb style of which would lead us to conclude that it was found in the origin of the LXX and not in the Heb.

4. Author

This statement reads: "And it came to pass, after Israel had been taken away captive and Jerusalem had been laid waste, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and uttered this lamentation over Jerusalem and said." The Tg also states that Jeremiah was the author. The rabbis and the church Fathers have no doubts on the subject. Jerome (cf on Zee 1211) thinks that 2 Ch 35 25 refers to these hymns. The same is said by Jos (Ant, X, v, 1). If this is the case then the Tg of Ch would have regarded Lam as having been written because of the death of Josiah. But this misunderstanding is not to be ascribed to him. It was easily possible that he was acquainted with lamentations of such a nature, but which afterward were lost. At all events, Jeremiah was by nature adapted to the composition of such elegies, as is proved by his book of prophecies.

Only in modern times has the authorship of these hymns by Josiah been seriously called into question; and it is now denied by most critics. For this they give formal and material reasons. The language of these lamentations shows many similarities to the discourses of Jeremiah, but at the same time also many differences. The alphabetical scheme is not worthy of Jeremiah is a prejudice caused by the taste of our times. Heb poets had evidently been making use of such methods for a long time, as it helps materially in memorizing. The text is not accurate on account of the destruction of Jerusalem, in fact, he would probably not have made use of it. But we have in this book a collection of lamentations written some time after this great catastrophe. The claim has also been made that the views of Jeremiah and those of the composer or the composers of these poems differ materially. It is said that Jeremiah emphasizes much more strongly the guilt of the people as the cause of the calamity than is done in these hymns, which lament the fate of the people and find the cause of it in the sins of the fathers (5,7), something that Jeremiah is said not to accept (Jer 3129f). However, the guilt of the people and the resultant wrath of God are often brought out in the midst of lament (3129f) that there is nothing like inherited guilt. He declares rather that in the blessed future things would be different in this respect. Then, too, we are not to forget that if Jeremiah is the author of these patriotic hymns, he does not speak in them as the prophet and the appointed accuser of his people, but that he is at last permitted to speak as he humbly feels, although there is no lack of prophetical reminiscences (cf Lam 4 21f). In these hymns he speaks out of the heart that loves his Jesus and his people, and he utters the priestly prayer of intercession, which he was not allowed to do when announcing the judgment over Israel. The fact that he also evinces great reverence for the unfortunate king and his Divinely given hereditary dignity (4 20), although as a prophet he had been compelled to pronounce judgment over him, would not be unthinkable in Jeremiah, who had shown warm sympathies also for Jehoiachin (22 24 25). A radical difference of sentiment between the two authors is not involved. On the other hand, a serious difficulty arises if we claim that Jeremiah was not the author of Lam in the denunciations of Lam over the prophets of Jesus (2 14, 4 13). How could the great prophet of the Destruction be so ignored if he himself were not the author of these sentiments? If he was he can easily understand this omission. In his book
of prophecies he has spoken exactly the same way about the prophets. To this must be added, that Lam 3 forces us to regard Jeremiah as the author, because of the personal sufferings that are here described. Compare esp. 3:14.37 f. 35 ff. 61.63. What other person was during the period of this catastrophe the cyssore of all eyes as was the prophet, esp., too, because he was guiltless? The claim that here, not an individual, but the personified nation is introduced as speaking, is altogether improbable, and in some passages absolutely impossible (vs. 14.48).

This little book must accordingly be closely connected with the person of Jeremiah. If he himself is the author, he must have composed it in his old age, when he had time and opportunity to live over again all the sufferings of his people and of himself. It is, however, more probable, esp. because of the language of the poems, that his disciples put this book in the present shape of uniform sentential utterances, basing this on the manner of lamentations common to Jeremiah. In this way the origin of ch 3 can be understood, which cannot artificially be shaped as his sayings, as in this case the personal feature would be more distinctly expressed. It was probably compiled from a number of his utterances.

In the Heb Canon this book is found in the third division, called khitubhim, or Sacred Writings, together with the Pss. However, the LXX adds this book to Jer, or rather, to the Book of Dan, found just after Jer. The Hebrews count it among the 5 m'ghilloth, or Rolls, which were read on prominent anniversary days. The day for the Lamentation was the 9th of Ab, the day of the burning of the temple. In the Roman Catholic church it is read on the last three days of Holy Week.

LITERATURE.—Comm. of Tholenius, Ewald, Nägelsbach, Gerlach, Kell, Cheyne, Oestig, Lühr, Budde; art. by Robertson Smith on "Lamentations" in EB.

C. Von Orelli

LAMP, LAMPSTAND, lamp/stand (בְּלֶם, בָּלֶם, לָמֹא, נָר, נָר, לָמֹד, לָמָּד, lampádh, Phoen ḫl'ptḥ, lampádh, whence λαμπάς, lampás; λύχνος, luchnos, is also used): Nór or nîr is properly "light" or "a light-giving thing," hence "lamp," and is so rendered in RV, but often "candle" in AV. Its use in connection with the tabernacle and the temple (Ex 25 37 ff; 2 Ch 4 20 f), where oil was employed for light (Ex 35 14; Lev 24 2), shows that this is its proper meaning. Lappádt is properly "a torch" and is thus rendered generally in RV, but "lamp" in Isa 62 1, where it is used as a simile. AV renders it "lamp" usually, but "torch" in Neh 2 3 f; Zec 12 6. In Job 12 5 RV renders it "for misfortune," regarding it as composed of the noun דָּש, dâd, and the preposition ל, l. Lampás in Gr corresponds to it, but luchnos is also rendered in RV "lamp," while AV gives "candle," as in Mt 5 15 and corresponding passages in the other Gospels.

Lamps were in use in very remote times, though we have few allusions to them in the early history of Egypt. There are indications that 1. Forms they were used there. Nichos for and History lamps are found in the tombs of Tell el-Amarna (Arch. Survey of Egypt, Am Tab, Part IV, 14). Lamplstands are also represented (ib, Part III, 7). Torches were of course used before lamps, and are mentioned in Gen (16 17 RV), but clay lamps were used in Canaan by the Amorites before the Israelites took possession. The excavations in Pal have furnished thousands of specimens, and have enabled us to trace the development from about 2000 BC onward. The exploration carried out at Lachish (Tell Hesdy) and Gezer (Tell Jezer) by the Pal Exploration Fund has given ample material for the purpose, and the numerous examples from tombs all over Pal and Syria have supplied a great variety of forms.

"Lamp" is used in the sense of a guide in Ps 119 105; Prov 6 23, and for the spirit, which is called the lamp of Jeh in man (Prov 20 27), and it of course often signifies the light itself. It is used also for the son who is to succeed and represent his father (1 K 16 4), and it perhaps is employed in this sense in the phrase, "The lamp of the wicked shall be put out" (Job 21 17; Prov 13 9; and perhaps Job 15 6).

The early Can. or Amorite lamp was a shallow, saucer-like bowl with rounded bottom and vertical rim, slightly pointed or pinched on one side where the lighted end of the wick was placed (Fig. 1). This form continued into Jewish times, but was gradually changed until the spout was formed by drawing the rim of the sides together, forming a narrow open channel, the remainder of the rim being rolled outward and flattened (Fig. 2), the bottom being also flattened. This was the early Heb pattern and persisted for centuries. The open bowl was gradually closed in, first at the spout, where the rim of one side was lapped over the other, and finally the whole surface was closed with only an orifice in the center for receiving the oil, and at the same time the spout was lengthened. This transformation is seen in Fig. 3, a lamp of the Seleucid period, or from 300 BC. These lamps have usually a circular foot and sometimes a string-hole on one side. The next development was a circular bowl with a somewhat shorter spout, sometimes being only a bulge in the rim, so that the orifice for the wick falls in the rim, the orifice for filling being quite small.
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at the bottom of a saucer-like depression in the center of the bowl. There is sometimes a loop handle affixed on the side opposite to the spout. Sometimes the handle is horizontal, but commonly vertical (Fig. 4). This form is called Roman, and the bowl is often ornamented with mythological human or animal figures (Fig. 5). Other forms are

period with surface blackened with recent usage. Olive oil was commonly used, but terebinth oil also (Thomson, LB, III, 472).

H. PORTER

LAMPSACUS, lamp’sa-kus. See SampsaMes.

LANCE, lans, LANCER, lan’ser, LANcET, lan’set. See ARMOR, III, 4, (3); 1 K 13 28 RV “lances.”


LAND-CROCODILE (RV), land-crek’ō-dil (72, ḫarp; LXX ἡρπαλλον, chamaileon, Lev 11 30; AV Chameleon): ḫarp is found only here, meaning an animal, the fifth in the list of unclean “creeping things.” Elsewhere is it trd “strength” or “power” and it has been thought that here is meant the desert monitor, Varanus griseus, a gigantic lizard, which is common in Egypt and Pal, and which attains the length of 4 ft. “Chameleon,” which AV has here, is used by RV for tinhahemeth (AV “mole”), the eighth in the list of unclean “creeping things” (of nāshām, “to breathe”; trd “swan” in ver 15 m). While it is by no means certain what animal is meant, there could be no objection to “monitor” or “desert monitor.” “Land-crocodile” is objectionable because it is not a recognized name of any animal. See CHAMELEON; LIZARD. Alfred Elly Day

LAND LAWS. See AGRARIAN LAWS.

LANDMARK, land’märk (700, g’bhāl, lit. “boundary”): The boundary may have been marked, as at present, simply by a furrow or stone. The iniquity of removing a landmark is frequently insisted on (Dt 19 14; 27 17; Prov 22 28; 33 10; Job 24 2 (g’bhalad), its removal being equivalent to theft.

LANE, lān (710, ḥamēān): An alley or bypath of a city. Occurs once in Lk 14 21, “Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city”: elsewhere trd “street,” e.g. Mt 6 2; Acts 9 11; Ecclus 9 7; Tob 13 18.

LANGUAGE, lan’gwâj, OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (Greek). See ARAMAIc LANGUAGE, also:

I. THE VERNACULAR koine THE LANGUAGE OF THE NT

1. The Old Point of View
2. The Revolution
3. The Proof of the New Position
   (1) The Papyrus
   (2) The Ostraca
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LITERATURE

1. The Vernacular “koine” the Language of the NT.—The ghost of the old Purist controversy is now laid to rest for good and all. The story
of that episode has interest chiefly for the historian of language and of the vagaries of the human intellect. See Winer-Thayer, Grammar of the Idiom of the NT, 1869, 12–19, and the 4th ed, 1892, for a sketch of this once furious strife. In the 17th century various scholars tried to prove that the Gr of the NT was on a par with the literary Attic of the classic period. But the Hebraists won them and established that it was Hebraic Gr, a special variety, if not dialect, a Bib Gr. The 4th ed of Cremer's Biblico-Theological Lexicon of NT Gr (trd by W. Urwick, 1892) quotes, with approval, Rothe's remark (Dogmatik, 1863, 298): "We may appropriately speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit has been at work, moulding for itself a distinctively religious mode of expression out of the language of the country which it has chosen as its sphere, and transforming the linguistic elements which it found ready to hand, and even conceptions already existing, into a shape and form appropriate to itself and all its own." Cremer adds: We have a very clear and striking proof of this in NT Gr:"

This was only twenty years ago and fairly represented the opinion of that day. Hatch in 1889 (Essays in Bib, Gr, 34) held that with most of the NT words the key lay in the LXX. But Winer (Winer-Thayer, 20) had long ago seen that the vernacular koine was "the special foundation of the idiom of the NT," though he still admitted "a Jewish-Gr, which native Greeks did not entirely understand" (p. 27). He did not see the practical identity of NT Gr with the vernacular koine ("common" Gr), nor did Schmiedel in the 8th Auflage of Winer (I. Thel; II. Thel, erstes Heft, 1894–97). In the second ed of his Grammar of NT Gr (ET by Thackeray, 1905, 2), Blass sees the dawn of the new day, though his book was first written before it came. Viteau (Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament, I, Le texte, 1893; II, Le sujet, 1896) occupies wholly the old position of a Judaic Gr. An extreme instance of that view is seen in Guillelmard's Hebraismen in the Gr Testament (1879).

2. The Revolution

The vernacular which he traces back to Stephanus. It is a good exercise to read Wetten's discussion of the "Language of the NT" in DB, III (1888), and then turn to Moulton, "Language of the NT," in 1-vol HDB. Wetten says: "The chief peculiarity of the syntax of the NT lies in the reproduction of Heb forms." Moulton remarks: "There is no reason to believe that any NT writer who ever lived in Pal learned Gr only as a foreign language when he went abroad," Still better is it to read Moulton, "New Testament Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery" in Cambridge Biblical Essays (1909, 161–205); Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (1911); or Angus, "The koine, the Language of the NT," Princeton Review, January, 1910, 42–92. The revolution has come to stay. It is now clear that the Gr of the NT is not a jargon nor a patois. In all essential respects it is just the vernacular koine of the 1st cent. AD, the lingua franca of the Graeco-Roman empire, the legacy of Alexander the Great's conquest of the East. This world-speech was at bottom the Attic vernacular with dialectical and pronominal inflexions thrown in, but a virile speech admirably adapted to the service of the many peoples of the time. The able article in vol III of HDB on the "Language of the NT" by Dr. J. H. Thayer appeared in 1900, and illustrates how quickly an encyclopaedia article may become out of date. There is a wealth of knowledge here displayed, as one would expect, but Thayer still speaks of "this species of Greek," "this peculiar idiom," "Jewish Greek," though he seems to have got beyond the idea of a koine for the NT. The last topic discussed by him is "Problems." He little thought that the biggest "problem" so near solution was the character of the language itself. It was Adolph Deissmann, then of Heidelberg, now of Bonn, who showed how to know the koine, the knowledge of the language of the NT. His Biblestudien (zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums) appeared in 1895. In this epoch-making volume he proved conclusively from the papyri and the inscriptions that many of the seeming Hebraisms in the LXX and the NT were common idioms in the vernacular koine. He boldly claimed that the bulk of the Hebraisms were falsely so termed, except in the case of translating Gr from the Heb or Aram, or in "perfect" Hebraisms, genuine Gr usage made more common by reason of similarity to the Sem idiom. In 1897 he produced Neue Bibelstudien, sprachgeschichtliche Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Erklärung des Neuen Testaments.

In 1901 (2d ed in 1903) these two volumes were translated as one by A. Grieve under the title Bible Studies. The most important are New Light on the NT (1907), The Philology of the Gr Bible (1908), Licht vom Osten (1908), Light from the Ancient East (tr by Strachan, 1910), St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912). It illustrates the NT language with much detail from the papyri, ostraka and inscriptions. He is now at work on a new lexicon of the NT which will make use of the fresh knowledge from these sources.

The otherwise helpful work of E. Preuschen, Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (1908–10), fails to utilize the papyri and inscriptions while drawing on the LXX and the NT Apoc and other early Christian literature. But this has been done by Eheling in his Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zum NT, 1913. The next step was made by A. Thumb, the great philologist, in his Geschichte des Zeitalters des Hellenismus; Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der "koine," 1901, in which the real character of the koine was for the first time properly set forth.

Winer and Blass had both lamented the need of a grammar of the koine, and that demand still exists, but Thumb went a long way toward supplying it in this volume. It is to be hoped that he will yet prepare a grammar of the koine. Thumb's interests cover the whole range of comparative philology, but he has added in this field: "Die Forschungen über die hellenistische Sprache in den Jahren 1896–1901," "Archi für Papyrologie, II, 590 t, "Prinzipschriften der Koine-Forschung," Neue Jahrb. für das kl. Alt., 1906; "Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des biblischen Griech.", "Theologische Rundschau, V, 83–99;"

In 1909 appeared his essay, Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (see above). Since 1908, The Expositor has had a series of papers by J. H. Moulton and his co-workers, Milligan, Schmiedel, regarding the papyri, which are very useful on the lexical side of the language. Thus the study is fairly launched on its new career. In 1900, A. T. Robertson produced a Syllabus on the NT Gr Syntax, a point of departure for comparative philology, which was rewritten in 1908, with the added viewpoint of the papyri research, as A Short Grammar of the Gr NT (2d ed, 1909, 3d ed, 1912; translations in Italian in 1910, Ger. and Fr. in 1911, Dutch in 1912). In October, 1909, S. Angus published a good article in the Harvard Theological Review on "Modern Methods in NT Philology," followed in January, 1910, by another in the Princeton Review on "The koine, the Language of the NT." The new knowledge appears also in Jakob Wackernagel, "Die griechische Sprache" (pp. 291–482, 2d ed, 1892), Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache, 1907. L. Radermacher has set forth very ably the "sprachlichen Vorgänge in ihrem Zusammenhang," in his Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Die Griechische des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volksprache. It is in reality the background of the NT Gr and is a splendid preparation for the study of the Gr NT. A full discussion of the new knowledge of grammatical detail has been prepared by A. T. Robertson under the title A Grammar of the Gr NT in the Light of Historical Research (in press). Moulton and Schmiedel are planning also to complete their works.

The proof of the new position is drawn from several sources:

1. The papyri.—These rolls have lain in the museums of the world many years and attracted little attention. For lists of the chief collections of the papyri see Moulton, Prolegomena, 250–6; Milligan, Sestec New lections from the Gr Papyri, xi, xii; Position Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der P solderzeit; Latv- und Wortlehre, vii–x; Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 23–41; Robertson, Gospel of the NT, Bibliography. New volumes of papyri as a result of recent explorations in Egypt are published each year. See Papyrus, and in the other encyclopedias e.v. Most of the papyri discovered belong to the polder 4th to 7th centuries (AD and AD in round numbers), and with great wealth of illustration they show the life of the common people of the time, whether in Egypt or Herculaneum (the two chief regions represented). There are various degrees of culture shown, as can be seen in many of the large volumes of Grenfell and Hunt, and in the handbooks of Lietzmann, Griechische Papyri (1905), and of Milligan, Greek Papyri (1910). From the scrap-heaps of the long ages, and are mainly receipts, contracts, letters of business or love, military documents, etc. They show all grades of culture, from the illiterate with phonetic spelling to the man of the schools. But we have here the language of life, not of the books. In a most startling way one notes the similarities of vocabulary, and syntactic and grammatical language of the papyrus of the 1st century AD, and that of the NT books. As early as 1778, F. W. Sturz made use of the Chara Borgia, "the first papyrus ever brought to Europe" (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 29), and Thierisch has shown that in the papyrus the name of the papyri for the philology of the LXX. But the matter was not pressed. Lightfoot threw out a hint about the value of the people, which was not followed till Deissmann saw the point; of Moulton, Proleg., 242. It is not necessary here to illustrate the matter at length. Deissmann takes up in detail the "Biblical" words in Thayer's Lexicon, and has no difficulty in finding most of them in the papyri (or inscriptions). Thus these papyri have "a particular value as a proof of the papyri. See Deissmann, Bible Studies and Light from the Ancient East, for extensive lists. The papyri show also the same meanings for many words once thought peculiar to the Bible or the NT. An instance is seen in the excursus, in the papyri, δοσεῖσθαι τῇ κώμῃ, ho παρακληθῆσαι, in the papyri, δοσεῖσθαι τῇ κώμῃ (Pap. Lugd. A 351), "without doubt an official designation" (Deissmann, Bible Studies, 155). So διάλεξις, advocate, for members of the community, διανοητική, anastrophe, for manner of life, ἀποκαθίστα, antilepsis, "help," μεταγραφή, letoursia, "public service," γέρα, παράκλησις, "sojourner," etc (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 107). R. Helbing (Grammatik der Septuaginta, 1908) and H. St. John Chackery (A Grammar of the NT Gr to the LXX, 1909) have applied the new knowledge to the language of the LXX, and it has been discussed with much ability in the first volumes. The use of the papyrus for grammatical purposes is made easier by the excellent standard Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Polderzeit; Laut- und Wortlehre (1906), though his "Syntagmata" is still a desideratum. Useful also is G. Crünoner, Memoria Graecae Herculanensis (1903).

2. The ostraka.—The ostraka are on this subject still in small bulk. In 1899 Ulrich Wilcken published Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien, and in 1902 W. E. Crum produced his book of Christian ostraka called Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum, and Others. This was followed in 1905 by H. R. Hall's Coptic and Gr Texts of the Christian Period from Ostraka, Sela, etc. These broken pieces of pottery were used by the lowest classes as writing material. It was very widely used because it was so very cheap. Wilcken has done more than anyone else to collect and decipher the ostraka. Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 46) notes that Cleantus the Stoic "wrote on ostraka or on leather or on leather or on leather or on leather. So he quotes the apology of a Christian for using potsherd for a letter: "Excuse me that I cannot find papyrus as I am in the country" (Crum, Coptic Ostraca, 55). The use of ἀρχων, ἀρχιπόλις, on an ostrakon for a prince is full, and illustrates well the frequent use of this word in the NT (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 111).

3. The inscriptions.—Here caution must be used since many of the inscriptions give, not the vernacular, but the literary language. The official (legal and military) decrees often appear in very formal style. But a number do preserve the vernacular idiom and often have the advantage of being dated. These inscriptions are chiefly on stone, but some are on metal and there are a few wax tablets. The material is vast and is constantly growing. See list of the chief collections in Deissmann's Light from the Ancient East, 10–29. Boeckler is the great name here. As early as 1779 Walsh (Observationes in Matt. ex graecis inscriptionibus) made use of Greek inscriptions for NT exegesis, and R. A. Lipsius says that his father (K. H. A. Lipsius, author of Grammatikische Untersuchungen über die biblische Grammatik) "contemplated a large grammar of the Gr Bible in which he would have availed himself of the ancient volumes of inscriptions" (Deissmann, Light, etc., 15). Schmiedel has made good use of the inscriptions so far in his revision of Winer; H. A. A. Kennedy (Sources of NT Gr, 1895),
see the living stream of the NT speech as it has come on down through the ages. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of modern Gr vernacular in the knowledge of NT Gr. The disappearance of the optative, the vanishing of the infinitive, and the survival of many others which are luminous in the light of the modern Gr vernacular. See Pschiari, Essai de grammaire historique nécro-grecque (1886–89).

(6) Historical and comparative grammar.—From this source the koine gets a new dignity. It will take one too far afield to sketch here the linguistic revolution wrought since the publication of, and partly caused by, Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik (1857), following Sir Wm. Jones's discovery of Sanskrit. The great work of Brugmann and Delbrück (Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, I–V, 1892–1909) marks the climax of the present development, though many workers have won distinction in this field. The point to accent here is that by means of comparative philology the Gr language is seen in its proper relations with other languages of the Indo-Germanic family, and the right interpretation of case, preposition, mode, tense, voice, etc., is made possible. The old traditional empiricism is relegated to the second rank, and a new science consonant with the facts has taken its place. See Delbrück, Intro to the Study of Language (1882), Giles, Short Manual of Comparative Philology (1901), for a résumé of the facts. Wright, Comparative Grammar of the Gr Language (1912), applies the new learning to the Gr tongue. The progress in classical scholarship is well shown by Sandys in his History of Classical Scholarship (I–III, 1906–8) and by Gudeman, Geschichte der klass. Philologie, 2. Aufl., 1909. Innumerable monographs have enriched the lit. of this subject. It is now feasible to see the Gr language as a whole, and grasp its historical unity. Seen in this light the koine is not a dying tongue or a corrupt dialect. It is a normal and natural evolution of the Gr dialects into a world-speech when Alexander's conquests made it possible. The vernacular koine which has developed into the modern Gr vernacular was itself the direct descendant of the Attic vernacular which had its roots in the regional koine and was itself very great. The dialectical developments are closely sketched by Thumb, Handbuch der grieschischen Dialekte (1909), and by Buck, Intro to the Study of Gr Dialects (1910), not to mention the older works of Hoffmann, Meister, etc. Jannaris has undertaken Historical Gr Grammar (1897) to sketch and interpret the facts of the Gr tongue throughout its long career, both in its literary and vernacular aspects. He has succeeded remarkably well on the whole, though not quite seeing the truth about the modern Gr vernacular. Schanz is seeking to lay the foundation for still better work by his Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache (1882–). But the NT student must be open to all the new light from this region, and keep his hand very great. See, further, Dieterich, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache von der hellen. Zeit (1898).

As already indicated, the Gr of the NT is in the main just the vernacular koine of the 1st cent. AD, though Gr as used by men of ability and varying degrees of culture. The most striking difference between the vernacular koine and the literary Attic is seen in the vocabulary. The writer in the literary koine has an adequate likeness to the classic Attic, but even they reveal the changes due to the intervening centuries. There was, of course, no violent break. The changes came gradually and naturally. It is mainly at this point that Deissmann has done such
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is much increase in aorists like eirxf, escha, and
imperfects like elx", elcha. The form -o<rav, -osan
(elxoa-av, elchosan, ^(rxoo-av, Sschosan) occasionally
appears. Quite frequent is a perfect like S^SuKav,
dedokan, and the augment is often absent in the pluperfect as in SeSil>K€i, dedokei.
Per contra, a double
augment occurs in direKariaTri, apekateste, and a
The
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temporal augment is often absent with diphthong
The koine has
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-Toxrav, -tosan, not -vrav, -m,ton.
In syntax the
tendency is toward simplicity, to short sentences,
the paratactic construction, and the sparing use of
articles.
The vernacular koine avoids both the
E
ombast of Asianism and the artificiahty of Atticism. There is, indeed, more freedom in violating
the rules of concord as to gender, number, and case.
The nominativus pendens is conunon. The comparative does duty often for the superlative adjective, and the superlative generally has the elative
sense.
The accusative is increasingly common
with verbs. The fine between transitive and intransitive verbs is not a hard-and-fast one.
The
growth in the use of prepositions both with nouns
and in composition is quite noticeable, but some of
the older prepositions, like dp.(pl, amphi, are vanishing.
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changing. The instrmnental use of ^v, en, is very
common. Many new adverbial and prei)ositional
phrases have developed. The optative is nearly
dead and the infinitive (apart from the use of toO,
ton, iv Tijj, en td, ds rb, eis td, with the infinitive) is
decaying before iva, hina. The future part, is rare.
M^, mt, begins to encroach on oi, ou, with infinitives
and participles. The periphrastic conjugation is
specially common. The direct discourse is more
frequent than the indirect. The non-final use of
i'ra, hina, is quite noticeable.
There are, besides,
dialectical and provincial peculiarities, but these
do not destroy the real unity of the vernacular
koine any more than do individual traits of separate
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(Light from the Ancient East, 245) is disposed to
deny any literary quality to the
books save
the Ep. to the He. "The Ep. to the He shows us
Christianity preparing for a flight from its native
levels into the higher region of culture, and we are
conscious of the beginnings of a Christian worldliterature." He speaks of it also as "a work which
seems to hang in the background like an intruder
among the
company of popular books." One
feels that this is an extreme position and cannot
be justified by the facts. It is true that Peter and
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John were dypdp,paToi Kal ISiSrai, agrdmmatoi kai
idiolai (Acts 4 13), and not men of the schools,
but this was certainly not the case with Luke and
Paul

who were men

of literary culture in the truest

Luke and Paul were not

Atticists, but that
idiom did not represent the best type of
culture.
Deissmann admits that the NT has become literature, but, outside of He, he denies any

sense.

artificial

literary quality in its composition.
Paul, for instance, wrote only "letters," not "epistles."
But
and Eph confront us. See Milligan, Gr Papyri,
xxxi, for a protest against the sweeping statement
of Deissmann on this point. One need not go to
the extreme of Blass, Die rhythmisohe Komposition des Hebr. Briefes," Theol. Stvdien und Kritik,
1902, 420-61;
Die Rythmen der asiatischen und

Rom

romischen Kunstprosa,_ 1905, to find in Hebrews
and Paul's writings illustrations of the artificial
rules of the Asianists. There is undoubtedly
rhythm in Paul's eloquent passages (cf 1 Cor 13,
15), but it is the natural poetic quality of a soul
aflame with high passions, not conformity to rules
of rhetoric.

To deny

literary quality to

Luke and


Paul is to give a narrow meaning to the word "literary" and to be the victim of a theory. Christanity, and make use of the vernacular koine, the wonderful world-speak so providentially at hand. But the personal equation figured here as always. Men of culture differ in their conversation with literate men and more nearly approximate literary style. It is just in Luke, Paul, and the author of He that we discover the literary flavor of men of ability and of culture, though free from artificiality and pedantry. The eloquence of He is that of passion, not of the art of Asianism. Indeed all literary art in language is the use of material and in beauty of language. The Gospel of Jn has the rare elevation and dignity of the highest type of mind. There is no Atticist tendency in the NT as in Jos, Ant. There is no posing for the occasion, or for posterity. It is the language of life, the vernacular in the main, but rising at times from the very force of passion to high, plateau's of emotion and imagination and poet's grace from the pens of men of real ability, and in some instances of high culture.

III. The Semitic Influence.—It is no longer possible to explain every variation in the NT from the classic Attic by the term Hebraism. That easy solution has disappeared. Sooth to say, when the true character of the vernacular koine is understood, though not much left by the grammarians. The Gr as a rule is just normal koine. Milligan (Gr Papyri, xxx) admits on the part of Moulton "an overtendancy to minimize" the "presence of un-doubted Hebraisms, both in language and grammar." That is true, and is due to his strong reaction against the old theory of so many Hebraisms. The Semiticisms (Hebraisms and Aramaismus) are very natural results of the fact that the vernacular koine was used by Jews who read the Heb Bible and the LXX tr, and who also spoke Aram as their native tongue. The LXX, as tr of Gr, directly from the Heb (or Aram.), has a much greater number of these Semiticisms. See Swete, An Intro. to the OT in Gr (1900), for the salient facts. Thackery in his Grammar of the OT in Gr (1869) shows "the noun—the basis of Septuagint Gr." The matter varies in different parts of the LXX, but in all parts the Sem influence goes far beyond what NT the NT does not, of course, give a true picture of the Gr spoken by the Jews in Alexandria or in Pal. But the constant reading of the LXX was bound to leave its impress on the style of the people (of the King James Version and the Eng. language). This is not the number of Semiticisms, but, all things considered, the fewness of them. Luke, just because he was a Gentile and so noted the Hebraisms in the LXX, shows rather more of them than the other NT writers: of περιηήσασται (1 Cor. 16:8). Others are more of musical inflections of the Heb style, as in ἀραχθεῖν ἂν οὖν τών, ἀραχθεῖν εποίησεν τόν, rather than ἀραχθεῖν τοί, ἀραχθεῖν itin. But there is a certain dignity and elevation of style so characteristic of the Heb OT that reappears in the NT; The frequent use of καὶ, κατ., in parts of the NT reminds one of the LXX and the Heb way. There is, besides, an indelible tone in the NT that is found in the OT. Swete (Apostrophe of St. John, cxx) laments the tendency to depreciate unduly the presence of Hebraic skill in the NT. The Nov. Hebraisms may have swung too far away from the truth. It will strike the level, but we shall never again be able to fill our grammars and comm., with explanations of so many peculiar Hebraisms in the NT. On the whole the Gr NT is standard vernacular koine.

IV. Individual Peculiarities of NT Writers.—There is not space for an extended discussion of this topic. The fact itself calls for emphasis, for there is a wide range in style between Mark's Gospel and He, 1 Pet and Rom, Luke's Gospel and the Apocalypse. There are no Atticists found in the NT (cf 4 Mac in the LXX and Jos), but there are the less literary writings (Mt, Mk, the Johannine books, the other catholic epistles, and the more literary writings (Luke's writings, Paul's Epistles, Peter's He). But even so, no hard-and-fast line can be drawn. Moulton, Cambridge Biblical Essays, 454, thinks 2 Pet more like the Atticistic writings, "though certainly the Atticists would have seemed to own a book so full of 'solecisms.'" Moulton assumes that 2 Pet is pseudepigraphic, and does not credit the notion that the crude 'Babu' Gr, to use Abbott's term, may be Peter's own uncorrected style (of Acts 4, 15), while 1 Pet may have the smoothing effect of Silvanus' hand (cf 1 Pet & 12). A similar explanation is open concerning the grammatical lapses of the Apocalypse, since John is also called ἀραμαῖος, ἀραμαῖος, in Acts 4, 15, whereas the Gospel of Jn may have had the revision of the elders of Ephesus (cf Jn 21, 24). But whatever the explanation, there is no doubt of the wide divergences of style between different books and groups of books in the NT list. The Lukan, Johanne, Petrine, Pauline groups stand apart, but with relevances with each other. The Gr LXX, the Dead Sea Scroll, and the Greek Physicist, 1907; The Sayings of Jesus, 1908; The Acts of the Apostles, 1909; The Date of the Acts of the Apostles, 1911 has accepted and strengthened the contention of Hawkins (Horae Synopticae, 2d ed, 1909) and of Hauré (Medical Language of Luke, 1882) that the medical terms in the Gospel of Luke and of Acts show that the books were written by the same writer and that a physician, and so Luke. The diversities in style here and there are chiefly, due to the sources of information used. Even in the Pauline books, which form so well-marked a collection, striking diversities of language and style appear. But these letters cover a period of some 15 years of intense activity and mental and spiritual development, and treat a great variety of topics. They properly reflect the changing phases of Paul's preaching of the cross of Christ in different places and under varying circumstances and confronting ever fresh problems. The plays of Shakespeare are useful parallels. Even in Paul's old age, in the Pastoral Epistles the stamp of Paul's spirit is admitted by those who admit only Pauline fragments; cf J. Weiss, Beiträge zur Paulusrech Rhetorik (1897). The style is indeed the man, but the source is not the function of the subject, and style varies with different periods of a man's life. E. A. Abbott has made an excellent discussion of the Johannine Vocabulary.
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Literature

There were only two languages employed in the archetypes of the OT books (apart from an Egyptian or Pera or Gr word here and there), namely, Heb and Bib. Aram., both of which belong to the great family of languages known as Semitic.

I. The Semitic Languages.

The languages spoken in Southwestern Asia during the historical period dealt with in the Bible have been named Semitic, after the son of Noah from whom the majority of peoples speaking these languages—Arabs, Hebrews, Aramaeans and Assyrians (Gen 10 21 ff)—were descended. To show, however, that the description does not fit exactly the things described—the Elamites and Lydians having probably not spoken a Semitic language, and the Canaanites, including Phoenicians, with the colonists descended from those at Carthage and elsewhere in the Mediterranean coast lands, as well as the Abyssinians (Ethiopians), who did, being reckoned descendants of Ham (Gen 9 18; 10 6 ff)—the word is now generally written “Semitic,” a term introduced by Leich- horn (1757). These languages were spoken from the Caspian Sea to the S. of Arabia, and from the Mediterranean to the valley of the Tigris.

The following list shows the chief members of this family:

1. Members including the language of the Sabaean of Semitic (Himyaritic) inscriptions, as well as Family Ga‘ez or Ethiopic, Arab, is now spoken from the Caucasus to Zanibar, and from the East Indies to the Atlantic.
2. Members including Hebrew, old and new, Phoen, with Punic, and Mosabitish (language of MS).
3. Members including the language of the Syriac (language of Syrian Christians), language of Bab Tulm, Mandaean; (b) West or Palestinian Aram., of the Jews, Palestinian Talm (Gemara), Bib., Aram. (“Chaldean”), Samaritan, language of Nabataean inscriptions.

With the exception of a few chapters and fragments mentioned below, the OT is written entirely in Heb. In the OT itself this language is called “the Jews” (2 K 18 26. Name 28). In Isa 19 18 it is called poetically, what in fact it was, “the language of Bab (Heb “lip”) of Canaan,” in the appendix to the LXX of Job it is called Syrian; and in the introduction to Eccles it is for the first time—that is, in 130 BC—named Heb. The term Heb in the NT denotes the language of the OT in Rev 9 11, but in Jn 5 2; 19 13ff this term means the vernacular Aramaic. In other passages it is
doubtful which is meant. Jos uses the same name for both. From the time of the Tgs, Heb is called "the sacred tongue" in contrast to the Aram. of everyday use. The language of the OT is called Old Heb in contrast to the New Heb of the Mish., the rabbinic, the Spanish poetry, etc.

Of Old Heb the remains are contained almost entirely in the OT. A few inscriptions have been recovered, i.e., the Siloam Inscriptions, a Heb calendar, a large number of ostraka from Samaria, a score of pre-exile seals, and coins of the Macu bees and of the time of Vespasian and Hadrian.

LITERATURE.—E. Renan, Histoire générale et systémas comparé des langues sémitiques; F. Hommel, Die seimti Sprachen; the comparative grammars of Wright and Brockettman; CTS art. "Semitic Languages" in Enc Brit, and Murray's Illustrated Bible Diet.

II. History of the Hebrew Language.—Heb as it appears to us in the OT is in a state of decadence corresponding to the present position of spoken Arabic. In the earliest period it does not resemble the classical Arabic of the 7th and following centuries. The variations found between the various strata of the language occurring in the OT are slight compared with the difference between modern and ancient Arabic.

Heb was no doubt originally a highly inflected language, like classical Arabic. The noun had three cases, nom., gen., and acc., ending in en, im, am, respectively, as in the Sabaean inscriptions. Both vbs.

1. Oldest Form

and nouns had the same numbers (sing., dual, and pl.) and two genders, masc. and fem. In the noun the dual and pl. had two cases. The dual and 2d and 3d pers. pl. and 2d pers. sing. fem. of the impf. of the vb. ended in am. In the noun the endings um, um, am in the noun was dropped. The vb. had three moods, indicative, subjunctive, and jussive, ending in w, a, and - respectively; as well as many forms or stems, each of which had an active and passive voice.

In the Heb of the OT most of these inflexions have disappeared. Of the three cases of the noun only the acc. am has survived in a few adverbial forms, such as 'amly. The dual has entirely disappeared from the vb., and also from the noun, with the exception of things that occur in pairs, such as head, eye, which have no pl. The nom. case of the dual and pl. of the noun has disappeared, and the accusative case is used for both. Except in cases of poetic archaisms the final nān of the vb. has been lost, and, as the final vowels have fallen away in vbs., as well as in nouns, the result is that the jussive forms serve for indicative and subj. also. Many of the forms or stems have fallen into desuetude, and the passive forms of two alone are used.

One of the most remarkable facts connected with the Heb of the OT is that although certain facts, extends through a period of over 1,000 years, there is almost no difference between the earliest period and the latest. This phenomenon is susceptible of several explanations. In the first place, nearly the whole of the OT lies in religious or choral compositions, such as the earliest writings would become the model for the later, just as the Korān—the first prose work composed in Arab, which has survived—has become the pattern for all future compositions. The same is true for many centuries of the influence of Aristophanes and Euripides upon the language of educated Greeks, and, it is said, of the influence of Confucius upon that of the learned Chinese.

But a chief cause is probably the fact that the Sem languages do not vary with time, but with place. The Arab. vocabulary used in Morocco differs from that of Egypt, but the Arab. words used in each of these countries have remained the same for centuries—in fact, since Arab. began to be spoken in them. Similarly, the slight differences which are found in the various parts of the OT are to be ascribed, not to a difference of date, but to the fact that some writers belonged to the Southern kingdom, some to the Northern, some wrote in Pal., some in Babylonia (cf. Neh 13:23; Jgs 12:6; 18:3). The OT lit. falls into two main periods: that composed before and during the Bab exile, and that which falls after the exile. But even between these two periods the differences of language are comparatively slight, so that it is often difficult or impossible to say on linguistic grounds alone whether a particular passage is pre- or post-exilic, and scholars of the first rank often hold the most contrary opinions on these points. For instance, Dillmann places the so-called document P before D in the regal period, whereas most critics date D about 821 and P about 621.

It is needless to add that the various writers differ from one another in point of style, but these variations are infinitesimal compared with those of Gr and Lat authors, and are due, as has been said, not only to locality and environment, but to the style of Hosea is quite different from that of his contemporary Amos, and that of Deuter-Isa shows very distinctly the mark of its place of composition. A much more potent factor in modifying the language was the influence of foreign languages upon Heb, esp. in respect to vocabulary.

7. Foreign Influences

The earliest of these was probably Assy., which was -- from which Heb gained a large number of loan words. It is well known that the Bab script was used for commercial purposes throughout Southwestern Asia, even before the Heb. entered Canaan. By the time of Babylon upon Pal seems to have been greatly exaggerated. The main point of contact is in the mythology, which may have been common to both peoples. In the later, esp. post-exilic stages of the language, many Aramaisms are found in respect to syntax as well as vocabulary; and in later phases, Pers. and even Gr words are found.

As in other languages, so in Heb, the vocabulary of the poetical lit. differs from that of the prose writers. In Heb, however, there is not the hard-and-fast distinction between these two which obtains in the classics. Whenever prose becomes elevated by the importation of feeling, it falls into a natural rhythm which in Heb constitutes poetry. Thus most of the so-called prophetical books are poetical in form. Another mark of poetry is a return to archaic grammatical forms, esp. the restoration of the final nān vb. The form of Sem which was indigenous in the land of Canaan is sometimes called Middle Sem.

Before the Israelites entered the land of Canaan, there were no Hebrew-speaking Canaanites.[61] The first Hebrews who lived in Canaan were from the tribe of Gad (Num 32:34). The Hebrews were a Semitic-speaking people, and the Canaanites were the local inhabitants of Canaan. The Hebrews spoke a language related to the Arabic and Semitic languages, which were spoken in the region of Canaan at the time of the Israelites. The Hebrew language was used by the Israelites for religious and literary purposes, and it is believed that the Hebrew language was the first written language in the world. The Hebrew language was used for the composition of the Bible, and it is believed that the Hebrew language was the first written language to be used for religious and literary purposes. The Hebrew language was used for the composition of the Bible, and it is believed that the Hebrew language was the first written language to be used for religious and literary purposes. The Hebrew language was used for the composition of the Bible, and it is believed that the Hebrew language was the first written language to be used for religious and literary purposes.
and “Negeb” for the South, indicating Pal as the home of the language (so Isa 19:18).

As the aboriginal inhabitants of the land of Canaan were not Semites, we cannot infer the existence of the Hebrew language any earlier than the first immigrations of Semites into Pal, that is, during the third millennium BC. It would thus be a much younger member of the Sem family than Assy-Bab, which exhibits all the marks of great antiquity long before the Heb language is met with.

The Bab exile sounded the death-knell of the Heb language. The educated classes were deported to Babylon or fi ed to Egypt, and those who remained were not slow to adopt the language used by their conquerors.

11. When Hebraism Became a Sacred Language

The old Heb became a literary and sacred tongue, the language of every-day life being probably Aramaic. It is not improbable that the Heb language, reduced to a literary form, was used by the Maccabees, and by Bar Cochba (135 AD).

Literature.—Gesenius, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache z. Beschr. of Heb. Sprache in GE 2, 2d ed.; see also “Literature” in the following section.

III. Chief Characteristics of Hebrew.—The special marks which particularly distinguish a language may be found in its alphabet, in its mode of inflection, or in its syntax.

The Heb alphabet is characterized by the large number of guttural sounds which it contains, and these are not mere palatalizations of Scotch or Ger. ch, but true throat sounds, such as are not found in the Greek alphabet. The four gutturals occupy considerably more than a fourth part of the volume; the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three-fourths. Besides the guttural, there are four glottal fricatives, i.e., sounds which are produced with compression of the larynx, and are quite different from our t, k, and g. In Gr the first was softened into Ø, the other two were dropped as letters but retained as numerals.

Though the Heb alphabet comprises no more than 22 letters, these represent some 30 different sounds, for the 6 letters b, d, g, k, p and t, when they fall immediately after a vowel, are pronounced bh, dh, gh, kh, ph, and ch. Moreover, the gutturals và ð each represent two distinct sounds, which are still in use in Arabic. The letter h is sometimes sounded at the end of a word as at the beginning. A peculiarity of the Heb alphabet is that the letters are all consonants. Four of these, however, were very early used to represent vowel and diphthong sounds, namely, N, h, w and y. So long as Heb was a spoken language no other symbols than these 22 letters were used. It was not until the 7th cent. AD that the earliest that the well-known elaborate system of signs to represent the vowels and other sounds was invented (see Text).

4. The Syllable

The Hebrew language is that no word or syllable may begin with a vowel; every syllable begins with a consonant. This is also true of other Sem languages, except Assy-Bab. When in the course of word-formation a syllable would begin with a vowel, the slight consonant N is prefixed. Moreover, there was no vowel-series, the root of the word being prefixed with two vowels, two of which would not stand without vowels intervening, as in the Eng. word “strength.” At most, two consonants may begin a syllable, and even so a slight vowel is sounded between them, as iw. A word may end in two consonants without vowels, as�ٌن, but no word or syllable ends in more than two.

The outstanding feature of the Sem family of languages is the root, consisting of three consonants. Practically, the trilateral root is universal. There are a few roots with more than three letters, but many of the quadrilateral roots are formed by reduplication, as kakib in Arabic. Many attempts have been made to reduce these-root stems to two-letter by taking the factors common to several roots of identical meaning. Thus ָד, ָד, ָד, “to be still,” seem all to come from a root ָד. It is more probable, however, that the root is always trilateral, but may appear in various modifications.

From these trilateral roots all parts of the vb are formed. The root, which, it ought to be stated, is not the infinitive, but the 3rd sing. Conjugations of these, perfect, expresses the simple idea of the root in its primary meaning, as in גש, “he broke,” the idea of intensity is expressed by doubling the middle stem letter, as ָָָ, “he broke in fragments”; the passive is expressed by the w-vowel in the first place and the 2nd vowel in the last, as ָָָ, “it was broken.” The reflexive sense prefixes an n to the simple root, or a t the intensive, but the former of these is often used as a passive, as ָָָ, “it was broken,” ָָָָ, “he sanctified himself.” The causative meaning is given by prefixing the letter h, as ָָָָָ, “he was king,” ָָָָָ, “he caused one to be king.” A somewhat similar method of vb. building is found outside the Sem language, for example, in Turkish. In some of these Sem languages the number of formations is very numerous. In Heb also there are traces of stems other than those generally in use.

There are no tenses in Heb, in our sense of the word. There are two states, usually called tenses, the perfect and the imperfect. In the

7. Absence of tenses

First the action is regarded as accom-

8. The Pronouns

The Hebrew pronouns are expressed by affixing to the perfect, and by prefixing to the imperfect, fragments of the personal pronouns, as šhabart, “I broke,” šābharâ, “we broke,” šešbhar, “he has broken,” šešbharâ, “he will break,” or (in prothetic narrative) “he will break”; in the second, the action is regarded as uncompleted, “he will break,” “he was breaking,” “he is breaking,” etc. The present is often expressed by the participle.

The different pronouns are expressed by suffixing to the perfect, and by prefixing to the imperfect, fragments of the personal pronouns, as šhabart, “I broke,” šābharâ, “we broke,” šešbhar, “he has broken,” šešbharâ, “he will break,” and so on. The fragments which are added to the perfect to express the nominative of the pronouns are, with some modification, esp. the change of t into k, added to the vb. to express the accusative, and to the noun to express the genitive; for example, šabbharâ “you broke,” šešbharâ “he broke you,” šešbharâ “your house,” šešbharâ “we counted,” šešbharâ “he counted us,” šešbharâ, “our book.”

The same principles are followed in regard to the noun as to the vb. Many nouns in the middle of the three stem-letters articulated with one or with two vowels, except that monosyllables gen-
generally become dissyllabic, owing to the difficulty of pronouncing two vowelless consonants together; thus, melek, "angel," shaphir, "book," goren, "threshingfloor" (instead of makal, giphr, gorn), dabbah, "a word or thing," kribib, "near." Nouns denoting place, instrument, etc., are often formed by prefixing the "to" to the roorer as mishpat, "justice," from shaphat, "he judged," mazlith, "a fork." Intensity is given to the root idea, as in the vb., by doubling the middle consonant: thus, heresh, "working," herash (for harrash), "workman;" gonen, "stealing;" ganyab, "a thief." Similarly, words denoting invariable physical forces, titem, "dumb," twer, "blind," heroseh (for horrisheh), "deaf and dumb." The fem. of nouns, as of the 3d pers. of vbs., is formed by adding the letter א, which when final is softened to h, g'birath, "queen-mother," mistress," but g'hirath, "your mistress."

The inflexion of both vbs. and nouns is accompanied by a constant lengthening or shortening of the vowels of the word, and this inflexion according to two opposite lines. In inflexion vbs. with vowel-affixes the penultimate vowel disappears, as halak, "he went," kabbah, "they went;" in the noun the ante-penultimate vowel disappears, as dabbah, "a word." As the verbal system, as stated above, is very late, the vocalization cannot be accepted as that of the living tongue. It represents rather the cantillation of the synagogue; and for this purpose, accents, which had a musical as well as an interjunctural value, have been added.

Heb syntax is remarkable for its simplicity. Simple sentences predominate and are usually connected by the conjunction "and." Subordin- nate sentences are comparatively rare, but descriptive and temporal clauses are not uncommon. In the main narrative, the predicates are placed at the beginning of the sentence, first simply in the root form (3d sing. masc.), and then only when the subject has been mentioned does the predicate agree with it. Descriptive and temporal clauses may be recognized by their having the subject at the beginning (e.g. Gen 1 2). A curious turn is given to the narrative by the fact that in the main sentences, if the last predicate is perfect, those which follow are likewise perfect, and vice versa, the conjunction which coordinates them receiving a peculiar vocalization —that of the definite article. In the Eng. Bible, descriptive and temporal clauses are often rendered as if they were parts of the main sentence, for example, in the first verses of Gen of which the literal text is somewhat as follows: "At the beginning of God's creating heaven and earth, when the earth was without form and void, and God's spirit [or, a great wind] moved upon the face of the water, God said, Let there be light." It will thus be seen that the structure of Heb narrative is not so simple as it appears.

In the Sem languages, compound words do not occur, but this deficiency is made up by what is called the construct state. The old Syntax rule, that the second of two nouns of the Noun which depend on one another is put in the genitive, becomes, in Heb, the first of two such nouns is put in the construct state. Thus, the construct state loses the definite article, and all its vowels are made as short as possible, just as if it were the beginning of a long word: for example, ha-bayith, "the house," but beth ha-melekh, "the house of the king;" the palace," dabbah, "a word;" but dabbare ruah, "words of wind," windy words.

The Heb language is very poor in adjectives, but this is made up for by a special use of the construct state just mentioned. Thus to ex- press the "magnitude" of a word that is added in the gen. cas., as in the ex- "ample above (Gen 1 2), "a mighty wind" = a wind of God; Ps 36 6, "the lofty mountains" = the mountains of God (Ps 65 8); 50 10, "great obedient" = exalts of God; Ps 10, "a holy man" = a man of God; "the sacred box" = the ark of God, and so on; in the NT, Mt 27 54, "the son of God" = Lk 23 47, "a righteous man." Matthew was thinking in Aram., Luke in Gr. A similar use is made in classical Sem. = hard of neck; "impudent" = hard of face; "extensive" = broad of hands; "miserable" = bitter of soul.

LITERATURE.—The articles on the Heb Language in Schenkel's Bibel-wissen, 1878, by Nödtke; in HDB 9th ed., by Robertson Smith; 11th ed. by Nödtke; in the Imperial Bible Dict., 1866, by T. H. Weir, also those in HDB, E. B.

Grammars: A. B. Davidson's Elementary Hebrew Grammar and Syntax; Gesenius, Heb Grammar, BT by Cowley, 2d ed.


IV. Biblical Aramaic.—The Aram. portions of the OT are the following: Ezr 4 6—18; 7 11—26; Dn 2 4—7 28; Gen 31 47 (two words); Jer 10 11. The language in Portions of the OT which they are written to be called Chaldean, but is now generally known simply as Bib. Aram. It represents a further declension from classical Sem as compared with the Heb. The following are the principal points in which Bib. Aram. differs from Heb.

The accent is placed on the last syllable, the first vowel disappearing, e.g. 'ab'hadh for Heb 'abbad. It is curious that the same feature is found in Algerian and Moroccan Arabic: thus 'aazw for kasw, 'a saa for saab, 'a zîd for za'dîd; télîtf for shâlîsh. The strong Heb Û frequently becomes Ú, and Ù becomes Ú: thus, 'orá for 'ere; 'âč for 'âš. In Heb the definite article is the prefix ha- (ha-); in Aram. the affix a-; the latter, however, has almost lost its force. The dual is even more

3. Grammar sparsely used than in Heb. The passive forms of vbs. and those beginning with nàn are practically wanting; the passive or redemptive forms are made by prefixing the letter t to the corresponding active forms, and that much more regularly than in Heb, there being three active and three passive forms.

In regard to syntax there is to be noted the frequent use of the part, instead of a finite vb., as in Heb, the disuse of the conjunction and, with the vocalization of the article; and the disuse of the construct state in nouns, instead of which a circumlocution with the relative di is employed, e.g. c'mim di dhabh, "an image of gold." The same periphrasis is found also in West African Arabic.

It will thus be seen that if Heb represents a dec- ceiling which was very similar to classical Arabic, Aram. Bib. Arab. stands at a still lower level. It is not to be supposed that More Dec- cadent than Heb passed into Aram., though on the Hebrew analogy of Arab, that view is not un- tenable. Rather, the different Sem languages became fixed at different epochs. Arab. as a literary language crystallized "out of the source; Heb and the spoken Arab, of the East far
down the stream; and Aram. and Moroccan Arsh. farthest down of all.

LITERATURE.—Kautzsch, Grammatik: Strack, Abriss
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II. Evidence Favoring Epistle to Ephesians.

1. Marcion's Opinion

Marcion, the heretic, was the first to deny the epistle to the Ephesians. He wrote that the apostle Paul did not know of the Laodiceans, and that the letter was written by a later apostle. This opinion was later adopted by Tertullian, who asserted that the epistle was written by the apostle to the Laodiceans. But this is not the case, as the epistle to the Ephesians clearly addresses the Laodiceans.

2. References in Ephesians and Other Epistles

The epistle to the Ephesians makes frequent references to the Laodiceans, and these references are consistent with the Epistle to the Laodiceans. The apostle Paul also mentions the Laodiceans in his letter to the Colossians, which is evidence that he was familiar with the Laodiceans.

3. Authenticity

The epistle to the Ephesians is a genuine epistle, written by the apostle Paul. The references to the Laodiceans are consistent with the context of the epistle, and there is no evidence to suggest that the epistle to the Laodiceans was written by anyone other than the apostle Paul.

4. Apocryphal Epistles

The only other alternative is that “the epistle to the Ephesians” is an apocryphal epistle. This is not the case, as the references to the Laodiceans are consistent with the context of the epistle, and there is no evidence to suggest that the epistle to the Ephesians was written by anyone other than the apostle Paul.

II. Evidence Favoring Epistle to Ephesians.—

But is there any evidence for concluding that it is not? A statement of the facts of the case seems to show that the epistle to the Ephesians was not written by the apostle Paul.

1. Marcion's Opinion against Marcion in this respect. It is not likely, says Moule (Eph, 25), "that Marcion was guilty here, where the change would have served no dogmatic purpose."

2. References in Ephesians and Other Epistles.

The references to the Ephesians in the epistle to the Laodiceans are consistent with the context of the epistle, and there is no evidence to suggest that the epistle to the Ephesians was written by anyone other than the apostle Paul.

The “Ep. to the Eph.” could not, primarily at least, be addressed to Ephesians, because Paul speaks of his readers as persons in regard to whose conversion from heathenism to the faith of Christ he had just recently heard: “For this cause I also, having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and what ye have heard from me both by word and epistle” (Eph 1 15 f). These words could not well be addressed to the church at Ephesus, which Paul himself had founded, and in reference to persons among whom he had lived for three years, and who he even knew personally “every one” of the Christians (Acts 20 31).

And in Eph 3 1 f AV, he writes: “For this cause I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward.” But how could he ever doubt that the elders of the church in Ephesus (Acts 20 17), as well as the members of that important church, were ignorant of the fact that a dispensation of the grace of God had been given to him? The inquiry, whether his readers had heard of the one great fact, does not in his mind carry over to his readers in Ephesus, for his church in Ephesus would be too well informed to need to be told of this great fact. But he knew the readers well, and could not describe the members of the church in Ephesus. “It is plain,” writes Moule (Eph, 26),
“that the ep. does not bear an Ephesian destination on the face of it.”

In the Ep. to the Cor there are many local references, as well as allusions to the apostle’s work in Corinth. In the Ep. to the Gal there are also many references to his work among the people of the churches in Galatia. The same is the case in the Ep. to the Phil. several names being mentioned of persons known to the apostle. In the two Epps. to the Thess, references also occur to his work among them.

Turning to the Ep. to the Col, and to that to the Rom—Colosse and Rome being cities which he had not visited previous to his writing to the churches there—he knows several persons in Colosse; and in the case of the Ep. to the Rom, he mentions by name no fewer than twenty-six persons in that city.

How is it then that “the Ep. to the Eph” there are no references at all to the three years which he spent in Ephesus? And how also is there no mention of any one of the members of the church or of the elders whom he knew so intimately and so affectionately? “Ephesians” is inexplicable on the ordinary assumption that Ephesus was the city to which the ep. was addressed.

The other theory, that the ep. was a circular one, seems in the first instance to Laodicea, involves no such difficulty.

Another indication in regard to the primary destination of the ep. is in the words, “ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Circumcision by that circumcision that is called Church Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands; that ye were at that time separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope, and without God in the world!” (Eph 2.11.12).

Do these words describe the church in Ephesus? Was the church there gentile in its origin? Very far from this, for as a matter of fact it began by Paul preaching the gospel to the Jews, as is narrated at length by Luke in Acts 18. Then in Acts 19, Paul comes again to Ephesus, where he went into the synagogue and spake boldly for the space of three months, but when divers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of the Way before the multitude, he separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus.

Here, therefore, is definite proof that the church in Ephesus was not gentile in its origin. It was distinct from the synagogue, but a gentlelement had been received into it. Now the church to which Paul writes “the Ep. to the Eph” was not Jewish at all. He does not speak to his readers in any other way than “you Gentiles.”

But an important consideration is that the “Ep. to the Eph” was written by Paul at the same sitting almost as that to the Col. These two epistles are sister epistles, and these along with Col. The Ep. to Philem were written andEpistles sent off at the same time, Onesimus and Tychicus carrying the ep. to the Col. (Col 4.7.8.9), Onesimus being the bearer of that to Philem, while Tychicus in addition to carrying the Colossian ep. was also the messenger who carried “the Ep. to the Eph” (Eph 6.21)

A close scrutiny of Col and “Eph” shows, to an extent without a parallel elsewhere in the epp. of the NT, a remarkable similarity of phraseology. There are only two verses in the whole of Col to which there is none parallel in Eph. The same words are used, while the thought is so similar, and so rich, that the one ep. is in no sense a copy or repetition of the other (see list of parallelisms, etc., in St. Paul’s Epp. to Colossae and Laodicea. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh). Both epp. come warm and instinct with life from the full heart of the great apostle who had not, up to that time, visited either city, but on whom, none the less, there came daily the care of all the churches.

To recapitulate: (1) The words “at Ephesus” in the inscription of the ep. are wanting in the two oldest and chief manuscripts of the MSS., and is as if Paul had written it as if none, or only a single epistle, as persons of whose conversion to Christ he knew only by report. (2) The ep. is the only one in which he speaks of them as knowing only by hearsay of his commission as an apostle of Christ. Also, though he had stayed there for three years, this ep. does not contain a single salutation. (3) He speaks of his readers as forming a church exclusively of Gentiles. But the church in Ephesus being exclusively gentile, was actually Jewish in origin. (4) “Eph” was written at the same sitting as Col, and the same messenger, Tychicus, carried them both. Therefore as the ep. was not, and could not be, addressed to Ephesus, the conclusion is that it was addressed to some church, and that it was not a treatise sent to the Christian church generally. The words of the first verse of the ep., “to the saints that are,” proves that the name of the place to which it was addressed is all that is lost from the MSS., but that no other explanation is possible but that they came warm from the heart of the same writer at the same time. The conclusion seems inevitable that the ep. to Laodicea is not lost at all, but that it is identical with the so-called Ep. to the Eph.

III. Laodicea Displaced by Ephesus.—How then did Ephesus displace Laodicea? It is explained at once if the theory is adopted that the epistle was a “circular” one addressed not to Laodicea only, but to other cities. We know e.g. that the apostle orders it to be taken to the church in Colosse and read there. So also it might have been sent to other cities, such as Hierapolis (Col 4.13) and Ephesus. Hence if the church in Laodicea were not careful to see that the ep. was returned to them, by those churches to whom they had sent it, it can easily be understood how a copy of this in any of those cities might leave out the words “in Laodicea,” as not agreeing with the name of the city where the MSS. actually was at the time the copies were multiplied, the words “in Ephesus” would be suggested, as the name of the chief city of Asia, from which province the ep. had come to the knowledge of the whole Christian church, and to which, in point of fact, Paul, in his instructions, that it was in keeping with the fitness of things, that Paul, who had founded the church in Ephesus, should have written an ep. to the church there.

In an article upon “Marcion and the Canon” by Professor J. Kent Harris, LL.D., in the Eos for T, June, 1907, there is reference to the Revue Biblique for January of that year, which contained a remarkable article by de Bruyne, entitled “Biblical Prologues of Marcionite Origin,” and which succeeded in showing that a very widely spread series of prologues to the Pauline Epp., which occur in certain Lat Bibles, must have been taken from the Marcionite Bible. Professor Render Harris adds that the prologues in question are not invented by Marcion himself, for in any case the Marcionite hand, from which they come, antedates the first edition of which the prologues are imitated. “It is clear from Tertullian’s polemic against Marcion, that the Pauline Epp. were known to Marcion. He in the following order in the Marcionite Canones: Gal. 1 and Col. Rom. 1 and 2 Thess, then Eph (which Marcion calls by the name of the ep. to the Laodiceans), Col. Phil., and Philem. In the following order: Gal., Rom., Col., Phil., and Philem. Also T, T. Clark, Edinburgh, has prologues that are current in Vulg and other MSS. for Eph and Col.: the Ephesian prologue, he says, was added to suit some Lat. edition, but he regards it as of Marcionite origin. However, we turn to our present prologue, we find that it opens as follows: ‘Colossenses et Ephesios, it tum Laodiceens et Asiae sunt. Hi accipio verbo veritatis perseverantium, et his in singulas epistolas reddam erat apostolae, nec ad hos accessit apostolae sed ut vos per epistolam corrigatur.” etc.

From this it is clear that originally the prologue to the Laodiceans preceded the prologue to Col, and that the
Ephesian prologue is a substitute for the Laodicean prologue, which can be partly reconstructed from the references in the Colossian prologue. We can see that there was a statement that the Laodiceans belonged to Asia, had never been under the influence of false apostles, and had never been visited by St. Paul, who corrects their error by an epistle.

IV. Reason for Such an Epistle.—Assuming therefore that the “Ep. to the Eph.” is the epistle which Paul wrote to the Laodiceans, various questions arise, such as, Why did he write to the church there? What was there in the state of the church in Laodicea to call for an epistle from him? Was there any heresy there, like the false teaching which existed in the neighboring church in Colossae?

The answer to such questions is that though we do not possess much information, yet these churches in the province of Asia had many things in common. They had originated at the same time, during the two whole years of Paul’s residence in Ephesus. They were composed of men of the same race, and speaking the same language. They were subject to the same influences of direction error. The errors to which any one church fell could not fail to affect the others also. These churches, then, required the same apostolic instruction and exhortation. This epistle, accordingly, bears a close resemblance to the Colossian, just for the reason that the circumstances of the church in Laodicea were similar to those of the church in Colossae; and also, that the thought of which Paul’s heart was filled as he wrote to Colossae, were adapted, in the first place, to counteract the false teaching which they also are the foundation of all Christian experience, and the very life of all Christian doctrine and truth. These are the great thoughts of the Church of all things. Christ the Reconciler of all things, Christ the Reconciler of all things, Christ the Reconciler of all things.

Note.—A very remarkable circumstance in regard to the apocryphal Ep. to the Laodiceans is mentioned by Nestle in the preface to his edition of the Lat. NT, published in Stuttgart in 1906. He writes that “the Ep. to the Laodiceans was for a thousand years part of many large Bible, and obtained a place in the Lutheran Ger. Bibles, together with Jerome’s Ep. to Damascus.”

John Rutterford

LAP: The word is the tr of three different Heb. expressions: פְּלֵעָה (Prov. 15:38), פּלְפָּה (2 K 4:39), and פּלְפָּה (Jer. 15:13), besides פֹּלְפָּה (Ps. 9:7). In all these passages the meaning is that of a part of oriental clothing, probably the folds of the garment covering the bosom or lap of a person. The flowing garments of Orientals invite the use of the same, on the part of speakers, in driving home certain truth or truths emunated by such a vehicle of expression. Every reader of Roman history recalls the impressive incident of Quintus Fabius Maximus (Cunctator), who, in 219 BC, was ambassador of Rome to Carthage, and who, before the city council, held the folds of his toga in the shape of a closed pouch, declared that he held enclosed in the same both peace and war, whichever the Carthaginians should desire to choose. When the Carthaginians clamored for war, he opened the folds of his garment and said: “Then you shall have war, just as you like it, Nehemiah, when pleading for united efforts for the improvement of social order, addressed the priests of Jerusalem to get a pledge of their cooperation: Also I shook out my lap (ךֹּקָה), and said, So God shake out every one from his house, and from his labor, that performeth not this promise; even thus be he shaken out, and emptied” (Neh. 5:13).

In EV the vb. “to lap” is found, which has no etymological connection with the above-mentioned nouns. It is in Heb פְּלֵעָה, “to lap,” and refers to the loud licking up of water by dogs (1 K. 21:19; 22:38 AV), and in the story of Gideon’s battle against the Midianites, of his 300 warriors (Jgs 7:5 f).

H. L. E. Loring

Lappidoth, lap’idoth, -dith (םַלְפָיָה, לֵפֶדָה, -ילפִּדָה, לָפֵית, לָפֵית; AV Lappidoth): Deborah’s husband (Jgs 4:4). The Heb name is a fem. pl. like Jeremiah (1 Ch 7:8), Naboth (1 K 21:1). The pl. is probably intensive. Jewish interpreters have identified Lappidoth (“flames”) with Barak, whose name is so vented by the same ideas, derived both from the current philosophy and from their ancestral heathen religions. They would, therefore, on the same principle require the same apostolic instructions and exhortation. This epistle, accordingly, bears a close resemblance to that in which he had just written to Colossae.

It is no more astonishing that Paul should have written to Laodicea, than that he also wrote to Colossae, which was probably the least important of all the cities and churches mentioned in the apostle’s work and career. Neither is it any more to be wondered at that he should have written so profound an epistle as that to “the Eph.” than he should have directed directions that it be sent on to Colossae and read there; for this reason, that the exposition of Christ’s great love to the church of Colossae and His giving Himself for it—the doctrine of the grace of God—is the very correction which he required for the Laodicite Laometricians, who, as the chief of all the other Colossians, and is also the groundwork of Christian truth and experience for all ages.

Lasciviousness, la-siv’i-ous-ness (κεφονία, aselgeia, “licentiousness,” “wantonness,” “unbridled lust,” “shamelessness,” “outrageousness”):

Etyologists assign three probable sources of aselgeia, viz.: (1) from a compound of a priv. and πεπληροφορήσαν, a Pelidian city, the seat of commerce to Thayer (NT Lexicon) “excelled in strictness of morals,” but according to Trench a place whose inhabitants were notorious for their vices; (2) from a compound of a priv. and πεπληροφορήσαν, “inhabitants of Théba,” “exciting delight or displeasure.” It evidently means conduct and character that is unbecoming, indecent, unattractively shameless.

MK uses it in 7:22 with uncertainty as to the vice meant. Paul (2 Cor 12:21) classes it with uncleanness and fornication as sins to be avoided; also (Gal 5:21). Very much in the NT 14:26, “wantonness”) puts it in the same catalogue with other works of the flesh; and (Eph 4:19) he refers to some aged ones so covetous that they made trade of themselves by giving themselves up to lasciviousness.

The same word is ταράτος “lasciviousness” in Rom 13:13, meaning wanton manner, filthy words, unchaste movements of the body. Peter (1 Pet 3:3) mentions those who “walk in lasciviousness, lusts,锄marchings, revellings, and wanton idolatries.” He speaks (2 Pet 2:2) of “pernicious doings” (AV “pernicious ways”); (2:7) “lascivious life” (AV “filthy conversation”); and (2:18) of “lasciviousness” (AV “wantonness”), as a means “to entice in the lusts of the flesh.” Jude ver 4 probably does not refer to any form of sensuality in using the word descriptive of “ungodly men”
who perverted the faith of some and denied our only Master.

WILLIAM EDWARD RAFFETY

LASEA, la-sē'a (Lāsā; Lāsāa): A town on the S. coast of Crete, 5 miles E. of Fair Havens (Acts 27 8). The ruins were examined in 1856 by Rev. G. Brown (see CH [St.P], ch xxii, 640). If St. Paul's ship was detained long at this anchorage, it would be necessary to purchase stores from Lasea; and this in addition to the inconvenience of the roadstead (see Fair Havens) would probably explain the captain's reluctance to winter there.

LASHA, la'sha (לָשָׁה, lāsha): A place named on the southern boundary of the Canaanites along with Gomorrah, Adnah and Zeboim (Gen 10 19). Onom identifies it with the hot springs at Callirrhoe in Wady Zerqa Ma'an, on the E. of the Dead Sea; in this agreeing with Tg Jerus. This position, however, seems too far to the N., and possibly the site should be sought on the W. of the Arabah. The absence of the article (cf Josh 15 2) prevents identification with the promontory el-Lisan, which runs into the sea from the eastern shore. Wellhausen (Comentatio II, 15) thinks we should read לָשָׁה, Lasha, as the letters ז and ש are like each other in their Palmyrene form. We should then have indicated the boundary from Gaza to the Dead Sea, and then from the Dead Sea to Leshem, i.e. Dan. This is very precarious. No identification is possible.

W. Ewina

LASSHARON, la-shā'rōn, la-shā-rōn (לָשָׁרָן, lāshārān or la-shārōn, AV Sharon): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua, named with Aphek (Josh 12 18). Possibly we should here follow the reading of LXX (B), "the king of Aphek in Sharon." Onom (s.v. "Saron") mentions a region between Mt. Tabor and the Lake of Tiberias called Sarona. This is probably represented by the ancient site Sarona, on the plateau 61 miles S.W. of Tiberias. If MT is correct, this may be the place intended.

LAST DAY. See Day, Last.

LAST DAYS. See eschatology of the OT.

LATE, TIMES (κατά τοὺς ἐξήγαγον, κατά τοὺς ἐσχάτους, χρόνους ἐξήγαγον, χρόνους ἐσχάτους [also pl.], ἐξήγαγον τοῦ χρόνου, ἐσχατὸν τοῦ χρόνου, ἐσχατῶν τῶν χρόνων, διὰ τοῦ ἐσχάτου χρόνου, διὰ τοῦ ἐσχάτου χρόνου): In AV this phrase occurs in 1 Pet 1 5; 1 Pet 2 10 (pl.); 1 Jn 2 18; Jude ver 18; RV has, in 1 Pet 1 20, "at the end of the times," and in 1 Jn 2 18, "the last hour," in closer adherence to the Gr. The conception is closely allied to that of "the last day," and, like this, has its root in the OT conception of "the end of days." In the OT this designates the entire eschatological period as that which the present course of the world is to issue into, and not, as might be assumed, the closing scene of history. It is equivalent to what was later called "the coming aeon" (see eschatology of the NT). In the NT, on the other hand, the phrase "the last time" does mark the concluding section of the present world-period, of the present age. In three of the NT passages the consciousness expresses itself that these "last times" have arrived, and that the period extending from the appearance or the resurrection of Christ until His Second Coming is the closing part of the present age, that the writer and readers are living in the last passage (1 Pet 1 5) "the last time" is projected farther forward into the future, so that it comes to mean the time immediately preceding the reappearance of Christ. Both usages can be readily explained. The days of the Messiah were to the OT writers part of the future world, although to the later Jewish chiasmus they appeared as lying this side of it, because differing from the world to come in their earthly and temporal character. To the early Christians the days of the Messiah appeared more closely assimilated in character to the future world, so that no reason existed on this score for not including them in the latter. Still it was also realized that the Messiah in His first appearance had not brought the full realization of the coming world, and that only His return from the dead would consummate the kingdom of God. Accordingly, the days in which they lived assumed to them the character of an intermediate period, marked off on the one hand from the previous development by the appearance of the Messiah, but equally marked off from the coming aeon by His reappearance in glory. From a formal point of view the representation resembles the Jewish chiasmatic scheme, but with a twofold substantial difference: (a) the chiasmatic scheme restricts the Messiah and His work to the last days, and does not carry Him over into the coming world, whereas to the Christian the coming world, no less than the last days, is thoroughly Messianic; (b) to the Jewish point of view both the days of the Messiah and the coming world are future, whereas to the Christian the former have already arrived. It remained possible, however, from the Christian point of view to distinguish within the last times themselves between the immediate present and the future conclusion of his period, and this is done in 1 Pet 1 5. Also in 1 Jn 2 18 the inference that "the last hour" has come is not drawn from the presence of the Messiah, but from the appearance of the anti-Christian power, so that here we also a more contracted conception of the last stage of history reveals itself, not only as future (1 Pet 1 5), but as present (hence "hour" not "time").

For literature see Eschatology of the NT.

GEERHARDUS VOS

LASTHENES, las-the-nes (Λάσθηνης, Lasthēnēs): A highly placed official under King Demetrius II, Nicator. He is called the king's "kinsman" (AV "kousin") and "father" (1 Mac 51 32, Jos, Ant, XIII, iv, 9), but these are to be taken as court titles rather than as denoting blood-relationship. According to Jos (Ant, XIII, iv, 3) he was a native of Crete, and raised an army for the king when he made his first descent upon the coast, and rendered him ultimately successful in his campaign. He was sent by Syria from Alexander Balas (1 Mac 10 67; Ant, XIII, iv, 3). The letter addressed to L. indicates that he was probably prime minister or grand vizier of the kingdom.

J. HUTCHISON

LATCHET, lāch'et (לַחַט, ṭōch; μπέτ, himēs): Leather thong used for tying on sandals (see Gen 14 23; Mk 1 7)). The stooping to the dusty shoe-latchet was esteemed by Orientals a service that was at once petty and degrading, and was usually assigned to menials.

LATIN, lat'in: Was the official language of the Rom Empire as Gr was that of commerce. In Pal Aram. was the vernacular in the rural districts and remoter towns, while in the leading towns both Gr and Aram. were spoken. These facts furnish the explanation of the use of all three tongues in the inscription on the cross of Christ (Mt 27 37; Mk 15 26; Lk 23 38; Jn 19 19). Thus the charge was written "in the legal language, and was technically regular as well as recognizable by all classes of the people. The term "Latin" occurs in the NT only in Jn 19 20, Παμψιλία (Pamysila), and in Lk 23
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Latin Version, Old

38. Ἰωάννης (Ἰώαννης), Ῥήματος (ῥήματος), according to Ἀ. Ν. ADN. It is probable that Tertullian made his plea against Paul before Felix (Acts 24) in Lat., though the Gr. was also used in such provincial courts by grace of the judge. It is probable also that Paul knew and spoke Lat. of W. M. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, 65, and A. Soutter, "Did Paul Speak Lat?" Expos, April, 1911. The vernacular Lat. had its own history and development with great influence on the ecclesiastical terminology of the West. See W. Bury, "The Holy Latin Tongue," Dublin Review, April, 1906, and Römisch, Itala und Vulgata, 1874, 480. There is no doubt of the mutual influence of Gr. and Lat. on each other in the later centuries. See W. Schulze, Graeca Latina, 1891; Vieriek, Sermo Graecus, 1888.

It is doubtful if the Lat. syntax is clearly perceptible in the koine (see LANGUAGE OF THE NT).

Delissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 117 f.) finds ἐν ὑπ' ἐνθεοτοκοῦ, ὑπ' ἐνθεοτοκίῳ (in Deut. 17:3), ἀνα γένος, ἀνα γένεσιν, ἀνα γένεσις (of 1 K 12:35). The papyrus (21st AD) give ἀνα γένους, ἀνα γεγενήσεις (cf. Lk 12:35). The papyri (21st AD) and the Epistles (cf. Lk 12:35) show a intercourse of the words, their relationship suggesting a development from the Greek and a natural conformity to the Lat. The idea is based on the belief that there is a parallelism in the use of these words. It may be that the Greek idea of having a parallelism is reflected in the idea of having a parallelism in the use of these words.

Besides the NT, there are Lat. translations of the OT in the 4th century. The oldest is the Vulgate of Jerome (c. 398-420), which was a revision of the earlier Latin translations. The Vulgate was the most widely used translation in the West until the 16th century. It was translated from the Hebrew and Greek texts, and it was the first translation to be printed in the Latin language. The Vulgate was used by the Roman Catholic Church and was the basis for most of the later Latin translations.

2. The Vulgate, with its many revisions and corrections, has become the standard Latin translation of the Bible. The Vulgate was the first translation to be printed in the Latin language, and it was the basis for most of the later Latin translations. The Vulgate was used by the Roman Catholic Church and was the basis for most of the later Latin translations.

3. The Latin Bible before Jerome

4. First Used in North Africa

5. Cyriac's Bible

6. Tertullian's Bible

7. Possible Eastern Origin of Old Latin

8. Classification of Old Latin MSS

9. Individual Characteristics of Old Latin MSS

10. Value of Old Latin for Textual Criticism

LITERATURE

The claim of Christianity to be the one true religion has carried with it the beginning of the Bible. It is the first history of the Bible, to make its holy Scriptures.

The claim containing the Divine message of salvation and life eternal, known to all Translation. Accordingly, wherever the first Christian evangelists carried the gospel beyond the limits of the speaking world, one of the first requirements of their work was to give the newly evangelized peoples the record of God's revelation of Himself in their mother tongue. It was through the LXX tr of the OT that the great truths of revelation first became known to the Gr. and Rom world. It is generally agreed that, as Christianity spread, the Syr and the Lat VSS were the first to be produced; and tr's of the Gospels, and of other books of the Old and NT in Gr, were the result of attempts of the later centuries before the close of the 2nd century.

The earliest translators of the Bible into Lat. no record has survived. Notwithstanding the careful investigation of scholars in recent years, there are still many questions relating to the origin of the Bible to which only tentative and provisional answers can be given. It is therefore more convenient to begin a study of the influence of the Latin languages on the Bible in the 4th century. See LITERATURE, vol. 4, chs. 24, 25, and 26.

The need for such a version was imminent. There existed by this time a multiplicity of Gr. differing from one another, and there was none possessed of commanding authority to which appeal might be made in case of necessity. It was the consideration of the chaotic condition of the existing tr's, with their divergences and variations, which moved Damasus to commission Jerome to his task and Jerome to undertake it. We learn particulars from the letter of Jerome in 383 transmitting to his patron the first installment of his revision, the Gospels. "I have compiled," he says, "a new work out of an old so that after so many copies of the Scriptures have been dispersed throughout the whole world I am as it were to occupy the post of arbiter, and seeing they differ from one another I am able to determine which of them are in agreement with the original Gr." Anticipating attacks from critics, he says, further, "If they maintain that confidence is to be reposed in the Lat. expositors, let them answer which, for there are almost as many copies of the Lat. as of the Gr. and any one may be sought from the majority, whether gr are not rather go back to the Gr. original, and correct the blunders which have been made by incompetent translators, made worse rather than better by the presumption of unskilful correctors, and added to or altered by careless comparison of old Gr MSS."

From Jerome's contemporary, Augustine, we obtain similar pictures of the translation into Gr. "He says (De Doctrina Christiana, i,11), 'can be numbered, but Lat. translators by no means. For whenever, in the first ages of the faith, a Gr. MS came into the hands of anyone who had also a little skill in both languages, he made bold to translate it forthwith.' In the same context he mentions "an innumerable variety of Lat transla-
tors," "a crowd of translators." His advice to readers is to give a preference to the Itala, "which is more faithful in its renderings and more intelligible in its sense." What the Itala is, has been greatly discussed. Formerly it was taken to be a summary designation of all the VSS before Jerome's time. But more recently it has been urged that it is a more specific name, and that it strongly urges the view that this term Augustine designates Jerome's Vulgate, which he might quite well have known and preferred to any of the earlier trs. However this may be, whereas before Jerome there were those numerous trs. of which he and Augustine complain, after Jerome there is the one predominant and commanding work, produced by him, which in course of time drove all others out of the field, the great Vulgate edition, as it came to be called, of the complete Lat Bible.

We are here concerned with the subject of the Lat Bible before the time of Jerome. The MSS which have survived from the earlier period are known by the general designation of Old Latin. When we ask where these first trs. came into existence, we discover a somewhat surprising fact. It was not at Rome, as we might have expected, that they were first noticed. The fullest list shows that Rome was mainly Gr., down to the 3d cent. St. Paul wrote the Ep. to the Rom. in Gr. When Clement of Rome in the last decade of the 1st cent. wrote an ep. in the name of the Roman church to the Corinthians, he wrote in Gr. Justin Martyr, and the heretic Marcion, alike wrote from Rome in Gr. Out of 15 bishops who presided over the Roman see down to the close of the 2d cent., only four have Lat names. Even the pagan emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his Meditations in Gr. If there were Christians in Rome at that period whose only language was Lat, they were not sufficiently numerous to be provided with Christian literature; at least none has survived.

It is from North Africa that the earliest Lat literature of the church has come down to us. The church of North Africa early received a baptism of blood, and could point to an illustrious roll of martyrs. It has also a distinguished group of Lat authors, whose Lat might sometimes be rude and mixed with foreign idioms, but had a power and a fire derived from the truths which it set forth.

One of the most eminent of these Africans was Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who won the martyr's crown in 257. His genuine works consist of a number of short treatises, or tracts, and numerous letters, all teeming with Scripture quotations. It is certain that he employed a version then and there in use, and it is agreed that "his quotations are carefully made and thus afford trustworthy standards of African Old Latin in a very early, though still not the earliest stage" (Hort, Intro to the NT in Gr., 789).

Critical investigation has made it clear that the version used by Cyprian survives in a fragmentary copy of St. Mark and St. Matthew, contained in a palimpsest at Paris called Codex Floriacensis (h). It has been found that another MS, Codex Palatinus (e) at Vienna, has a text closely akin to that exhibited in Cyprian, although there are traces of mixture in it. These MSS, together with the quotations of the so-called Speculum Augustini (m), is known among scholars as African Old Latin. Another MS with an interesting history, Codex Colbertinianus (c) contains also a valuable African element, but in many parts of the Gospels it side also with what is called the European Old Latin more than with k or e. Codex Bobbiensis (k) has been edited with a learned introduction in the late Bishop John Wordworth's Old Latin Bib. Texts, the relation of k to Cyprian and the old Latin text has given us a fixed point in the history of the Lat Bible a century and a half earlier than Jerome.

We proceed half a century nearer to the fountain-head of the African Bible when we take up the testimony of Tertullian who flourished toward the close of the 2d cent. Helian's Bible differed from Cyprian in being a competent Gr scholar. He was thus able to translate for himself as he made his quotations from the LXX or the Gr NT, and is thus for us by no means so safe a witness to the character or existence of a standard version. Professor Zahn (GK, 1, 60) maintains with considerable plausibility that before 210-240 AD there was no Lat Bible, and that Tertullian went to Rome and obtained a copy of the Vulgate, and that he went along. In this contention, Zahn is not supported by many scholars, and the view generally is that while Tertullian's knowledge of Gr is a disturbing element, his writings, with the copious quotations from both Old and NT, testify to the existence of a version which had already been for some time in circulation and use. Who the African Wycliffe or Tindale was who produced that version has not been recorded, and it may in fact have been a Lat gospel or apocalypse or something similar, which was then provided with Christological and NT elements. But this is one of the problems awaiting the discovery of fresh material and fuller investigation for its solution.

Although the evidence has, up to the present time, been regarded as favoring the African origin of the first Lat tr of the Bible, recent investigations into what is called the Western text of the NT has yielded results pointing elsewhere. It is clear from Old Latin a comparison that the Western type of NT has a close affinity with the Lat witnesses originating in western provinces of the empire. The close textual relation disclosed between the Lat and the Syr VSS has led some authorities to believe that, after all, the earliest Lat version of the NT may have been made in the Greek at Antioch. But this is one of the problems awaiting the discovery of fresh material and fuller investigation for its solution.

We have already noticed the African group, so designated from its connection with the great African Fathers, Tertullian and the Cyprians, and comprising k, e, and to some extent h and m. The antiquity of Old Latin MSS of the text here represented is attested by these African Fathers. When we come down to the 4th cent., we find in Western Europe, and esp. in North Italy, a second type of text, which is designated European, the precise relation of which to the African has not been clearly ascertained. Is this an independent text which has arisen on the soil of Italy, or is it a text derived by alteration and revision of the African as it traveled northward and westward? This group consists of theCodex Vercellensis (a) and Codex Veronensis (b) of the 4th or 5th cent. respectively, and there may be included also the Codex Vindobonensis (i) of the 7th cent. at Vienna. These give the Gospels, and a gives for St. John the text as it was read by the 4th-cent. Father, Ludger...
of Cagliari in Sardinia. The Lat. of the Gr-Lat MS D (Codex Bezae) known as d, and the Lat. of the translator of Irenaeus are classed with this group.

Later, Professor Hort says from the middle of the 4th cent. the third type, called Italic from its more restricted range, is found. It is represented by Codex Brixianus (f) of the 6th cent., now at Brescia, and Codex Monacensis (q) of the 7th cent., at Munich. This text is probably a modified form of the European, produced by revision which has brought it more into accord with the Gr. and has given it a smoother Lat. aspect. The group has received this name because the text found in many of Augustine's writings is the same, and as he expressed a preference for the Itala, the group was designated accordingly. Recent investigation tends to show that we must be careful how we use Augustine as an Old Latin authority, and that the Itala may be, not a pre-Vulg text, but rather Jerome's Vulg. This, however, is still uncertain; the fact remains that as far as the Gospels are concerned, f and q represent the type of text most used by Jerome.

That all these groups, comprising in all 38 codices, go back to one original is not impossible. Still these may have been at first local VSS, and then an official version formed out of them. When Jerome's revision took hold of the church, the Old Latin representatives for the most part were discarded. Some of them, however, held their ground and continued to be copied down to the 12th and even the 13th cent. Codex e is an example of this; it is a MS of the 12th cent., but was added to by Professor Burkitt has pointed out (Texts and Studies IV, "Old Latin," 11) "It came from Langueoc, the country of the Albigeness. Only among heretics isolated from the rest of Western Christianity could an Old Latin text have been written as so late a period." An instance of an Old Latin text copied in the 13th cent. is the Gigas Holmiensis, quoted as Gig, now at Stockholm, and so called from its great size. It contains the Acts and the Apocalypse of the Old Latin and the rest of the NT according to the Vulg. It has to be borne in mind that in the early centuries complete Bibles were unknown. Each group of books, Gospels, Acts and Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, and Rev for the NT, and Pent, Historical Books, Ps and Prophets for the OT, happened separately. It is interesting, also, to note that when Jerome revised, or even retranslated from the LXX, Tob and Jth of the Apoc, the greater number of these books, the Wd, Eccles, 1 and 2 Macc, and Bar were left unrevised, and were simply added to the Vulg from the Old Latin version.

These Old Latin texts going back in their earliest forms to nearly the middle of the 2d cent. are very early witnesses to the Gr text from which they were made. They as a rule of Old Latin the more valuable inasmuch as they for Textual Criticism are manifestly very literal texts. Our criticism great uncial MSS reach no farther back than the 4th cent., whereas in the Old Latin we have evidence—indirect indeed and requiring to be cautiously used—reaching back to the 2d cent. The text of these MSS is neither dated nor localized, whereas the evidence of these VSS, coming from a particular province of the church, and being used by Fathers whose period is definitely known, enable us to judge of the text and use in it. In this connection, too, it is noteworthy that while the variations of which Jerome and Augustine complained were largely due to the blunders, or natural mistakes, of copyists, they did sometimes represent various readings in the Gr originals.


T. NICOL

LATTER DAYS. See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OT.

LATTICE, lat. is. See House, II, 1, (9).

LAUD, lvd.: A vb. meaning "to praise," used in Rom 15:11 AV, and Ps 117:1; 145:4. RV either should have avoided the word altogether or else should have used it much more extensively—preferably the latter, as the word is not obsolete in liturgical Eng.

LAUGHING-STOCK, läf'ing-stök: Something set up to be laughed at; thrice in RV the tr of הילנה הים בקיע "laughter," etc (Job 12:4; Jer 20:7; cf Jer 48:26.27.39; Lam 3:14). See Mock, Mocking.

LAUGHTER, läf'ter ( platağ, παίζω, παίζον, παίζεω, "to laugh," πίπτω, πιπτόν, "laughter"); γέλοιο, geló, καταγέλασο, katagélado: (1) Laughter as the expression of gladness, pleasant surprise, is the tr of παίζω (Gen 17:17; 18:12.13.15; 21:6), which, however, is not "with me," as AV and RV (so Delitzsch and others; see also Hastings in HDB), not in the sense of derision, but of surprise and pleasure. In the same ver for "God hath made me to laugh," RV gives in m, "hath prepared laughter for me," and this gave his name to the son, the promise of whose birth evoked the laughter (Ish², Ἰσαὰς; gélado (Lk 6:21.25) has the same meaning of gladness and rejoicing; πιπτόν, "laughter," has also this sense (Job 8:21; Ps 126:2). It is, however, "laughed to scorn" in Job 12:4; RV "laughing-stock"; so Jer 20:7; 48:26.27.39; Lam 3:14, "derision." (2) παίζω is used (except Job 29:24; Eccl 3:4) in the sense of the laughter of defiance, or derision (Job 8:22; 41:29); in Piel it is often trs "play," "playing," "merry." (3) La'agh is "to scorn," "to laugh to scorn" (2 K 19:21; Neh 2:19; παίζω has also this sense (2 Ch 30:10; πιπτόν (Ezk 23:32); πιπτόν (Job 12:4); katagélado (Mt 9:24; Mk 3:20; Lk 8:35); Lk 6 21.25; see above. Katagélado is found in Jth 12:12, "laugh to scorn" (Eccles 7:11; 20:17; 1 Macc 10:70, RV "derision").

For "laugh" (Job 23:17) RV has "mock;" for "mocked of his neighbor" and "laughed to scorn" (Job 12:4) "laughing-stock"; for "shall rejoice at the time to come" (Prov 31:25), "laugheth at the time to come"; "laughter" for "laughing" (Job 8:21).

W. L. WALKER

LAUNCH, länch, länch. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1.

LAVER, lâ'vir ( עֹלָה, ke'dor): Every priest in attendance on the altar of Jch was required to wash in it his hands and his feet before entering 1. in the Tabernacle. To this end a laver was ordered to be made as part of the tabernacle equipment (30:17-21; 38:8). Its composition was of brass (bronze), and it consisted of two parts, the bowl and its pedestal or foot (30:18, etc). This first laver was a small one, and was made of the hand mirrors of the women in attendance upon the altar (38:8). Its place was between the altar and the tabernacle (40:30). See TABERNACLE.

The difficulty as to the washing of parts of the sacrificial carcases was overcome, in the temple of
Solomon, by the construction of "10 lavers" and a "molten sea" (1 K 7 23-37; 2 Ch 4 2-6; see II Kings 25). We learn:

2. In the 1844 Temple the priests to wash in—therefore took the place of the laver in the tabernacle—and the lavers were used as baths for portions of the burnt offerings. The lavers themselves were artistic works of unusual merit for that age. Like that in the tabernacle, each had its own stand or base, which was cast in a separate piece from the laver. These bases rested on wheels which allowed the laver being moved from one part of the court to another without being turned about. Five stood on the north and five on the south side of the temple. They were ornamented with "lions, oxen, and cherubim," and on a lower level, with a series of wreaths or festoons of flowers (1 K 7 27-37). In modern speech, the lavers may be described as so many circular open tanks for the storage of water. Each laver contained 40 baths (about 320 gals.) of water. Its height was 5 cubits, the locomotive machinery being 3 cubits in height. The height of the laver, judging from its capacity, about 2 cubits. The last we hear of the lavers, apart from their bases, is that the idolatrous king Ahaz cut off the border of the base and lavers from them (2 K 16 17). During the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah foretold that the molten sea and the bases (there being then no lavers) should be carried to Babylon (Jer 27 19). A few years later it is recorded that the bases were broken up, and the brass of which they were made was carried away (Jer 32 17).

The Gr word (Kérpuy, loutrón) occurs twice in the NT. In Eph 5 26, Paul says that Christ gave Himself for the church "that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing [Gr "laver"] of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." In these passages the reference is to the constant physical purity demanded of the Jewish priests when in attendance upon the temple. Christians are "a holy priesthood," and are cleansed not by water only, but, in the former passage, "with the word" (cf Jn 15 3); in the latter, by "the renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Eph 5 25; 1 Jn 3 5). The feet-washing mentioned by Jesus is emblematic of the same thing (Jn 13 10).

W. Shaw Caldecott

III. LAW IN THE EPISTLES

1. Romans
2. Galatians
3. Epistle of Peter and John
4. Epistle to the Hebrews
5. Epistle of James
6. Epistle of Paul and John

LITERATURE

The Gr word for "law" is νόμος, nómo, derived from νόμος, nóm, "to divide," "distribute," "apportion," and generally meant anything established, anything received by usage, a custom, usage, law; in the NT a command, law.

It may not be amiss to note the definition of law given by a celebrated authority in jurisprudence, the late Mr. John Austin: "A law, in the most general and comprehensive acceptance in which the term, in its literal meaning, is employed, may be said to be a rule laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being, by an intelligent being having power over him."

Under this comprehensive definition, he classifies "laws set by God to His human creatures, and laws set by men to men." After analyzing the theologies, he defines the expression of a particular desire; duty or obligation, signifying that one is bound or obliged by the command to pursue a certain course of conduct, and sanction, indicating the evil likely to be incurred by disobedience, as thus summarized: (1) a wish or desire conceived by a rational being that another rational being shall do or forebear; (2) an evil to proceed from the former and to be incurred by the latter in case the latter does or fails to do what is wished; (3) an expression or intimation of the wish by words or other signs." This definition makes it clear that the term "laws of nature" can be used only in a metaphorical sense, the metaphorical application being suggested as follows: Austin shows by the fact that uniformity or stability of conduct is one of the ordinary consequences of a law proper, consequently, "wherever we observe a uniform order of events, or if we find in the objects of phenomena, we are prone to impute that order to a law set by its author, though the case presents us with nothing that can be likened to a sanction or duty." As used in the NT it will be found generally that the term "law" bears the sense indicated by Austin, and includes "command," "duty," and "sanction."

1. Law in the Gospels.—Naturally we first turn to the Gospels, where the word "law" always refers to the Mosaic law, although it has different applications. That law was really threefold: the Moral Law, as summed up in the Decalogue, the Ceremonial Law, prescribing the ritual and all the typical enactment, and what might be called the Civil or Political Law, that relating to the people in their national, political life. The distinction is not closely observed, though sometimes one emphasizes one aspect, sometimes another, but generally the whole law without any discrimination is contemplated. Sometimes the law means the whole OT Scriptures, as in Jn 10 14; 12 24; 15 25. At other times the Law means the Pent, as in Lk 24 44.

The Law frequently appears in the teaching of Christ. In the Sermon on the Mount He refers most specifically and fully to it. It is frequently asserted that He there exposes the imperfection of the Law and sets His own authority against its authority. But this seems to be a superficial and an untenable view. Christ indeed affirms very definitely the authority of the Law: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets" (Mt 5 17). Here the term would seem to mean the whole of the Pentateuch. "I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one title shall in no wise pass away from the law till all things be accomplished" (Mt 5 17 18). A similar utterance is recorded in Lk 16 17: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail." (1)Authority of Law upheld in the Sermon on the Mount.—The perfection and permanence of the Law as well as its authority are thus indicated,
and the following verse in Mt still further emphasizes the authority, while showing that now the Lord is speaking specifically of the moral law of the Decalogue: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall not teach men to observe them, but shall sin in the sight of heaven and earth; but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (5:19.)

These impressive sentences should be borne in mind in considering the utterances that follow, in which the comparison of the Law and His own teaching, and from which has been drawn the inference that He condones and practically abrogates the Law. What Jesus really does is to bring out the fulness of meaning that is in the Law, and to show its spirituality and the wideness of its reach. He declares that the righteousness of His disciples must exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (ver 20). Their righteousness consisted largely in a punctilious observance of the external requirements of the Law; the disciples must yield heart of grace to the inner spirit of the Law, its external and internal requirements.

(a) Christ and tradition: Jesus then proceeds to point out the contrast, not so much between His own teaching and that of the Law, as between His interpretation of the Law and the interpretation of other teachers: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time" (AV), "to them of old time" (RV) (ver 21). Either rendering is grammatically allowable, but in either case it is evidently not the original utterance of Moses, but the traditional interpretation, which He had in view. "Ye have heard that it was said"; Christ's usual way of quoting the OT is, "It is written" or some other formula pointing to the written Word; and as He had referred to the written Word as a whole, nothing would be strange if He should now use the formula "It was said" in reference to the particular precepts. Evidently He means what was said by the Jewish teachers.

(b) Sin of murder: This is further confirmed by the citation: "Thou shalt not kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment." The second clause is not found in the Pent as a distinct statement, but it is clearly the generalization of the teachers. Christ does not set Himself in opposition to Moses; rather does He depose the precepts of the scribes who were sitting in Moses' seat, they truly expound the Law (Mt 23:2), and interpret the Law as they please; and so this command as it only referred to the act of murder, so Christ shows the full and true spiritual meaning of it; "But I say unto you" (ver 22.) to every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment." (ver 22.)

Murder.

A.D. 27.

(a) Adultery and divorce: Again, "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery" (ver 27). The traditional teaching confined this mainly to the outward act, "But I say unto you," says Christ, "that adulterer pertains even to the lustful thought." (ver 28.) In dealing with this matter He passes to the law of divorce which was one of the civil enactments, and did not stand on the same level with the moral precepts against committing adultery, nay, the very carrying out of the civil provision might lead to a real breach of the moral precept itself. The desire to divest the authority of the precept itself, in the very desire to uphold the authority of the moral law, Christ pronounces against the laws of the scribes and Pharisees. Later on, as recorded in Mt 19:3-6, He was questioned about this same law of divorce, and again He drew a further distinction from the Law by the Jews, and affirms strongly the sanctity of the marriage institution, showing that it was antecedent to the Mosaic law; so again, in the beginning, and derived its binding force from the Divine pronouncement in Genesis 2:24, the nature of things: as to the Mosaic law of divorce, He declares that it was permitted on account of the hardness of their hearts; but in this case, the formulation was sufficiently to discharge the tie. This civil enactment, justified originally by the true moral ideal of the Decalogue, Christ claims authority to transcend, but only so in doing so He would "proclaim the word of God" as said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." See DIVORCE.

(b) Oaths: The next precept Jesus cites is one partly civil and partly ritual, concerning the taking of oaths. The words are not found in the Pent as a definite enact-

ment; they are rather a gathering up of several utterances (Lev 19:12; Nu 30:2; Dt 23:21), and again in the form of the citation suggests to the hearers a new interpretation that is in question. But the kind of swearing allowed by the law was the very opposite of profane swearing. It was the frequent and natural inference of the duty to respect the authority of that 3d command; He was enforcing its spirituality and claiming the reverence due to the Law by the familiar question, how far the words of Christ bear upon oath-taking in a court of law we need not enter. His own response to the adjuration is variously interpreted. Some practically put upon His oath (Mt 26:63-64); and other instances (as has been drawn from the practice of the civil law) of a ver 18; of a ver 21; of a ver 22; of a ver 23; of a ver 24; and so on. The question of oath-taking (ver 34) offers a suitable place for confirmation and an end of strife. See OATH.

Retaliation: He next touches upon the "law of retaliation": "an eye for an eye" (ver 38), and consistently with our understanding of the other sayings, we think that Jesus is dealing with the traditional interpretation which admitted of personal revenge, of men taking the law into their own hands in their own behalfs. Such a practice Christ utterly condemns, and inculcates instead gentleness and forbearance, the outcome of love even toward enemies. The Christian, having no grudge, finds place among the Mosaic provisions, but it is a place that appears there, not as it stands in its literal sense, but as it stands itself in its own way, but as a political enactment to be carried out by the magistrates and so to disconnectenance private revenge. Christ shows the Gospel received by His people would supersede the necessity for these requirements of the civil code; although His words are not to be interpreted quite literally, for He Himself when smitten on the one cheek did not turn the other to the stroke. However, the principle of the law of retaliation still holds good in the legislative procedure of all associations, and according to the NT teaching, will find place even in the Divine procedure in the day of judgment. See also Forbearance.

(c) Love to neighbors; love of enemies: The last saying mentioned in the Sermon is the clinical character: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy" (Mt 5:43). The first part is indeed the injunction of the Law, the second part is an unwarrantable addition to it. It is only a part that Christ virtually condones when He says, "But I say unto you, Love your enemies." (ver 44.) That the interpretation of these teachers was unwarrantable may be seen from many passages in the Pent, the Prophets and the Psalms, which set forth the moral aspect of the Law's requirement; and as to this point, Christ does not refer only to Prov 25:21,22, "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat." Christ while condemning the addition unfolds the spirit of the precept itself, for the love of neighbor rightly interpreted involves love of enemies; and so on in the various applications. (ver 37) He answers the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbor?" by the parable of the Good Samaritan, showing that everyone in need is our neighbor. See also Forgiveness; Wrath.

The last reference in the Sermon on the Mount to the Law fully bears out the idea that Christ really upheld the authority while elucidating the spirituality of the Law, for He declares that the principle embodied in the "Golden Rule" is a deduction from, is, indeed, the essence of, "the law and the prophets" (Mt 7:12).

(2) Other references to the Law in the teaching of Christ.—We can say, save that formation next.

In Mt 11:13, "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John," the Law in its teaching capacity is in view, and perhaps the whole of the Pent is meant. In Mt 12:1-8, in rebutting the right against His disciples of breaking the Sabbath, He cites the case of David and his men eating the showbread, which it was not lawful for any but the priests to partake of; and of the priests doing work on the Sabbath day contrary to the letter of the Law; from which He deduces the conclusion that the ritual laws may be set aside under stress of necessity and for a higher good. In that same chapter (vs 10-13) He indicates the lawfulness of healing—doing good—on the Sabbath day.
(a) Traditions of the elders and the 5th commandment: In Mt 16:1-6 we have the account of the Pharisees complaining that the disciples transgressed the traditions of the elders by eating with unwashed hands. Jesus retorts upon them with the question: “Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God said, ‘Honor thy father and thy mother,’ and, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’”

(b) Christ’s answer to the young ruler: To the young ruler (Mt 19:16-22) He presents the commandments as the rule of life, obedience to which is the door to eternal life, especially emphasizing the man’s concern for his immortality. The young man, professing to have kept them all, shows that he has not grasped the spirituality of their requirements, and it is further to test him that Christ calls upon him to make the “great renumeration” (or all, i.e., an additional command so much as the unfolding of the spiritual and far-reaching character of the command, “Love thy neighbor as thyself.”

(c) Christ’s answer to the lawyer: To the lawyer which He is the great commandment in the Law, He answers by giving him the sum of the whole moral law. “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment.” And a second like unto this (Mt 22:35-39). In Mark’s report (Mk 12:31), He adds, “There is none other commandment greater than these.”

(d) References in the Fourth Gospel: In His discourses He had recorded in Jn 7, He charges them with failure to keep the Law: “Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doth the law?” (ver 19). And referring to the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath day, a deed which has, He shows how one law was in conflict with another. Moses had enjoined circumcision, and sometimes the time for circumcision would fall on the Sabbath day. Yet with all their reverence for the Sabbath day, they would, in order to keep the law of circumcision, perform the operation on the Sabbath day, and so, He argues, it is unreasonable to complain of Him because on the Sabbath day He had fulfilled the higher law of doing good, healing a poor sufferer. In none of all Christ’s utterances is there an slight throw upon the Law itself; it is always held up as the standard of right and its authority vindicated.

The passages we have considered show the place of the Law in the teaching of Christ, but we also find that He had to sustain the practical relation to that Law. Born under the Law, becoming part of a nation which honored and venerated the Law, every part of whose life was externally regulated by it, the life of Jesus Christ could not fail to be affected by that Law. We note its operation:

(1) In His infancy. —On the eighth day He was circumcised (Lk 2:21), thus being recognized as a member of the covenant nation, partaking of its privileges, assured of its blessings. He is, according to the ritual law of purification, He is presented in the temple to the Lord (Lk 2:22-24), while His mother offers the sacrifice enjoined in the

“law of the Lord,” the sacrifice she brings pathetically witnessing to her poverty, “a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons” being the only gifts allowed to those who were not able to provide a lamb (Lev 12). The Divine approval is set upon this consecrating act, for it is while it is being done concerning Him after “the custom of the law” (ver 27), that the Spirit of God comes upon Him, and Harps the Christ prophesy which links all the Messianic hopes with the Babe of Bethlehem.

Again, according to the Law His parents go up to the Passover feast when the wondrous child has reached His 12th year, the age when a youthful man assumed legal responsibility, in “being a son of the Law,” and so Jesus participates in the festal observances, and His deep interest in all that concerns the temple-worship and the teaching of the Law is shown by His absorption in the conversation of the doctors, whose questions He answers so intelligently, while questioning them in turn, and filling them with astonishment at His understanding (Lk 2:41-47).

(2) In His ministry. —In His ministry He ever honors the Law, and He is, in fact, His “curse” to the Pharisees contradicting them. He heals the leper by His sovereign touch and word, but He bids him go and show himself to the priest and offer the gift that Moses commanded (Mt 8:4). And again, when the lepers appeal to Him, He refuses to accept what implies the healing of the unclean (Lk 17:14). He drives out of the temple those that defile it (Mt 21:12-13; Jn 2:15-17), because of His zeal for the honor of His Father’s house, and, so, while showing His authority, emphasizes the independence of the temple and its services. So, while claiming to be the Son in the Father’s house, and therefore above the injunctions laid upon the servants and strangers, He nevertheless pays the temple-tax exacted from every son of Israel (Mt 17:24-27). He attends the various feasts during His ministry, and when the shadows of death are gathering round Him, He takes special pains to observe the Passover with His disciples. Thus to the ceremonial law He renders continuous obedience, the motto of His life practically being His great utterance to the Baptist: “Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness” (Mt 3:15). If He obeyed the ceremonial law, unquestionably He obeyed the moral law. His foremost concern was the spiritual well-being of men. His mission is for the forgiveness of sins, and He offers forgiveness to all, and this He does on account of His life, and this He does because the Law and the prophets bear witness to Him, Acts 15:8-9). He is the Son and the Teacher of the Law.

We enter not upon the theological question as to the relation of the death of Christ to the penal inflictions of the Law Divinity enforced on behalf of sinners—that touches the doctrine of the Atonement—we only note the fact that in Relation to the Death of Christ, His death was brought about in accordance with the Law. The chief priests, in hatred, sent officers to take Christ, but overawed by His matchless eloquence, those officers returned empty-handed. In their chargers, the chief priests can only say that the people who follow Him know not the Law, and are cursed (Jn 7:48). Nevertheless, on this occasion, ventured to remonstrate: “Dost our law judge a man, except it first hear him himself?” (ver 51). This sound legal principle these men are bent on disregarding: their one desire is to put an end to the life of this man, who has aroused their hatred, and at last when they get Him into their hands, they strain the forms of the Law to accomplish their purpose. There is no real charge that can be brought against Him. They dare not bring up the plea that He broke the Sabbath, for again they would incur their own condemnation on that score. He has broken no law: all the things they can do is to bring false witnesses to testify something to His discredit. The trumpety charge is founded upon a distorted reminiscence of His utterance about destroying the temple, through its trains according to the ritual law of purification, He is presented in the temple to the Lord (Lk 2 22-24), while His mother offers the sacrifice enjoined in the

(1) Christ charged with blasphemy in relation to the Jewish law. —Then the high priest adjures Him to say upon oath whether He be the Son of the Living God. Such a claim would assured-
ly, if unfounded, be blasphemy, and according to the Law, be punishable by death. On a previous occasion the Jews threatened to stone Him for this—to them—blasphemy was the most unfounded charge of all. He is the Son of God, the high priest, rendering his clothes, declaring himself the high priest of an unchangeable sanctuary. He is the Son of Man, the high priest, who has put upon him the garments of the high priest, who is the Lord’s sacrifice. Do not, therefore, believe a word spoken by any unbeliever, who claims Him worthy of death (Mt 26; Mk 14; Lk 22). If you then believe that He claimed to be, then the high priests were right in holding Him guilty of blasphemy; it now remains for you to consider whether the claim after all might not be true.

(2) Christ charged with treason under the Roman law— New Testament law has to do with the ceremonial law involved in the resurrection of Christ, as, of course, the Roman law was involved in the crucifixion of Christ, but also the Rom law. On one other occasion Christ had come into touch with the law of Rome, viz. in the striking of the Jews by the Herodians as to the lawfulness of giving tribute to Caesar (Mt 22 17). According to the Jews, only the Jews need to consider the law made by Rom governor for the death penalty, and Jesus must be tried before him. The charge cannot now be blasphemy, for the Roman law has nothing to say to that—and so they trump up a charge of treason against Jesus.

In preparing it, they practically renounce their Messianic hopes. The charge, however, breaks down before the ceremonial, and only by playing on the weakness of Pilate do they gain their end, and the Roman law decrees His death, while leaving the Jews to see to the carrying out of the sentence. In this the evangelist sees the fullness of Christ’s words concerning the manner of His death: “And they had to be done which the law of Moses commanded, saying: ‘Thou shalt not counterfeit the mark of God.’ He fulfilled the ceremonial law which He had not fulfilled as a Jew before.”

2. Law in All Its Parts

Looking at the whole testimony of the Gospels, we can see how He was the Law fulfilled to the letter. He fulfilled the moral law by obeying, by bringing out its fullness of meaning, by showing its intense spirituality, and by establishing it on a sureer basis than ever as the eternal law of righteousness. He fulfilled the ceremonial and typical law, not only by conforming to its requirements, but by realizing its spiritual significance. He fulfilled the shadowy outlines of the types, and the Law was fulfilled. The essential distinction between meats clean and unclean was no longer necessary, but showed the importance of true spiritual purity (Mt 15 11; Mk 7 18-23). He taught His disciples those great principles, when, after giving the law to the Jews from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself” (Lk 24 27). And as He opened their mind that they might understand the Scriptures, He declared, “Not Moses spoke, but as it is written in all the law and the prophets, concerning me” (Lk 24 44). John sums up this in his pregnant phrase, “The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ” (Jn 1 17). The grace was in contrast to the condemnation of the moral law, the truth was the antithesis to the shadowy outline of the types and ceremonies.

3. Allusions by the magistrates of Philippi, to the he is afterward offered the oppor

Roman Law tunity of quietly slipping away, but standing on his dignity as a Roman citizen, he demands that the magistrates themselves, who had violated the law by publicly honoring uncondemned Romans, should come and set them free. This same right as a Roman citizen Paul again asserts when about to be scourged by the command of the centurion (22 25), and his protest is successful in averting the indignity. His trial before the emperor Festus well illustrates the procedure under the Roman law, and his appeal, as a Roman citizen, to Caesar had important results in his life.
III. Law in the Epistles.—The word is used both with and without the article, but though in some cases the substantive without the article refers to law in general, yet in many other cases it undoubtedly refers to the Law of Moses. Perhaps, as has been suggested, it is that, where it does refer to the Mosaic Law, the word without the article points to that law, not so much as Mosaic, but in its quality as law. But speaking generally, the word with and without the article is used in reference to the Law of Moses.

1. In Romans

1. Romans

(1) Law as a standard.—In Rom Paul has much to say about law, and in the main it is the moral law that he has in view. In this great ep., written to people at the center of the famous legal system of Rome, many of them Jews versed in the law of Moses and others Gentiles familiar with the idea of law, its nature, its scope and its sway, he first speaks of the Law as a standard, want of conformity to which brings condemnation. He shows that the Gentiles who had not the standard of the revealed Law nevertheless had a law, the law of Nature, a law written upon their heart and conscience. Rome, therefore, was familiar with the conception of a law of nature, which became a law of nations (ius gentium), so that certain principles could be assumed as obtaining among those who had not the knowledge of the Roman code; and in accordance with these principles, both Romans and barbarians could be regulated. Paul's conception is somewhat similar, but is applied to the spiritual relations of man and God.

(2) Gentiles condemned by the law of nature.—By law in general, yet in many other places the light of that law, are condemned. They have violated the dictates of their own conscience. And the Jews, with the fuller light of their revealed law, have equally failed. In this connection Paul incidentally lays down the great principle that "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom 2 13). His great aim, in the ep., is to show that justification is by faith, but he here asserts that if anyone would have justification through law, then he must keep that law in all its details. The Law will pronounce the doer of it justified, but the mere hearing of the Law without doing it will only increase the condemnation. "As many as have sinned without the law shall none the less be judged; and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law" (2 12). Paul does not pronounce upon the question whether a Gentile may be saved by following the light of Nature; he rather emphasizes the negative side that those who have failed shall perish; they have light enough to condemn, is his point.

(3) All men under condemnation.—Having proved that both Jews and Gentiles are under sin, he closes his ep. with an appeal to repentance, "Who shall come to those that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God" (3 19). Thus the Law shuts up into condemnation. It is impossible for any sinner to be justified "by the works of the law"; the Law not only condemns but "through the law cometh the knowledge of sin" (3 20). It shows how far short men have come of God's requirements. It is a mirror in which the sinner sees his filthiness, but the mirror cannot cleanse, though it shows the need of cleansing.

(4) The redeeming work of Christ providing righteousness apart from the Law.—Then setting forth the great redemption of Jesus Christ, the apostle shows that it provides a righteousness which can satisfy the requirements of the Law; a righteousness that is indeed "apart from the law," apart from all men's attempts to keep the Law, but is nevertheless in deepest harmony with the principles of the Law, and has been witnessed "by the law and the prophets" (3 21). (In this passage the "law" seems to mean the Pentateuch, and in ver 19, in view of the preceding citations from the Ps, it appears to mean the whole OT Scriptures.) Since the righteousness secured by Christ comes upon the sinner through faith, manifestly the works of the Law can have nothing to do with our obtaining of it. But so far is faith-righteousness from undermining the Law, that Paul claims that through faith the Law is established (3 31).

(5) Abraham's blessings came not through the Law.—Proceeding to show that his idea of justification by faith was no new thing, that the OT saint had enjoyed it, he particularly shows that Abraham, even in his uncircumcised state, received the blessing through faith; and the great promise to him and his seed did not come through the Law, but on the principle of faith.

(6) Law worketh wrath and intensifies the evil of sin.—Indeed, the blessing coming to sinners by way of the Law, the "law worketh wrath" (4 15); not wrath in men against the Law's restrictions as some have argued, but the holy wrath of God so frequently mentioned by the apostle in this ep. The Law worked wrath, inasmuch as when disobeyed it brings on the sinner the Divine disapproval, condemnation; it enhances the guilt of sin, and so intensifies the Divine wrath against it; and it, in a sense, provokes to it: the sinful nature rebels against it to the utmost on the ground that it is the very fact of a thing being forbidden arouses the desire for it. This seems what he means in a subsequent passage (5 20), "And the law came in besides, that the trespass might abound"; as if the very multiplying of restrictions intensified the tendency to sin, brought out the evil in human nature, showed the utter vileness of the sinful heart and the terrible nature of sin, and thus made the need for salvation appear the greater, the very desperation of the disease showing the need for the remedy and creating the desire for it; the abounding of sin preparing the way for the superabundance of grace. That the presence of Law enhances the evil of sin is further shown by the statement, "But as many as have sinned under the law, and there transgression" (4 15); transgression—pardonability—the crossing of the boundary, is, in the strictest sense, only possible under law. But there may be sin apart from a revealed law, as he has already proved in the 2d chapter.

(7) Law in the light of the parallel between Adam and Christ.—In the 5th chapter, dealing with the parallel between Adam and Christ he says: "For until the law was in the world; but sin is not chargeable upon men, except they be taught by the law" (5 13). He cannot mean that men were not held responsible for their sin, or that sin was not in any sense reckoned to their account, for he has in that 2d chapter proved the opposite; but sin was not so imputed to them as to bring upon them the punishment of death, which they nevertheless did suffer, and that is traced by him to the sin of Adam. These, he says, had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression (ver 14); they had not transgressed a positive command as he did, although they had undoubtedly violated the law, if he knew that they were sinners. In drawing out the parallel between Adam and Christ, he plainly indicates that as Adam's transgression of law brought condemnation on the race, so Christ's obedience to the Law brings the Law its justification.

(8) Law and righteousness.—So far he may be
said to have spoken of the Law in regard to the sinner; and it is mainly the Law in its judicial aspect, the Law in relation to righteousness. The Law reveals righteousness, the Law demands righteousness, the Law condemns for unrighteousness. Redemption is a working out of righteousness. The Law witnesses to the perfect righteousness of Christ. The righteousness secured by Christ meets all the requirements of the Law, while gloriously transcending it. The righteous penalty of the Law has been borne by Christ; the righteous requirements of the Law have been fulfilled apart from the condemnation of the Law. "He that hath died is justified from sin" (6:7). But though in one aspect the believer is dead, in another he is alive. He dies with Christ, but he rises spiritually with Him. Thus, "withal he spiritually alive he is "to yield," "to present" his "members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (13:13), and for his comfort he is assured that in this new sphere of life sin shall not have power to bring him under the condemnation of the Law. "Sin, holy, not the dominion over you: for ye are not under law, but under grace" (6:14). His relationship to the Law has been altered through his union with Christ, and this fact the apostle proceeds to illustrate. He enumerates the death of the believer as "the last of a man for so long as he liveth" (7:1). Death dissolves all legal objections. The believer, spiritually dead, is not under the dominion of the Law.

(10) Illustrated by the law of the husband.—The specific case is then given of a married woman bound by law to her husband, but freed from that law through his death, and in the application, he says, "wherefore, my brethren, ye are dead to the law through the body of Christ" (7:4). If the Law in this metaphorical description is the husband who has the woman as his wife, as has been humorously understood by commentators, then the application is based on the general thought of death dissolving all claims of dominion over one. The marriage law involves the death of the husband as well as the wife, and so he can speak of the death of the believer rather than of the death of the law. Another explanation of the metaphor is that the old sinful state is the husband to which the ego, with its dominion over the soul, is bound, the sinful state being brought to death through Christ. The personality is free to enter into union with Christ. Whatever view is adopted, the leading thought of the apostle is clear, that through the death of Christ the believer is free from the Law: "but now we have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were held" (6:6).

(11) The purity and perfection of the Law in its own sphere.—The question is then raised, "Is the law sin?" (ver. 7). The thought is repudiated as unthinkable, but he goes on to show how the law was related to sin, giving from his own experience the exemplification of what he has said in the 3d chapter, that by the Law is the knowledge of sin. The Law revealed his sin; the Law aroused the opposition of his nature, and through the working of sin under the prohibition of the Law, he found the tendency to be death. Nevertheless, there is no doubt in his mind that the Law is not responsible for the sin, the Law is not in any manner to be blamed as defiled, as holy, as holy, just, and good (ver. 12). Sin in the light of the holy Law is shown to be exceeding sinful, and the Law itself is known to be spiritual.

We need not deal with the difficult passage that follows concerning the inner conflict. There has always been much discussion as to whether this is a conflict in the soul of the unregenerate man or of the regenerate—we believe it is in the regenerate, setting forth the experience of the believer—but whatever view is taken, it is clear that the law cannot bring deliverance; the higher part of man's nature, the regenerate nature according to the interpretation one adopts, may "consent unto the law that it is good" (ver.16), may even "delight in the law of God" (ver. 22), but there is another law at work, the law of sin in the members of Christ. This law means captivity and wretchedness from which deliverance can only come through Jesus Christ (vs 23-25). The word "law" in these verses is used in the sense of principle, "the law of my mind," "the law of sin," "the law in my members," but over against all is the law of God.

(12) Freedom from the penal claims of the Law.—The description of the Law as holy, righteous and good, as spiritual, as the object of delight to a true heart, is enough to show that the delivery which the Christian of our generation has received from the condemnation and condemning power of the Law. This is borne out by the excusing conclusion: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," (8:1). The Law, which by Christ, no longer press upon those who are in Him. When the apostle adds, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death" (8:2), he is using "law" in the general sense as a principle or power of producing ordered action, and "the law of the Spirit of life" may be taken to mean the method of the Spirit's working, and indeed may well be a way of describing the gospel itself—the new law, through which the Spirit operates. The other phrase, "law of sin and death," is not to be construed as putting the law on a level with Moses, but the law, the principle of sin producing death mentioned in the previous chapter, unless we think of it as the holy Law which gives the knowledge of sin and brings the condemnation of death. The failure of the Law to produce a satisfactory result is definitely attributed to the weakness of the flesh, which is in effect reflecting the statement of the previous chapter, but all that the Law could not accomplish was accomplished by the death of Christ. In Christ sin is condemned, and in those who are brought into union with Him the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled.

(13) The Law remains as a rule of life for the believer.—Thus the Law is not abrogated. It remains as the "law of the Spirit of life" for believers. The utmost holiness to which they can attain under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is still the "righteousness" which the Law requires. That the apostle's teaching is far removed from Antinomianism is shown, not only by all that he says in these chapters about the believer's new life of absolute spiritual service, but by the specific statement in Rom. 13:8-10, which at once prescribes the commandments as rules of life (in Eph. 6:2 he cites and enforces the 5th commandment) and shows how true obedience is possible. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another; for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law." Then, after specifying several of the commands, he declares that these and all other commands are "summed up in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The man in Christ has found the true principle of obedience. He has entered into the true spirit of the holy law. That spirit is all summed up in the love of Jesus Christ, the love of Christ, living in His love, sees the Law not as a stern taskmaster condemning, but as a bright vision alluring. He indeed sees the Law embodied in Christ, and the imitation of Christ
involves obedience to the Law, but he fulfills the Law not simply as a standard outside, but as a living principle within. Acting according to the dictates of the love begotten at the cross, his life is conformed to the moral law by the power of the Spirit of Christ; but here we may take the Law as a whole, including all the ceremonial and typical observances which were designed to lead the people to Christ.

(4) The bondage of the Law.—But while there was undoubtedly much of privilege for the people under the Mosaic dispensation, there was also something of bondage. And so Paul says, “We were kept in ward under the law” (ver 23), and in the next chapter, he speaks of the child, though heir to a great estate, being “under guardians and stewards until the day appointed of the father” (4 2), which seems to be the same thought as under the pedagogue, and this he calls a state of “bondage” (ver 3). The Law guarded and tutored and restrained; the great typical observances, though foreshadowing the grace of the gospel, were yet, in their details, irksome and burdensome, and the mass of rules as to every part of the Jew’s conduct proved to be, speaking after the present-day manner, a system of red tape. Little was left to the free, spontaneous action of the soul; the whole course of the Jew from the cradle to the grave was carefully marked out.

(5) Sonship and its freedom from the Law’s restrictions. But in the fulness of time “God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons” (4 4). The gospel of the grace of God embodied in Christ shows its gracious character in that it not only answers the requirements of the moral law and removes its condemnation: fulfils, and by fulfilling abrogates the typical observer of the ceremonial law, but also abolishes all the directions and restrictions given to the Jews as a separate people, and brings its subjects into a condition of liberty where the renewed spirit under the mighty love of Christ can act spontaneously, the great principles of the moral law remaining as its guide, while the minute rules needed for the infancy of the race are no longer apposite for the “to be dead in the flesh, but alive to God through faith in Christ Jesus” (3 20). And so Paul warns these Christians against turning back to the “weak and beggarly rudiments” and observing “months, and seasons, and years” (4 9,10).

In the remaining Ep. of Paul, little is said of the Law, and we need only indicate the connections in which the word occurs. In 1 Cor 7 39 there is a reference to the wife being bound by the law as long as her husband liveth” (AV). The word “law,” Epistles however, is omitted from the critical texts and from RV. In the same ep. (9 8:9; 14 21.34) the word is used of the Pent or the Scriptures as a whole. In 9 20 Paul refers to his practice of seeking to win men to Christ by accommodating himself to their standpoint, “to those who are under the law, as under the law”; and in 15 56 occurs the pregnant statement, an echo of Rom, “The power of sin is the law.” In 2 Cor the word does not occur, though the legal system is referred to as the ministration of death, in contrast to the gospel ministration of the Spirit (ch 3). The word “law” is once used in Eph (2 15), in reference to the work of Christ not only producing harmony between God and man, but between Jew and Gentile: “abolished in his flesh the enmity of commandments contained in ordinances,” also spoken of as “the middle wall of partition,” and referring esp. to the ceremonial enactments.

In Phil 3 5,6,9 we have the fine autobiographical passage wherein we see the self-righteous Pharisee...
system was really a system of grace at the heart of it; in spite of its external rubrics which might well be abused, it made provision for satisfying for the time the breaches of the law; the sacrifices themselves could not take away sin, but periodical sacrifices were made in contrast to the physical, the blotting out through the work of the cross, of the bond written in ordinances and the consequent deliverance of the believer from the bondage of ceremonial observances (211-17), though the eternal ined of the law was to come," Christ being the glorious substance. In 1 Tim 189, we have the two pregnant statements that "the law is good, if a man use it lawfully," and that "law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless."

The word "law" occurs 14 times in this ep., and a great deal of attention is given to the subject, but it is generally the law in its ceremonial and typical aspect that is in question.

4. In the Epistle to the Hebrews

It is not necessary to look at the matter in detail, but simply to indicate the line of teaching.

(1) Harmony with the Pauline teaching.—The ancient doubt as to the authorship of the ep. seems today to have crumbled away. Incarnation, the ground for a conclusion are no stronger than formerly, but in the desire to ascribe the ep. to Paul, too much emphasis is perhaps laid upon the supposed un-Pauline character of the teaching. There is, after all, profound harmony between the teaching of the Pauline Ep. and the Pauline teaching of the Law, and the harmony applies to this matter as of the Law. (Gal 35; Col 217) are exactly in line with the teaching of the Law.

(2) The Law transcended by the gospel.—The author shows how the Law, which was a word spoken through angels, is transcended by the gospel, which has been spoken by the Lord of angels, and so demands greater reverence (He 22-4), and all through the ep. it is the transcendent glory of the gospel dispensation introduced by Christ and ascribed to Him, which is made to shine before us.

(3) Law of Mosaic priesthood.—The author deals specifically in chs. 7 and 8 with the law of priesthood, showing that Christ's Priesthood, "after the order of Melchisedek," surpasses in glory that of the Aaronic priesthood under the law; not only surpasses but supersedes it; the imperfect and inadequate to the perfect; the shadowy to the real; the earthly to the heavenly; the temporal to the eternal. And as Paul justifies his doctrine of justification apart from the deeds of the Law by reference to the OT teaching, so here he deals with the Mosaic Law, and his argument is that Christ makes good all that the tabernacle and its services typified, that His one, all-perfect eternal sacrifice takes the place of the many imperfect temporary sacrifices offered under the Law. At the best the Law had "a shadow of the good things to come" (101). The shadow was useful for the time being, the people were greatly privileged in having it, it directed them to the great Figure who cast the shadow. The whole ceremonial

5. In the Epistle to the Hebrews

James mentions the "law" 10 times in his ep., and in each case it is the moral law. The influence of the Sermon on the Mount is seen throughout the ep., and some distinct echoes of it are heard, as e.g. the injunction, "Swear not at all" (612). James has been described as the law teacher, and that fact in the light of the influence of the Sermon on the Mount is enough to show that, in that wonderful discourse, did not disregarde the Law, far less abrogate it, but rather exalted and reinforced it. The fundamentals taught by Christ exalt the Law, glorify it, in fact seems almost to identify it with the gospel, for in ch 1, when speaking of the Word and the importance of hearing and doing it, he in the same breath speaks of looking into "the perfect law, the law of liberty," and indeed, it is just possible, as some think, that he means the gospel by the epittle, although it seems better to take it as the Law itself in the gospel, the Law looked at in its spirituality, as the guide of the Christian man who has entered into the spirit of it.

Even in the OT, as Pss 19 and 119 specifically show, it was possible for spiritually-minded men to see the beauty of the Law and find delight in its precepts. In 28 he speaks of the "royal law," and shows that here he does not deal specifically with the Mosaic Law, but with the Ten Commandments, and the great law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," in this agreeing with his Master and with Paul, finding in love of neighbor the sum of the Law and its true fulfillment. Rest is given place to this kingdom which is the true fulfillment of this "royal law," and leads to those indulging in it being "convicted" by the law of transgression (ver 9). He then affirms the solidarity of the Law, so that a breach of it in one particular is a breach of the whole, and makes a man "guilty of all" (ver 10), a far-reaching principle which Paul had also indicated when quoting in Gal the words, "Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them" (Gal 310), and when in Rom 7 he showed that the conviction that he had broken the 10th commandment made him realize that he had broken the whole Law. James then exhorts his readers to speak and act as those who are to be judged by "a law of liberty" (212), so that he sets no limit to the range of that law. Finally, in 411, he warns them by implication against speaking against the Law or judging the Law, that is, to assume the place of judge instead of "doer of the law." James could not have used such language unless he had a profound conviction of the perfection of the Law, and it is the perfection of the Law as a rule of life for spiritual men redeemed from its condemnation that James considers it, and so we can call it the perfect law, the law of liberty, the Royal Law.
In the Epp. of Peter and John, the word “law” does not occur, but Peter shows that the holiness of God remains as in the Pent.
6. In the standard of life, and the example of Epistles of Christ shows the way (1 Pet 2 21), while in the church is found the spiritual realization of the sanctuary, priesthood and sacrifice of the old economy (1 Pet 2 5–9). Peter has one reference to the Rom law, enjoining upon his readers obedience to it in the political sphere. John enjoins the keeping of the commandments, these being apparently the commandments of Christ (1 Jn 2 3, 4; 5 2), and the test of keeping the commandments is love of the brethren, while hatred of a brother is, as in the Sermon on the Mount, murder. All sin is “lawlessness” (3 4), and the sum of all law-keeping is love of God and love of the brethren, and so the summary of the old Law is echoed and endorsed.
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LAW IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

I. TERMS USED
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   (1) Miqwah (“Command”)
   (2) Edah (“Witness”)
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1. The Critical Dating of the Laws
2. The Grouping of Laws
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   (1) Judgments. Compared with Code of Ham.
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4. The Book of the Law of Dt 31
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   (1) Servants and the Poor
   (2) Punishments
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   (4) Sabbath and Feasts
2. The Ceremonial Law
   (1) Origin of Sacrifice
   (2) The Levitical Ritual
3. The Law Truly a Torah

IV. THE PASSING AWAY OF THE LAW

LITERATURE

Law, at least as custom, certainly existed among the Hebrews in the times before Moses, as appears from numerous allusions to it, both in matters civil and ceremonial, in the earlier Scriptures. But we have no distinct account of such law, either as to its full contents or its enactment.

Law in the OT practically means the Law promulgated by Moses (having its roots no doubt in this earlier law or custom), with sundry later modifications or additions, rules as to which have been inserted in the record of the Mosaic Law.

The following are matters of pre-Mosaic law or custom to which allusion is made in Gen and Ex: the offering of sacrifices and the use of altars (Gen passim); the religious use of pillar (Gen 28 18); purification for sacrifice (35 2); tithes (14 20; 28 22); circumcision (17 10; Ex 4 25); inquiry at a sanctuary (Gen 25 22); sacred feast (Ex 5 1 etc); priest (Ex 19 20); sacred oath (Gen 14 22); custom of anointing (16 18; 25 6; 28 6–30); birthright (31 30–34); elders (24 2; 60 7; Ex 3 16); homicide (Gen 9 6), etc. We proceed on to the Law of Moses.

I. TERMS USED.

The Hebrew word rendered “law” in our Bibles is תָּׂרָאָה, tōrāh. Other synonymous words either denote (as indeed does tōrāh itself) aspects under which the Law may be regarded, or different classes of law.

Tōrāh is from torāh, the Hiphil of yārāh. The root meaning is “to throw”; hence in Hiphil the word means “to point out” (as by throwing out the hand); “direct”; and tōrāh is “direction.”

Tōrāh may be simply “human direction,” as the “law of thy mother” in Prov 1 8; but most often in the OT it is the Divine law. In the sin, it often means a law, the pl. being used in the same sense; but more frequently tōrāh in the OT is the general body of Divinely given law. The word tells nothing as to the way in which the Law, or any part of it, was first given; it simply points out the general purpose of the Law, viz. that it was for the guidance of God’s people in the various matters to which it relates. This shows that the end of the Law lay beyond the mere obedience to such and such rules, that end being instruction in the knowledge of God and of men’s relation to Him, and guidance in living as the children of such a God as He revealed Himself to be. This is dwelt upon in the later Scriptures, notably in Pss 19 and 119.

In the completed Canon of the OT, tōrāh technically denotes the Pent (Lk 24 44) as being that division of the OT Scriptures which contains the text of the Law, and its history down to the death of Moses, the great lawgiver.

(1) Miqwa˒ (“command” or, in pl., “commands”), is a term applied to the Law as indicating that it is laid upon men as the expression of God’s will, and therefore that it must be obeyed.

2. SYNONYMS OF TORAH

(2) Edah, “witness” or “testimony” (in pl. “testimonies”), is a designation of God’s law as testing the guidance of His dealings with His people. So the ark of the covenant is called the “ark of the testimony” (Ex 25 22), as containing the “testimony” (ver 16), i.e. the tables of the Law upon which the covenant was based. The above terms are general, applying to the tōrāh at large; the two next following are of more restricted application.

(3) Mihraph, “judgments”: Mihraph in the sing., sometimes means judgment in an abstract sense, as in Gen 18 19; Dt 32 4; and designates the act of judging, as in Dt 16 18; 17 9; 24 17. But “judgments” (in the pl.) is a term constantly used in connection with, and distinction from, statutes, to indicate laws of a particular kind, viz. laws which, though forming part of the tōrāh by virtue of divine sanction, originated in decisions of judges upon cases brought before them for judgment. See further below.

(4) Hukkim, “statutes” (lit. “laws engraved”), are laws immediately enacted by a lawgiver. “Judgments and statutes” together comprise the whole law (Lev 18 3; Dt 4 18 AV). So also we now distinguish between consuetudinary and statute law.

(5) Pikkadhim, “precepts” This term is found only in the Ps. It seems to mean rules or counsels provided to suit the various circumstances in which men may be placed. The term may perhaps be meant to apply both to the rules of the actual tōrāh, and to others found, e.g. in the writings of prophets and “wise men.”

II. THE WRITTEN RECORD OF THE LAW.

The enactment of the Law and its committal to writing must be distinguished. With regard to the former, it is distinctly stated (Jn 5 37) that “the law was given through Moses”; and though this does not necessarily imply that every regulation found in the synoptic is his, a large number of the laws are expressly ascribed to him. As regards the latter, we are distinctly told that Moses wrote certain laws or col-
lections of laws (Ex 17 14; 24 4-7; Dt 31 9). These, however, form only a portion of the whole legislation; and therefore, whether the remaining portions were written by Moses, or— if not by him —when and by whom, is a legitimate matter of inquiry.

It is not necessary here to discuss the large question of the literary history of the Pent, but it must briefly be touched upon. The Pent certainly appears to have reached its present form by the gradual piling together of diverse materials. Dt being the most separated composition which it seems to have been clearly established by critical examination between a number of paragraphs in the remaining books which apparently must once have formed a narrative by themselves, and other paragraphs, partly narrative but chiefly legislative and statistical, which appear to have been subsequently added. Without endorsing any of the critical theories as to the relation of these, one to the other, or as to the dates of their composition, we may, in a general way, accept the analysis, and adopt the well-known symbol JE to distinguish the former, and P the latter. Confining ourselves to their legislative contents, we find in JE a short but very important body of law, the Law of the Covenant, formulated in full in Ex 19-20, and repeated full to a portion of it in Ex 34 10-28. All the rest of the legislation is contained in P and Dt.

We are distinctly told in Ex that the law contained in Ex 20-23 was given through Moses. Rejecting this statement, critics of the school of Wellhausen affirm that its true date must be placed considerably later than the time of Joshua. They maintain that previous to their conquest of Canaan the Israelites were mere nomads, ignorant of the practice of which, as well as their culture in general, they first learned from the conquered Canaanites. Therefore (so they argue), as the law of Ex 20-23 presupposes the practice of agriculture, it cannot have been promulgated until some time in the period of the Judges at the earliest; they place it indeed in the early period of the monarchy. All this, however, is mere assumption, support for which is claimed in some passages in which a shepherd life is suggested, or in certain passages which show that both in the patriarchal period and in Egypt the Israelites also cultivated land. See B. D. Ehrman, "Have the Hebrews Been Nomads?" Expos, August and October, 1908. It can indeed be shown that this law was throughout in harmony with what must have been the customs and conceptions of the Israelites at the age of the exodus (Rule, OT Institutions). Professor Ehrman's in his "Allgemeine Studien, Part III (1910), vigorously defends the Mosaic origin of the Book of the Covenant.

The same critics bring down the date of the legislation of Dt to the time of Josiah, or at most a few years earlier. They affirm (wrongly) that the chief object of Josiah's reform was the re-establishment of worship at high places in Jerusalem. They rightly attribute the zeal which carried the reform through to the discovery of the "Book of the Law" (22 8). Then arguing that the frequent previous practice of worship at high places is the non-existence of any law to the contrary, they conclude that the rule of Dt 12 was a rule recently laid down by the temple priesthood, and written in a book in Moses' name, this new book being what was "found in the temple of the Lord." But this is manifestly unsound: its grave difficulties are well set out in Möller's Are the Critics Right? And here again careful study vindicates the Mosaic character of the law of Dt as a whole and of Dt 12 in particular. M. Édouard Naville in La découverte de la loi sous le roi Josias propounds a theory which he supports by a most interesting argument: that the book found was a foundation deposit, which must therefore have been built over by masonry at the erection of the temple by Solomon.

Equally unsound, however plausible, are the arguments which would make the framing of the Levitical ritual the work of the age of Ezra. The difficulties created by this theory are far greater than those which it is intended to remove. On this also see Möller, Are the Critics Right?

Rejecting these theories, it will be assumed in the present art. that the various laws are of the dates ascribed to them in the Pent; that whatever may be said as to the date of some "of the laws," all which are therein ascribed to Moses are truly so ascribed.

The laws in P are arranged for the most part in groups, with which narrative is sometimes intermingled. These e.g. are some of the Laws of Lev 19, 22-26; Ex 20-23, Nu 1-4, etc. The structure and probable history of these groups are very interesting. That many of them must have undergone interpolation appears certain from the following considerations. Each of the groups, and often one or more paragraphs within a group, is headed by a recurring formula, "Jehovah spake unto Moses [or unto Aaron, or unto Moses and Aaron], saying." We might at first expect that the contents of each group or paragraph so headed would consist solely of what Jehovah had said unto Moses or Aaron, but this is not always so. Not infrequently some direction is found within such a paragraph which cannot have been spoken to Moses, but is the outcome of some later date. Unless then we reject the statement of the formula, unless we are prepared to say that Jehovah did not speak unto Moses, we can only conclude that these later directions were at some time inserted by an editor into paragraphs which originally contained Mosaic laws only. That this should have been done would be perfectly natural, when we consider that the purpose of such an editor would be not only to preserve (as has been done) the real Law, but also to provide a manual of law complete for the use of his age, a manual (to use a modern phrase) made complete to date.

That the passages in question were indeed interpolations appears not only from the fact that removal of the text of what otherwise would be grave discrepancies, but because the passages in question sometimes disturb the sequence of the context. Moreover, by thus distinguishing between laws promulgated (as stated) by Moses, and laws to which the formula of statement was not intended to apply, we arrive at the following important result. It is that the former laws can all be shown to be in harmony one with another and with the historical formula of the Mosaic law; while the introduction of the later rules is also seen to be what would naturally follow by way of adaptation to the circumstances of later times, and the gradual unfolding of Divine purpose.

It would be much too long a task here to work this out in detail: it has been done by E.W. Thomas in this article in OT Institutions, Their Origin and Development. Two instances, however, may be mentioned. The consistence of the law of inheritance.—In Ex 13 23 (26) we read, "This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no alien eat thereof: the house of Israel only shall eat thereof." But this is manifestly unsound: its grave difficulties are well set out in Möller's Are the Critics Right? And here again careful study vindicates the Mosaic character of the law of Dt as a whole.
The hypothetical Constitution of Nation, 12-17; 23

According to Lev 23 34-39a, 40-42, the Feast of Tabernacles was in large part only. This was because the Mosaic ritual as appears from the formula in ver 33, and in certain other passages. But as a development of the "latter" part of the Feast, it is very likely that it was subsequently added, and therefore insertions to that effect were made here. The The second day of the Feasts of the Lord shall be a sabbath day, service of the Lord, which was and so this week is continued. The observance of the "set feasts" which we find in Ex Num 23 24-29, 30. It is very likely that this was—very similar to that of: the "negative confession" in the Egyptian Book of the Dead. The Jewish religious rules of the Law of the Covenant we find, not new rules or an establishment of new institutions, but the new sanction of what was already law. The "feasts" of Jehovah: the Book of Leviticus, the "Book of the Law of Dt 31 26, and the so-called "Law of Holiness." This book, expressly so named (Ex 24 7), is stated to have been written by Moses (24 3), it must have comprised the contents of Ex 20-23. The making of the Book of the Covenant at Sinai, led up to by the revelation of the Covenant, the words of Ex 3 12-17; 6 2-8; 19 3-6, was the transaction of a very first importance in the religious history of Israel. God's revelation of Himself to Israel being very largely, indeed chiefly, a revelation of His moral attributes (Ex 34 6-7), could only be effectually apprehended by a people who were morally fitted to receive it. Hence, it was that Israel as a nation was placed under God by a stated relation to Himself by means of a covenant, the condition upon which the covenant was based being, on His people's part, their obedience to a given law. This was the law contained in the "Book of the Covenant." It consisted of "words of Jehovah" and "judgments" (Ex 24 3 AV). The latter are contained in Ex 21 1-22 17; the former in ch 20, in the remaining portion of ch 22, and ch 23. The "judgments" (Aramaic = law) relate entirely to matters of right between man and man; the "words of Jehovah" relate partly to these and partly to duties distinctively religious.

(1) The judgments compared with Code of Hammurabi.

The "judgments" appear to be taken from older consuetudinary law; not necessarily comprising the whole of that law, but so much of it as pleased God now to stamp with His express sanction and to embody in this Covenant Law. They may well be compared with those contained in the so-called Code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, who is thought to have been the Amraphel of Gen 14. These are called "the judgments of righteousness which Hammurabi the mighty king confirmed." The resemblance in form and in subject between the two sets of "judgments" are very striking. All alike have the same structure, beginning with a hypothetical clause, "if so and so," and then giving the rule applicable in the third person. All alike relate entirely to civil, as distinguished from religious, matters, to rights and duties between man and man. All seem to have had a similar origin in judgments passed in the first place on causes brought before judges for decision. When these threatening consuetudinary law.

On Basis of the law of the covenant an earlier custom and conception.—It is remarkable that, alike in matters of right between man and man, and in matters relating directly thereto, the Law of the Covenant did little (if anything) more than give a new and Divinely and solemn sanction to requirements which, being already familiar, appealed to the general conscience of the community. If, indeed, in the "words of Jehovah" there is the bringing of consuetudinary moral or (more particularly) religious requirements, e.g. in the first and second commandments of the Decalogue, it would seem to have been so by way of revision, which must have been already gaining hold upon the minds of at least the more thoughtful of the people, and which could be developed and recommended to them by the events of their recent history. In no other way could the Law of the Covenant have appealed to their conscience. It must have been seen that the covenant could be securely based.

As in the "hymn of this age," there is a ratification of old consuetudinary law; as again in the second table of the Decalogue we have moral rules in accordance with a standard of morality which to all intents and purposes the prophet foretold would be fulfilled long after the time when the people already were under the "negative confession" in the Egyptian Book of the Dead. The Book of the Covenant we find, not new rules or an establishment of new institutions, but the new sanction of what was already law. These "feasts" of Jehovah: assume the rendering of service to Jehovah; they do not insist on it as if it were a new thing, but they enjoin that the Israelites shall not add to His service also the service of other gods (Ex 20 3; 23 24). They assume the observance of the three "feasts", they enjoin that these shall be kept to Jehovah—unto me", i.e. "unto me only" (Ex 19.17). They assume the making of certain offerings to Jehovah, they enjoin that these shall be made liberally—of the first, i.e. of the best—and without delay (Ex 29). They assume the rendering of worship by sacrifice, and the existence of an accustomed ritual, and therefore they do not lay down any scheme of ritual, but they give a few directions designed to guard against idolatry, or any practices tending either to irreverence toward God and law and feast, or to("feast", "Book of the Covenant." The Book of the Law of Dt 31, and the "law of Holiness.")
only subordinately with matters of ritual: it warns against perils of idolatry and superstitions. Corruptions, common in the service of other gods, but which might by no means be mixed up with Jeh's service: it insists upon righteous conduct between man and man, and very strongly inculcates humanity toward the poor and the dependent: it enjoins upon those in authority the impartial maintenance of right, as also fairness, moderation and mercy, in the administration of law and the infliction of punishment: it sets forth the fear of God as that principle of Hebrew actions, and the love of God in response to His mercy toward them. It does not lay down any scheme of ritual, though it gives rules (14:3-21) as to things which might not be eaten as unclean; it also gives directions as to the disposal of tithes (14:22-29; 26:12); it enlarges upon the direction in the Law of the Covenant for the observance of the three feasts, adding to this the observance of the Passover (ch 16); it lays down a law (expressed conditionally) restricting to one sanctuary the offering of at least the more solemn sacrifices (ch 12); and it frequently inculcates liberality toward the Levites, both on account of the sacred services rendered by them, their dispersal among the tribes, and the precarious character of their life. Like the other books of the Pentateuch, it assumes the existence of an accustomed ceremonial, and it is remarkable that when there is occasion to do so it makes use of phraseology (ch 12) similar to that of the ritual laws of Moses in Lev and Nu. It is quite possible that some interpolations may have been made in the text of chs 5, 6, but not on any sufficient scale to affect the general character of the original book. This "Book of the Law" then was an expansion of the Law of the Covenant, enforcing its principles, giving directions in greater detail, and setting in a framework of exhortation, warning and encouragement. Thus its relation to the covenant is indicated by Dt 26:16-19; 34:1. This is that "book of the Law of Moses," at which reference is frequently made in the books of K, Ch, Ezr and Neh.

In marked contrast to the numerous rules, sometimes intermingled with narrative, which we find in Ex 25-40; Lev 1-16, and through-out Nu, there is a selection of laws which evidently was once a book by itself. This, from its constant insistence upon holiness as a motive of conduct, has been called "the Law of Holiness." Though it contains many laws long since stated to have been spoken by Moses, we are not told by whom it was written, and therefore its authorship and date are a fair subject of inquiry. In its general design it bears much resemblance to the Law of the Covenant, and the Book of the Law contained in Dt. As in and, esp. in the latter, the laws are set up in a parenetic framework, the whole closing with promise of reward for obedience and a threat of punishment for disobedience (cf Ex 20:23-33; Lev 26; Dt 28). Like them it deals much with physical aspects, and has been said to have been spoken by Moses, but it is not so familiar as the other. In Ex 25, in particular, the law contained in Ex 25-40 is a selection of laws which are not found in Nu, and which are not found in Ps, Prov. and the NT. A clue to its date is to be found in its conception of holiness. The idea found in the Prophets and the NT that moral wrongdoing renders unclean must be sought on the basis of a later conception, viz. upo on OT conception of ritual uncleaness. Now ritual uncleanness was originally physical uncleanness only, and was not necessarily applicable to the spirit. That it is all: this is perfectly clear from the whole contents of Lev 11-15. On the other hand we find the idea of moral uncleanness and uncleanness fully formed in the Ps, Prov., and in the Prophets, including the earlier prophets, with moral duties: chs 19 and 20 are practically an independent conception. We find that whereas in Lev 11-15 sexual acts which were lawful rendered unclean equally with those which were unlawful, in H adultery and incest are denounced as rendering specially unclean, the idea being that their technical uncleanness makes them intensely unclean through their immorality (Lev 18:24-30). Similarly, conversely familiar spirits and wizards, which probably involved physical defilement (perhaps through the ingredients used in charms), is strongly denounced (Deut 18:11). Sins, however, which in themselves entail physical uncleanness, such e.g., as injustice, are not mentioned in the Pentateuch, though they are so regarded in the Prophets. First, then, we have ritual uncleanness, which is physical only in the rules of Lev 11-15 (Lev 11:3-8), while the Prophets (embrying a pro-Mosaic conception): Lastly, we have moral wrongs in itself rendering unclean, and this is pronounced by the Prophets: immediately we have the transitional conception in H. The date therefore of the Law of Holiness may be Mosaic, but must be considerably earlier than the earliest of the writing prophets.

The remaining groups of Mosaic laws would appear to have been extant in their original form (i.e. without interpolation), no doubt in the custody of the priests, for for a probably a very considerable time, it may have been for centuries, before their final compilation in their present form. The arrangement of these groups as they now stand after H and with narrative intermingled, is by no means haphazard, as it might at first appear.

(1) Exod. As the directions for the erection of the tabernacle with the purpose of its several parts were given to Moses only after he had been on Mount Sinai, the covenant, they follow the account of it immediately. Thus Ex contains the history of the making of the Ark of what led up to it, and of what immediately followed it, viz. the provision of the home for the covenant-worship.

(2) Leviticus. This book follows with the rules of that worship; not indeed with all its details, but with an account of all that was essential for the making of the covenant, they follow the account of it immediately. Thus Ex contains the history of the making of the Ark of what led up to it, and of what immediately followed it, viz. the provision of the home for the covenant-worship.

(3) Numbers. The purpose of Nu is supplementary. Nu 1-6, containing the numbering and ordering of the tribes and rules as to the representative Levitical minis- try, sets forth the corporate character of Israel's serv- ice of God. The Israelites were not to be a mere aggre-gation of tribes, but a single nation, the bond of their union being the covenant with God. The camp itself, ordered and guarded against polluting persons, was to be a symbol of this holy unity. Chs 7-10 narrate the taking of the Passover at Sinai, important to the first commemorative Passover. The remaining chapters contain, alternately, a narrative of events following the departure from Sinai, with a collection of laws usually in some way connected with the events narrated, but all of them supplementary to the more essential laws already recorded.

(4) Deuteronomy. As a separate work and based upon, sayings and doings at the very close of the 40 years, Dt naturally follows last.

III. The General Character and Design of the Law. Both in civil matters and in ceremonial the Law had to deal with men who lived in a compara-tively early age of human history. Its rules were necessarily adapted to the standards of the age. At the same time they inculcated principles, the working out of which would by degrees bring about a great advance in men's con cep- tions both of what is true and of what is right.
As J. B. Moyle says (Lectures on the OT), "The morality of a progressive revelation is not the morality with which it starts but that with which it ends. The moral excellence of the OT Law is evident, not only in its great underlying principles, but in the suitability of its individual rules to promote moral advance.

1. The Civil Law

(1) Servants and the poor.—We have already noted the similarity between the "judgments" of Ex 20 and 21 and the "judgments" of Hammurabi, in respect to form and subject. Notwithstanding the practical wisdom found in many of the latter, there was a spirit of God between them and the former, for while both the Law of the Covenant and its enlargement in Dt, guarded the interest of and secured justice, and mercy too, to slaves and the poor, the laws of Hammurabi (Ex 20-23) were merely the practical expression of the commandant, the owner of that house shall be put to death." The Law indeed permitted slavery, an institution universal in the ancient world, but it made provisions which must very greatly have mitigated its evil. "Every seven years a Levite joined, both in Ex and in Dt, that after six years' service a Heb manservant should "go out free for nothing," unless he himself preferred to remain in servitude (Ex 21:2-6; Dt 15:12-18). The rule in Dt was not exactly the same, but it nevertheless guarded their interests, while Heb women servants were afterward included in the rule of Dt 15:12. A still greater amelioration was brought in by a later rule connected with the law of the Jubilee as set out in Lev 25:39-55. Again, though servitude was permitted on account of debt, or as a rescue from poverty (Ex 21:2-7; Dt 15:12), manumitting was a capital offense (Ex 21:16).

(2) Punishments.—The rule of Ex 21:22-25 ("eye for eye," etc; cf Lev 24:19-20; Dt 19:16-19) sounds harsh to us, but while the justice it sanctioned was rough and ready according to the age, it put a restraint on vindictiveness. The punishment bore no more proportion to the crime than the same spirit of restraint in punishment is seen in the rule as to flogging (Dt 25:2). Similarly the rule that murder was to be avenged by "the avenger of blood," a rule under the circumstances of the case both necessary and salutary, was protected from abuse by the appointment of places of refuge, the rule with respect to which was designed to prepare the way for a better system (see Ex 21:12-14; Nu 35:12; Dt 19:1-13).

(3) Marriage.—The marriage customs of the Mosaic age permitted polygamy and concubinage, marriage by purchase or by capture in war, slave-marriage, and divorce. The Law allowed the continuance of these customs, but did not originate them; on the contrary, its provisions were designed to restrict the old license, giving protection to the weaker party, the woman, limiting as far as possible the evils of the traditional system, a system which could not suddenly be changed, and preparing the way for a better. Consider the effect of the following rules: as to slave-wives (Ex 21:7-11); captives of war (Dt 21:10-14); plurality of wives (Dt 21:15-17); adultery (Ex 20:14.17; Dt 22:22); fornication (Dt 22:25-29; 25:17.18; Lev 21:9); divorce (Dt 22:23); the woman who was taken in marriage; the heir of a succession (Lev 18:6-18); marriage of priests (Lev 21:7.10-15); royal polygamy (Dt 17:17).

(4) Sabbaths and feasts.—The law as to these, though partly ceremonial, yet served social ends. The Sabbath day gave to all, and particularly to servants and the poor, and domestic cattle too, a useful rest from daily toil, to safeguard common rights at perhaps a time of transition as to customs of land tenure: connected with it also were rules as to release of slaves and relief of debtors (Ex 20:9-11; Lev 25:2-7; Dt 15:1-18). The observance of the Sabbath day seems to have fallen into disuse, perhaps as early as some 500 years before the Bab captivity (2 Ch 36:1), and it is probable that the Jubilee (the design of which seems to have been to adjust conflicting rights under new customs of land tenure and in the relation of employer to employed) was instituted to take its place (Lev 25). The law as to the annual feasts insured both the social advantages of festive gatherings of the people, and their sanctification by association with the important festival of the year, when God's presence was near (Lev 23:1-21). We have already noted that the conception of sin as uncleanliness, rendering the sinner forever unfruitful for the presence of God, must have been an outgrowth from the earlier concept of purely ritual (physical) uncleanliness. This development, and an accompanying sense of the sinfulness of and of its need of atonement by sacrifice, were undoubtedly brought about by the gradual working of the law of the sin offering (Lev 4:1-5:18; 12-15; 16). Similarly the rules as to guilt offerings (Lev 5, 14, 6) must by degrees have led to a true conception of repentance, as including both the seeking of atonement through sacrifice and restitution for wrong committed. The sin offering was, however, a peculiarly Mosaic institution, marking a development in the sacrificial system. The only sacrifices of which we have any trace in pre-Mosaic times were meal and drink offerings and purifications (or, to use the Levitical term, peace offerings).

2. The Ceremonial Law

(1) Origin of sacrifice.—We read of the offering of sacrifice all through the patriarchal history, and farther back even than Noah in the story of Cain and Abel; and there can be no doubt that the Levitical system of sacrifice was based upon, and a development (under Divine ordering) of, the sacrificial system already traditional among the Hebrews. Sacrifice was undoubtedly of Divine origin; yet we have no account, or even hint, of any formal institution of sacrifice. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel are spoken of in a way that leaves the impression that they were offered spontaneously, and the most probable assumption would seem to be that the very first offerings of sacrifice were the outcome of a spontaneous desire (Divinely implanted). We may be sure in early men to render service to the higher Being for whose relation to themselves they were, if ever so dimly, conscious.

Preliminary research has not yet been able to present to us a distinct picture of primitive men; and even if the results of anthropology were more certain than they now yet claim to be, what is certain is that society centered in is the conceptions, not of early men everywhere, but of the early ancestors of the Hebrews. However infantile this may have been and probably were, there may well have been far more of communality truth in them, than we usually imagine—than students of anthropology have any knowledge of. Sooner or later early men did make offerings to God, and as far as the story of Moses is concerned it was certainly based upon the patriarchal, so we may fairly assume that the earliest offering of the latter were an outgrowth from those which underlay the sacrifice of the patriarch's own still earlier ancestors.

It is well observed by Dr. A. M.绒 (OT Theology, p. 313) that the sacrifices of Cain and Abel are called
a minḥād or present; and this idea of sacrifice as a gift to God most easily accounts for the facts with which we have to deal in the history of OT sacrifice. When early men first made offerings to God, they probably did so for the spirit of young children who give gifts to older persons whom they know in what way, the gifts be of any use to them. They simply give in affection which is of itself the only sacrifice.

The one only thing of prime value to the discoverers of history must have been food; hence offerings to God were everywhere in the first place offerings of food. A difficulty must soon have arisen, for men must have become convinced very soon that the Divine Being did not feed upon the food offered, at least not in a literal sense. Ultimately, among the Israelites, the idea of His actual feeding became either a teaching, or for the gospel, one not in the main. The difficulty the time the difficulty seemed to have been met by the assumption that the Divine Being consumed an inner essence of food, and the whole food offered became to be set free by fire. Food offered in sacrifice came to be burnt in order to fit it to become the food of God. This certainly appears from Lev 3 11-16 (cf Lev 21 6.8.17.21).

Coming, however, to animal as distinguished from vegetable food, the animal sacrifice was the offering of the blood, and that blood was offered because blood was life. The idea that life can be given by giving blood lay at the root of a custom which must have been well-nigh universal in primitive times, that of blood covenanting (see H Clay Buck). In this, two persons would each to the other of his own blood, drawn from the living vein, and the blood covenanting was supposed to be by the commingling of their blood, to become actual sharers of one life. To give to another one's own blood was to give to another one's own self, with all the dedication of love and service which that would imply. Not only would they seem to have lain at the foundation of the primitive offering of blood to God: It was the offering of the life of the offerer.

It is probable that the blood offered was the blood of the offerer, and that there was no infliction of death—only in this way the dedication of life. The dedicatory rite of circumcision may have been a survival of sacrifice in this its earliest form; so also what is known in Lev 11 12.28. When, however, the blood offered had come to be the blood of a substitute, and that a substitute animal, the sacrifice would come to include the slaughter of that animal and the further the consumption, in whole or in part, of its carcase by fire as an offering of food.

(2) The Levitical ritual. Whether the above theory be accepted or not, so far as animal sacrifice became an offering of food, it would stand in line with vegetable sacrifice; but in both the excellence of the Levitical ritual stood in this, that while it was framed for a people whose conceptions were in general, raised, it stood in higher conceptions, and fitted to become at last symbolical of purely spiritual truth. It was through the teaching, not only of prophets but of the Levitical ritual itself, and while it was still in full sway, that the words of 1 John 3 14 were uttered: "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High." The Levitical ritual, as respects animal sacrifice in particular, was so framed, on the other hand, to keep alive the idea of sacrifice as the offering of life, not of death, of life's dedication, not its destruction, and therefore to make it a true type of Christ's living sacrifice. On the other hand, the rules of sacrifice guarded Him, as a matter of fact, sprang up widely among the heathen. The rule, e.g. in Lev 1 2 and elsewhere, that ye shall offer your oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock, excluded human sacrifice. The rule that the first act in every sacrifice must be to slay the creature offered excluded the infliction of unnecessary suffering. The detailed rules as to the offering and disposal of the blood, and the varying modes of disposal of the carcase, kept alive the essential idea of a such sacrifice, and shut out from degenerating into a mere heaping up, as in Egypt, of altars with mere loads of food. The rules of the peace offering, clothing it always with a spiritual motive (see Lev 7 12.16), raised it to a level far above the sacrifice of that class among the surrounding heathen, guarding it against their licentious festivity (cf Hos 2 11-13; 4 13.14; Am 2 8; 5 21-23) and gross ideas as to the part of God in the feasting.

(3) The Law truly a torah.—In every one of its departments the Law proved itself to be indeed a torah directing God's people in the upward way, leading them on from the state of advancement, such as it was, to which they had already attained by Moses' time, to higher and higher standards, both of faith and of duty, till they were prepared for the gospel, when Christ, who Himself said of the old Law, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" (Mt 5 18 AV). Meanwhile we have, in the teaching of the prophets, not a counter influence, not a system rivaling the Law, but its unfolding, both inspired of God, both instruments in His progressive revelation. "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" were the words of Samuel, a faithful servant of the Law, and himself a frequent offerer of sacrifice. The Law was led to the heart of devout Israelites in the prophetic age is seen in the fervent words of Ps 119.

IV. The Passing Away of the Law.—The great general principles of the Law were not transitory but abiding, and reappear under the gospel dispensation. Otherwise, however, i.e. in those particulars, whether ceremonial or civil, in which it was adapted to merely passing needs, the Law passed away when Christ came. It is not always realized that Christ's coming has began to pass away. The following are illustrations:

(1) The whole rationale of the Levitical worship consisted in its being based upon the covenant made at Sinai, and the symbol of the Covenant was the offerer. As long as the priests were a small portion only of the whole Levitical body, as they appear in the history down to the middle period of the monarchy. But by the time of the exile they disappeared from history except as a remnant of priestly ministers, and, after the return from the exile, even these were in number a mere handful compared with the priests (Exr 2 36-42; 8 15-20.24-30; Neh 11 10-19). The attempt to revive the old law (Neh 10 38.39) was well-intentioned but impracticable: it was evidently soon abandoned (Neh 13 10-13; Mal 3 8-10). We learn from Jos that tithes were regarded later as due to the priests, not to the Levites (Jos, Ant. XX, viii, 8; ix, 2).

(3) That law which, as long as the priests were a small portion only of the Levitical body, as they appear in the history down to the middle period of the monarchy. But by the time of the exile they disappeared from history except as a remnant of priestly ministers, and, after the return from the exile, even these were in number a mere handful compared with the priests (Exr 2 36-42; 8 15-20.24-30; Neh 11 10-19). The attempt to revive the old law (Neh 10 38.39) was well-intentioned but impracticable: it was evidently soon abandoned (Neh 13 10-13; Mal 3 8-10). We learn from Jos that tithes were regarded later as due to the priests, not to the Levites (Jos, Ant. XX, viii, 8; ix, 2).

(3) That law which, as long as the priests were a small portion only of the whole Levitical body, as they appear in the history down to the middle period of the monarchy. But by the time of the exile they disappeared from history except as a remnant of priestly ministers, and, after the return from the exile, even these were in number a mere handful compared with the priests (Exr 2 36-42; 8 15-20.24-30; Neh 11 10-19). The attempt to revive the old law (Neh 10 38.39) was well-intentioned but impracticable: it was evidently soon abandoned (Neh 13 10-13; Mal 3 8-10). We learn from Jos that tithes were regarded later as due to the priests, not to the Levites (Jos, Ant. XX, viii, 8; ix, 2).

(4) It is probable that some of the supplementary rules in Nu may have been designed for temporary use only, and may have passed away before the close of the OT. It may have been so, e.g. with the law of Nu 5 11-31, a law probably most useful in the circumstances of the Moabite age, and perhaps itself a post-Mosaic addendum.

LITERATURE.—Driver, LOT, with which should read Möller, Are the Critics Right? And Orr, POT; A. B. Davidson, Theology of the OT; J. B. Maxey, Rules, Ideas in Early Ages; Rule, OT Institutions, Their Origin and Development; Kuts, Sacrificial Worship of the OT; Hoonacker, Le sacre de Josué; Edouard Naville,
LAW, JUDICIAL, jōd-dish'āl: This was the form of Divine law which, under the dominion of God as the Supreme Magistrate, directed the policy of the Jewish nation, and hence was binding only on them, not on other peoples. The position of Jeh, as the Supreme Ruler, was made legally binding by a formal election on the part of the national assembly (Ex 19 3-8); and that there might be no question about the matter, after the death of Moses, Joshua, in accordance with instructions received by his great predecessor in the office of final judge, in the public assembly caused the contract to be renewed in connection with most solemn exercises (Josh 8 30-35). No legal contract was ever entered into with more formality and with a clearer understanding of the terms by the several parties than was the contract which made it binding on the Hebrews permanently to recognize Jeh as the Supreme Ruler (Ex 24 3-8). He was to be acknowledged as the Founder of the nation (Ex 20 2); Sovereign, Ruler, and Judge (Ex 20 2-6); and in these capacities he was the object of love, reverential fear and worship, service, and absolute obedience. Flagrant disregard of their obligations to Him manifested in idolatry or blasphemy was regarded as high treason, and like high treason in all nations punishable by death (Ex 20 3-5; 22 20; Lev 24 16; Dt 17 2-5). The will of Jeh in critical cases was to be ascertained through special means (Nu 9 8; Js 1 12; 20 18; 23 28; 1 S 10 22).

The ruling official recognized by the Hebrews as a nation was the chief magistrate, but he stood as Jeh's vicegerent, and therefore combined various authorities in his person. We must distinguish the functions of the chief magistrate (1) under the republic, (2) under the constitutional monarchy, and (3) under the senatorial oligarchy after the Bab captivity. Moses was the first chief magistrate under the republic; after him, Joshua, and the other judges. Under the constitutional monarchy, it was the king whose government was limited, for he could be punished, if need be, the native Hebrew; must not keep a large cavalry; must not support a harem; must not multiply riches; must be a defender of the national religion; must be guided by law, not whim; must be gracious and compassionate to the people (Dt 17 15-20). After the Bab captivity, the senatorial oligarchy combined ecclesiastical and state authority, later sharing it with the Rom government. See also SANHEDRIN.

FRANK E. HIRSCH

LAW, ROMAN. See Roman Law.

LAWFUL, lō'fūl (usually ὑπάκοα, mishpat, "relating to judgment," or "a pronounced judgment," or ἀντίκρισις, coddis, "relating to that which is righteous, or "just"); ἐκτίμησις, ἐκτίμη, εἰκόνος, εἰκωνομεῖν, "that which is authorized according to law" or "an privilege according to legitimate custom:" (cf Ezek 18 5-19). 21 27; Isa 49 24; Mt 12 10; Acts 16 21; 19 39): Used of persons: of God, as being righteous both in the punishment of the wicked and the rewarding of the righteous (Ps 146 17 Heb); of man, as being just and equitable in all his dealings with his fellow-man (Ezk 33 19). It is used of things when the same are in accord with a pronounced judgment or a declared will of God, and thus pleasing in His sight (Mt 3 4). When the course of individual conduct is according to God's law of righteousness, it is declared to be "lawful" (Ezk 33 19). The word is used in a forensic sense as declaring the legal status of a person conforming to law. The idea of straightness, rigid adherence to God's law, whether religious, civil, or ceremonial, cannot be excluded from the definition of the word ("lawful"").

Neither AV nor ARV is consistent in its tr of the Heb and Gr words τῷ "lawful." Sometimes the words "just" and "righteous" are used. To arrive at the full and proper meaning of "lawful" therefore, it is necessary that we study the passages containing these synonymous terms. The written Law of God is the recognized standard by which things, actions and persons are to be judged as being lawful or unlawful. WILLIAM EVANS

LAWGIVER, lā'giv-ér (πρωτοτελής, mabhēkî; νομοθῆτης). There are two words, one Heb and one Gr, which are τῷ "lawgiver." The former occurs 7 in the OT, and in AV in every case except Jgs 6 14 is thus τῷ "lawgiver" but twice (Dt 33 21; Isa 33 22), though in the other passages (Gen 49 10; Nu 21 18; Jgs 5 14; Ps 60 7; 108 8) this meaning is retained in the margin. The Gr word occurs in the NT but once (Jas 4 12), where it has a meaning that is almost the exact equivalent of the Heb word in Isa 33 22. In both passages God is declared to be the "lawgiver," and in the NT passage is so called because He has the power to rule and judge, to save and destroy. The Heb word is τῷ "lawgiver" because he is not the lawgiver. God is the lawgiver, and therefore possesses the right to pronounce judgment (cf Isa, supra). The word, however, implies more than mere legislative function; it also connotes the ideas which makes this very plain, since he adds to the statement that God is our judge and lawgiver the further declaration that He is also king. This meaning adheres to the very history of the word. It is based upon the monarchical conception in which the legislative, judicial and administrative functions are all vested in one person. In Jas the two terms "lawgiver and judge" express the idea of God's absolute sovereignty. The vb. nomôthetein occurs in He 7 11; 8 6, but it does not extend beyond the meaning "to enact laws." The Heb word is restricted to poetic passages, and except in Isa 33 22 is applied to a tribal or kingly ruler. Moses is preeminently the lawgiver to Jewish and Christian circles, but it should be noted that in the Scriptures neither is he given this title. The primary meaning of the vb. from which mabhēkî is derived is "to cut," "to carve," and a derived meaning is "to ordain." The meaning of the part, mabhēkî is probably that which it means (1) the symbol which expresses the lawgiver's authority, that is, the commander's staff; and (2) the person who possesses the authority (Dt 33 21). It has the first of these meanings in Nu 21 18; Ps 60 7; 108 8, and probably in Gen 49 10, though here it may have the second meaning. The parallelism, however, seems to require an impersonal object to correspond to scepter, and so the reading of the text (RV) is to be preferred to that of the margin (Skinner, ad loc.). In Dt 33 21; Jgs 5 14; Isa 33 22, it means the person who wielded the symbol of authority, that is the prescriber of laws. In a primitive community this would be a military commander. In Gen 49 10 the "ruler's staff" is the symbol of kingly authority (Driver), and this verse consequently implies the supremacy of Judah which came in with the Davidic kingdom. This word contains no reference to the Messiah. In Nu 21 18 there is an allusion to the custom of formally and symbolically opening fountains under the supervision of the ruler. It is the instruction of the leader of the tribe. Such a custom seems to have been in vogue till compar-
tively modern times. Gray cites Buddha in the New World for March, 1896, and Muir’s Mohamet and Islam, 344 f. In Jgs 8 14 the word means “military commander,” as the context shows. This is the meaning also in Dt 33 21, where it is affirmed that God obtained a position worthy of its warlike character. Tg, Vulg, Pesh, and some moderns seem to have reference to the pharaoh of Moses, but Nebo was in Reuben and not in Gad.

W. C. Morro

LAWLESS, ἁτέχες (ἀτέχνος, ἀνόμοι): While occurring but once in AV (1 Tim 1 9), it is τρ in various writings as “lawless” (1 Cor 9 21); “unlawful” (2 Pet 2 8 AV); “lawless” (1 Tim 1 9); “transgressor” (Mk 15 28; Lk 22 37); “wicked” (Acts 2 23 AV; 2 Thess 2 8 AV). When Paul claims to be “without law,” he has reference to those things in the ceremonial law which might well be passed over, and not to the moral law. Paul was by no means an antinomian. Those are “lawless” who break the law of the Decalogue; hence those who disobey the commandment, “Honor thy father and thy mother,” are lawless (1 Tim 1 9). The civil law is also the law of God. Those breaking it are lawless, hence called “transgressors.” Those who are unjust in their dealings are also “lawless;” for this reason the hands of Pilate and those who with him unjustly condemned Jesus are called “wicked” (Acts 2 23 AV). The most notable example of lawlessness is the Antichrist, that “wicked [lawless] one” (2 Thess 2 8).

William Evans

LAWYER, λόγιος (νομικός, σύναγερος): “According to the lawyer, a man is an expert in law;” “about the law,” “lawyer.” [Mt 22 35; Lk 7 30; 10 25; 11 45.46.52; 14 3; Tit 3 13]: The work of the “lawyers,” frequently spoken of as “scribes,” also known as “doctors” of the law (Lk 2 46 m), was first of all that of jurists. Their business was threefold: (1) to study and interpret the law; (2) to instruct the Hebrew youth in the law; (3) to decide questions of the law. The first two they did as scholars and teachers, the last as advisers in some court. By virtue of the first-named function, they gradually developed a large amount of common law, for no code can go into such detail as to eliminate the necessity of subsequent legislation, and this usually, to a great extent, takes the form of judicial decisions founded on the code rather than on separate enactment. And so it was among the Hebrews. The provisions of their code were for the most part quite general, thus affording much scope for casuistic interpretation. As a result of the industry with which this line of legal development had been pursued during the centuries immediately preceding our era, the Heb law had become a very complicated science; and since it was forbidden to record these judicial decisions, a protracted study was necessary in order to commit them to memory.

But since the law must have universal application, the views of the individual scribe could not be taken as a standard; hence the several disciples of the law must frequently meet for discussion, and the opinion of the majority then prevailed. To these men interested in the study would be invited, that they might memorize the formulas agreed upon and might clear up the points upon which they were uncertain by asking questions of the recognized doctors (Lk 2 46).

Such centers of legal lore, of course, would seldom be found in rural communities; the authorities would not generally gather in large centers of population, esp.—until 70 A.D.—in Jerusalem. While such law schools were purely theoretical, yet they stood in close relation to the practical. Whenever doubt arose regarding the application of the law to a particular case, a question was referred to the nearest lawyer; by him to the nearest company of lawyers, perhaps to the Sanhedrin, and the resultant decision was in force. Thus the lawyers became law makers, and after the destruction of Jerusalem, the rabbis were recognized as the absolute authority in such matters. Frequently a single lawyer of great reputation, Menahem, Hillel or Gamaliel I., might pronounce dicta of unques tioned recognition as of much authority. In the court of our day, though sometimes his opinions were received and corrected by the legal tribunal, especially the Sanhedrin. Of course, frequently, the laws were under the sway of such a man’s influence, so that what he said upon his own authority would be ratified in the assembly of the doctors.

The second function of the lawyer was that of teachers. The renowned rabbis always sought to gather a company of pupils about them whose business it was to repeat the teachers’ law formulas until they had “passed into their flesh and blood.”

For the purposes of such instruction as well as for the discussion of the teachers and the students, there were special schools, a few of which are mentioned in connection with the synagogues as places of special merit and prestige. In Jerusalem, these law schools were conducted in the temple, probably in the hall dedicated to this special purpose (Mt 21 23; 26 55; Mk 14 49; Lk 2 46; 20 1; 21 37; Jn 18 20). The students during this time the lectures sat on the floor of the platform, hence the expression “sitting at the feet of” (Acts 22 3; Lk 2 46). Finally, the lawyers were called upon to decide cases in court or to act as advisers of the court. Before the destruction of Jerusalem, technical knowledge of the laws was not a condition of eligibility to the office of judge. Anyone who could command the confidence of his fellow citizens might be elected to the position, and many of the rural courts undoubtedly were conducted, if not among, by men of limited knowledge. Naturally such men would avail themselves of the legal advice of any “doctor” who might be within reach, esp. inasmuch as the latter was obliged to give his services gratuitously. And in the more dignified courts of large municipalities, it was a standing custom to have a company of scholars present to discuss and decide any new law points that might arise. Of course, frequently, these men were elected to the office of judge, so that practically the entire system of jurisprudence was in their hands.

Frank E. Hirsch

LAY, lāy, LAYING, lāng: (1) ἐκτίνημος, “to put,” and the Gr equivalent, τιθῆμι, τίθεμι, are very frequently τρ by “to lay.” RV very often changes the AV rendering of ἐκτίνημος, but never of τιθῆμι, to “lay” (Isa 1 52, “how he set himself against him in the way” (AV “he laid wait for him”); 2 K 11 16, “So they made way for her” (AV “And they laid hands on her”); cf 2 Ch 23 15; Job 24 12, “God regardeth not the folly” (AV “God layeth not folly”); Job 34 23, “For he needeth not further to consider a man” (AV “For he will not lay upon man more”); Isa 28 17, “And 1 will make just the line” (AV “Judgment also will I lay to the line”); Job 17 3, “Give now a pleasant face” (AV “Lay down now”); (2) ὁδός, ὁδών, ὁδί, “to give,” is very commonly by “to lay.” RV changes the tr of AV in Ezek 4 5, “I have appointed”; Ezek 33 28 f, “I will make the land a desolation” (AV “I will lay the land most desolate”); Jer 38 20, “I will lay thee upon thine own heart” (AV “I will lay thee upon thine own heart”); Is 58 9, “I will lay the stones” (AV “lay thy stones”); Dn 29 22, “the sicknesses wherewith Jebediah made it sick” (AV “the sicknesses which the Lord hath laid upon”). For other differences of RV and AV of Dt 21 8; 2 K 2 5; 1 Ch 21 9 11; Ezra 3 5 13 19 9 6; Jer 5 26; Mk 7 8; Lk 19 44; Jas 1 21; 1 Pet 2 1. In most of these passages the change of RV is due to the peculiar use of the word “lay”
in AV. The following expressions are found very frequently: "to lay hands on," "to lay wait," "to lay up," "to lay aside," "to lay upon," "to lay down," etc.

"Laying of wait." AV, is rendered "lying in wait" in Nu 36 21 ff.; Acts 9 24 reads: "But their plot became known" (AV "But their laying away was known"). The "laying on of hands" is a very general expression. See Hands, Laying on of.

A. L. Breslich

LAZARUS, laz'a-rus (Ἄλαζρος, Lidzaroś, an abridged form of the Heb name Eleazar, with a Gr termination): Means "God has helped." In LXX and Jos are found the forms Ἕλεαζρ, Eleazdr, and Ἐλαζᾶρος, Eleazaros. The name was common among the Jews, and is given to two men in the NT who have nothing to do with each other.

The home of the Lazarus mentioned in Jn 11 1 was Bethany. He was the brother of Martha and Mary (Jn 11 1-2; see also Lk 10 38-41). All three were esp. beloved by Jesus (Jn 11 5), and at their home He was entertained (Lk 10 38-41; Jn 11). As intimated by the number of condoling friends from the city, and perhaps from the costly ointment used by Mary, the family was probably well-to-do.

In the absence of Jesus, L. was taken sick, died, and was buried, but after having lain in the grave four days, was brought back to life by the Saviour (Jn 11 3-16, 43, 44). As a result many Jews believed on Jesus, but others went and told the Pharisees, and a council was therefore called to hasten the death of the Master's death (Jn 11 45-50). Later, six days before the Passover, at a feast in some house in Bethany where Martha served, L. sat at table as one of the guests, when his sister Mary anointed the feet of Jesus (Jn 12 1-3). Many of the common people came thither, not only to see Jesus, but also the risen L., believed in Jesus, and were enthusiastic in witnessing for Him during the triumphal entry, and attracted others from the city to meet Him (Jn 12 9.11.17.18). For that reason the priests plotted to murder L. (Jn 12 10).

This is all that we really know about the man, for whether the Jews accomplished his death we are not informed, but it seems probable that, satiated with the death of Jesus, they left L. unmolested.

Nothing is told of his experiences between death and resurrection (cf Tennyson, "In Memoriam," xxxi), of his emotions upon coming out of the tomb, of his subsequent life (cf Browning, "A Letter to Browning,"), and not a word of the mission he is supposed to give as to the other world. His resurrection has been a favorite subject for various forms of Christian art, and according to an old tradition of Ephesus he was 30 years old when he was raised from the dead, and lived to be 30 years old.

As might be expected this miracle has been vigorously assailed by all schools of hostile critics. Ingenuity has been exhausted in inventions objections to it. But all are told, really amount only to repetition of objections which have been made before.

(1) The silence of the other Gospels.—There is here, no doubt, some difficulty. But the description of the early Christians, as many scholars think, to screen the family from danger may have kept the story from becoming current in the oral tradition whereas the Synoptics drew their materials, though Matthew was probably an eyewitness. But, in any case, a Syriac and a Latin reading of which the others had omitted tells us that he had been witnessed, since all danger to the family had long ago passed away, as it was of especial interest to his story, and he had recorded no other case of resurrection. As any rate, the Gospel writers do not seem to regard a resurrection from the dead by the power of Jesus as so much more stupendous than other miracles, as they seem to modern scholars' ordinary events. And, moreover, the Synoptics do unconsciously attest this miracle by describing a sudden outbreak of a renewal excitement in favor of Jesus which can be accounted for only by some extraordinary event.

(2) The stupendous character of the miracle.—But to a philosophical believer in miracles this is no obstacle at all, for to omnipotence there are no such things as big miracles or little ones. Of course, Martha's statement as to the decomposition of the body was only her opinion of the probability in the case, and it is not to be wondered from the beginning and who had intended to raise L., might well in His providence have watched over the body, that it should not see corruption. When all said, "He who has created the organic cell within inorganic matter is not incapable of reestablishing life within the inanimate substance."

(3) Its non-use as an accusation against Jesus.—The objection that Jn 11 47-53 is inconsistent with the fact that in accusing Jesus before Pilate no mention is made of this miracle by the enemies of Jesus has little weight. Who would expect them to make such a self-convicting acknowledgment? The disavowal of the priests at the miracle and their silence about it are perfectly consistent and natural.

No one of the attempted explanations which deny the reality of the miracle can offer even a show of probability. That L. was just recovering from a trance when Jesus arrived; that it was an imposture arranged by his family and sanctioned by Jesus in order to overwhelm His enemies; that it was a fiction or parable tv into a fact and made up largely of synthetical materials, is a derogation of the words, "I am the resurrection, and the life," a myth—such explanations require more faith than to believe the fables of the Talm. They well illustrate the credulity of unbelief. The narrative holds together with perfect consistency, is distinguished by vividness and dramatic movement, the people who take part in it are intensely real and natural, and the dialogue of the sisters perfectly agrees with the sketch of them in Lk. No morbid curiosity of the reader is satisfied, invented stories are not necessary, it is denied that it is a necessary link in the story of the final catastrophe.

The purpose of the miracle seems to have been: (1) to show Himself as Lord of life and death just before He should be Himself condemned to die; (2) to strengthen the faith of His disciples; (3) to convert many Jews; (4) to cause the priests to hasten their movements so as to be ready when His hour had come (Plummer, HDB, III, 57).

In the parable in Lk 16 19-31 the poor man is pictured as in abject poverty in this world, but highly rewarded and honored in the next. It is the only instance of a proper name used in a parable by Jesus. Some think that he was a well-known mendicant in Jesus, and have even attempted to define his...
disease. But this is no doubt simple invention, and since "in Christ's kingdom of truth names indicate realities," this was probably given because of its significance, suggesting the beggar's faith in God and patient dependence upon Him. It was this faith and not his poverty which at last brought him to Abraham's bosom. Not one word does L. speak in the parable, and this may also be suggestive of patient submission. He does not murmur at his hard lot, nor rail at the rich man, nor after death triumph over him. The parable is related to that of the Rich Fool (Lk 12 16-21). This latter draws the veil over the worldling at death; the other lifts it. It is also a counterpart of that of the Unjust Steward (Lk 16 1-13), which shows how wealth may wisely be used to our advantage, while this parable shows what calamities result from failing to make such wise use of riches. The great lesson is that our condition in Hades depends upon our conduct here, and that this may produce a complete reversal of fortune and of popular judgments. Thus L. represents the pious indigent who stood at the opposite extreme from the proud, covetous, and luxury-loving Pharisee. The parable made a deep impression on the mind of the church, so that the term "lazar," no longer a proper name, has passed into many languages, as in Lazar house, lazarette, also applied to the inmates of Irish towns. There was even an order, half-military, half-monastic, called the Knights of St. Lazarus, whose special duty it was to minister to lepers.

The rich man is often styled Dives, which is not strictly a proper name, and properly meaning "rich," which occurs in this passage in the Vulg. But in Eng. lit., as early as Chaucer, as seen in the "Sompnoure's Tale" and in "Piers Plowman," it appears in popular use as the name of the Rich Man in this parable. In later theological lit. it has become almost universally current. The name Nineus given him by Euthymius never came into general use, though the Sahidic version has the addition, "whose name was Nineus." His sin was not in being rich, for Abraham was among the wealthiest of his day, but in his worldly unbelief in the spiritual and eternal, revealing itself in ostentatious luxury and heart-hardened contempt of the poor. Says Augustine, "Seems be Jesus, that ye have been familiar with that book where he found the name of the poor man written, but found not the name of the rich, for that book is the life of men!"

G. H. TREVER

LEACH, lech. See Horseleach.

LEAD, led (ἕδη, ἀπερίθτι): Lead was one of the first metals to be used in the free state, probably because it was so easily obtained from its ores. Lead was found anciently in Egypt and the Sinai peninsula. There is no lead found in Pal proper, but in Northern Syria and Asia Minor it occurs in considerable quantities, usually associated with silver. These sources do not furnish an important supply in Bible times. It was also brought by the Phoenicians from Spain (Tarsash) (Ezk 27 12) and the British Isles.

Lead was used, as it still is, all along the Mediterranean shores for sinkers. Pieces of Epyg fishnets probably dating from 1200 BC are now preserved in the British Museum, with their lead sinkers, some of which lead was the heaviest metal known to the ancients, gold excepted, it was generally used for fish-lines and sounding lines (cf Acts 27 28), esp. in the dense waters of the Mediterranean. Moses mentioned the sinking qualities of lead in the sea in a simile of the sinking of Pharaoh's hosts "as lead in the mighty waters" (Ex 15 10).

Lead was used by the ancients for binding stones together. In most of the ancient ruins of Syria the Arabs have dug holes at the bases between stones in walls and columns in order to remove the iron, bronze, or lead thus used. In the museum of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, there are several specimens of cast-lead sarcophagi dating from the time of Christ.

In Jb 19 22-24 lead is mentioned as used in the engraving of permanent records. Two inferences might be drawn from this passage: either that the letters were cut with a chisel (pen) and then the cutting was filled with lead, or that sheets of lead were used as tablets on which to write, the writing being done with an iron tool. Lead is frequently referred to along with iron, brass, silver and tin (Nu 31 22; Ezk 22 18-20; 27 12). The use of lead for plumbines is implied in Am 7 7-8; Zec 4 10; as a weight in Zec 5 7-8. That OT writers understood the use of lead for purifying gold is shown by Jer 6 29 and Ezk 22 18-22 (cf Mal 3 2). See Metals; Refiner.

JAMES A. PATCH

LEAF, leaf, LEAVES, leafs: Used in three different senses, with reference: (1) To trees (ἤδη, ἀπελθ, "a coming up"), Gen 3 7; 8 11; Lev 26 36 (ἤδη, ἄπερήθη); Ezek 17 9; φόλαξ, phasion. Figuratively (a) of spiritual blessings (Ezk 47 12; cf Rev 22 2) and prosperity (Ps 1 3); (b) of moral decay (Isa 64 6), and (c) of a formal, empty profession (Mt 21 19). (2) To a book (ἤδη, ἀπελθ, Jer 36 23 (m. "columna"; see ver 2); as the parchment was gradually unfaded a more precise colophon could thus be read. (3) To doors (ἤδη, πλάτα, "side," ἔπερ, ἔφερα, "a screen" "hanging"), 1 K 6 54. The door of the Holy Place consisted of two halves, but each half had two leaves (cf Eze 41 24). M. O. EVANS

LEAGUE, lég. See Confederacy.

LEAH, le'a (לֵיהָ, לְדָה; Aṣṭa, Seat, "weary," "dull"[?], "wild cow"): Rachel's sister, and the elder daughter of Laban (Gen 29 16). We are told that her eyes were "tender" (לֵיהָ, ῥακκָה). Genesis renders it "weak," LXX δακρυα, ἄθροιστα; accordingly, she was not weak-eyed, but by no means "blear-eyed" (of Vulg.). Her eyes were lacking that luster which always and everywhere is looked upon as a conspicuous part of female beauty. Jes (And, 1 xix, 7) says of her, ἕπερ, ἐν ὅπερι, τοῦτοι, εἰκὼν ἑωρέσει οὐκ εἴπερ, which may safely be rendered, "she was of no comely countenance."

L. became the wife of Jacob by a ruse on the part of her father, taking advantage of the oriental custom of heavily veiling the prospective bride. When taken to task by his rate son-in-law, Laban excused himself by stating it was against the rule of the place "to give the younger before the first-born" (Gen 29 21-26). Although Rachel was plainly preferred by Jacob to L., still the latter bore him six sons: Reuben, Simon, Levi, Judah (Gen 29 31 ff), Issachar, Zebulun, and a daughter, Dinah (Gen 30 17-21). Up to this time Rachel had not been blessed with children of her own. Thus the lesson is brought home to us that Jeh has a special and kindly regard for the lowly and despised, provided they learn, through their troubles and afflictions, to look to Him for help and success. It seems that homely L. was a person of deep-rooted piety and therefore better suited to become instrumental in carrying out the plans of Jeh in her handsome, but worldly-minded, sister Rachel.

When Jacob decided to return to the "land of his fathers," both of his wives were ready to accompany him (Gen 31 4.14). Before they reached the end of their journey their course was sorely
LEANNOTH, lè-an’oth (Ps 88, title). See Psalms.

LEAPING, lé’ping. See Games.

LEAVING, lé’asing. See Games.

LEAVEN, lev’n (סַּוָּא, sôwá, חֵמֵשׁ, čemš, צָמֵה; Lat fermentum): The nomadic ancestors of the Hebrews, like the Bedouin of today, probably made their bread without leaven; but leaven came to play a great part in their bread-making, their law and ritual, and their religious teaching (see Ex 12 15; 19; 13 7; Lev 2; 11; Dt 16 4; Mt 13 33; 16 6–12; Mk 8 15; Lk 12 1; 13 21).

(1) The form of leaven used in bread-making and the method of using it were simple and definite. The "leaven" consisted always, so far as the evidence goes, of a piece of fermented dough kept over from a former baking. There is no trace of the use of other sorts of leaven, such as the lees of wine or those mentioned by Piny (NH, xviii.26). The lump of dough thus preserved was either dissolved in water in the kneading-trough before the flour was added, or was "hid" in the flour (AV "meal") and kneaded along with it, as was the custom mentioned in the parable (Mt 13 33). The bread thus made was known as "leavened," as distinguished from " unleavened" bread (Ex 12 15, etc).

See Bread.

(2) In law and ritual.—The ritual prohibition of leaven during the "feast of unleavened bread" including the Passover (Ex 23 15, etc) is a matter involving restudy. For the historical explanation given in the Scriptures, see esp. Ex 12 43–50; 13 5 ff;Dt 16 3. The antiquity of the prohibition is witnessed by its occurrence in the earliest legislation (Ex 23 18; 34 25). A natural reason for the prohibition, like that of the similar exclusion of honey, is sought on the ground that fermentation implied a process of corruption. Plutarch voices this ancient view of the matter when he speaks of it as "itself the offspring of corruption, and corrupting the mass of dough with which it is mixed."

FERMENTATUM is used in Persius (Sat., i.24) for "corruption." For this reason doubtless it was excluded also from the offerings placed upon the altar of Jeh, cakes made from flour without leaven, and these only, being allowed. The regulation for these " unleavened cakes" was magath (Lev 10 12). Two exceptions to this rule should be noted (Lev 7 13; cf Am 4 5): "leavened bread" was an accompaniment of the thank offering as unleavened leaves were used also in the wave offering of Lev 23 17. Rabbinical writers regularly use leaven as a symbol of evil (Lightfoot).

(3) In teaching.—The figurative uses of leaven in the NT, no less than with the rabbis, reflect the ancient view of it as "corrupt and corrupting," in parts at least, e.g. Mt 16 6, and esp. the proverbial saying twice quoted by Paul, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor 5 6; Gal 5 9). But as Jesus used it in Mt 13 33, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven," it is clearly the name for the hidden, silent, mysterious, but all-pervading and transforming action of the leaven in the measures of flour that is the point of the comparison.


GEO. B. EAGER

LEBANON, lè-ba’nə, leb’-a-na (Նաբո, Nabō; Heb ṣwēhōn, "white"): Head of a family of returning exiles (Ezr 2 45; Neh 7 48; cf 1 Esd 5 29).

LEBANON, leb’a-non (Ναβων, Nabων; Vulg Libanus): Derived from the root "lebān, "lebān, "to be white," probably from the snow which covers its summits the greater part of the year. "White mountains" are found in almost every country. The light color of the upper limestone may, however, form a sufficient reason for the name. In prose the article is usually connected with the name. In poetry it is more often without the article. In the LXX, however, the article is generally present both in prose and poetry.

The Lebanon range proper borders the east coast of the Mediterranean, for a distance of 100 miles, running N.E. and S.S.W. 2. General from the mouth of the Litān river, Description the classic Leontes (which enters the sea a little N. of Tyre), to the mouth of the Eleutherus (Naḥar el-Kheir), a few miles N. of Tripolis. This river comes through a depression between Lebanon and the Nuseiriyeh mountains, known as "the entrance to Hamath," and connects with a caravan route to the Euphrates through Palmyra. For a considerable distance N. of the Litān, the mountain summits average from 4,000 to 6,000 ft. in height, and the range is more or less anti-Lebanon: Souk-Wādī-Barrada.
dissected by short streams which enter the Mediterranean. Most prominent of these is the Nahr ez-Zaherádny, which, after running 25 or 30 miles in a southerly direction through the center of the range, like the Litdany, turns abruptly W. opposite Mt. Hermon, reaching the sea between Tyre and Sidon. Its main courses, Nahr el-Annam and Nahd Namar, descend to the sea between Sidon and Beyrout, and Nahr Beyrout just N. of the city. Throughout this district the mountain recesses are more or less wooded. Opposite Beyrout the range rises to an elevation of 8,500 ft. Thirty miles farther N.E. the summit is reached in Jebel Mukhmal, at an elevation of 10,225 ft., with several others of nearly the same height. An amphitheater here opens to the W., in which is sheltered the most frequented cedar grove, and from which emerges the Nahr Kadishá ("sacred stream") which enters the Mediterranean at Tripolis. Snow is found upon these summits throughout the year (Jer 13 14), while formerly the level area between these furnished the snow fields from which a glacier descended several miles into the headwaters of the Kadishá, reaching a level of about 5,000 ft. The glacier deposited in this amphitheater a terminal moraine covering several sq. miles, which at its front, near Bsharré, is 1,000 ft. in thickness. It is on this that the grove of cedars referred to is generally based.

The view from this summit reveals the geographical features of the region in a most satisfactory manner. Toward the E. lies Coele-Syria (the modern Buká), 7,000 ft. below the summit, bordered on the eastern side by the mountain wall of Anti-Lebanon, corresponding to the cliffs of Moab E. of the Jordan valley, opposite Judea. This depression in fact is but a continuation of the great geological fault so conspicuous in the Jordan valley (see Am 1 3); in which the rocks look like Ba'albek, which appears at the base of Anti-Lebanon, only 20 miles away. The valley is here about 10 miles wide, and forms the watershed between the Orontes and the Litdény. To the N.E. the valley of the Orontes is soon obscured by intervening peaks, but to the S.W. the valley of the Litdany closes up only where the glistering peak of Mt. Hermon pierces the sky, as the river turns abruptly toward the sea 40 miles distant. Toward the W., the blue waters of the Adriatic, as a poor quaquaversal as the crow flies, show themselves at intervals through the gorges cut by the rapid streams which have furrowed the western flanks of the mountain (Cant 4 15); 3,000 ft. beneath is the amphitheater many sq. mi. in area filled with the terminal moraine from which the Kadishá river emerges, and on which the grove of cedars (cf. 1 K 4 33; Ps 92 12; Hos 14 5) appears as a green spot in the center. Onward to the W. the river gorges with its way amid numerous picturesque village sites and terraced fields, every foot of which is cultivated by a frugal and industrious people. To the traveler who has made the diagonal journey from Beyrout to the cedars, memory fills in innumerable details which are concealed from vision at any one time. He has crossed Nahr el-Kelb ("Dog River") near its mouth, where he has seen Egypt and Assyrian inscriptions dating from the time of Sennacherib's invasion. Ascending this river, after passing numerous villages surrounded by mulberry and olive groves, vineyards, and fields of wheat, and pausing to study the ruins of a temple dating from Rom times, and having crossed a natural bridge at Jisr el-Hogar with a span of 120 ft., rising 75 ft. above the stream, he arrives, at the end of this beautiful road, at the ruins of one of the famous temples of Venus destroyed by the order of Constantine on account of the impurity of the rites celebrated in it. Here, too, is a famous spring, typical of many others which gush forth on either side of the Lebanon range from beneath the thick deposits of limestone which overlie its summit. The flow of water is enormous, and at certain seasons of the year is colored red with a mineral matter which the ancients regarded with mysterious reverence (see LB, III, 244). The lower part of the amphitheater is covered with verdure and a scentsy growth of pine and walnut trees, but the upper part merges in the barren cliffs which lie above the snow line. Onward, alternately through upturned limestone strata, left by erosion in fantastic forms, and through barren areas of red sandstone, where no other species of Lebanon would flourish if protected from the depredations of man and his domestic animals, he crosses by turns at higher and higher levels the headwaters of the Ibrahim, Fadar, Jozeh, Byblus and the Bétry rivers, and at length reaches, on the fourth day, the Aádisa, 5 miles below the cedars of Lebanon. Viewed from the Mediterranean the Lebanon range presents a continuous undulating outline of light-colored limestone peaks, the whole rising so abruptly from the sea that a great part of the distance there is barely room for a road along the shore, while in places even that is prevented by rocky promontories projecting boldly into the sea. The only harbors of importance are at Beyrout and Tripolis, and these are only partially protected, being exposed to the N.W. The eastern face of the range falling down into Coele-Syria is very abrupt, with no foothills but one or two important valleys.

Geologically considered, the Lebanon consists of three conformable beds of limestone which overlie an anticline with its steepest face to the

3. Geology E. The lowest of these is a few thousand ft. thick, consisting of hard limestone containing few fossils, the most characteristic of which is Ouganda, of which a few thin beds are now and then exposed in the cliffs. This formation has been named Glandarian. In its folds this has been elevated in places to a height of 5,000 ft. Through erosion it is exposed in numerous places, where it presents picturesque castellated columns, whose bluish-gray sides are beautifully fluted by atmospheric agencies. The second formation consists of several hundred feet of red-colored sandstone alternating with soft limestone and clay deposits, occasionally containing concretions of iron, manganese, and efflorescent salts. It is this that occasionally colors the water of the spring at Adonis. The characteristic fossil is Trigonia syriaca. Altogether this formation attains a thickness of 1,000 ft., and it is on its eroded surfaces that the most of the Lebanon pines are found. It contains also many signs of volcanic action. The third formation consists of humirous limestone, a cretaceous formation, in some places almost wholly composed of fragments of the fossils from which it derives its name. This formation appears on all the highest summits, where in most cases it is nearly horizontal, and in places attains a thickness of 5,000 ft. Between the summits of the range and the foothills this formation has been almost wholly carried away by erosion, thus exposing the underlying formations. Cretaceous strata of still later age are found at low levels near the sea, which in places are covered by small deposits of Tertiary limestone, and by a porous sandstone of the Pleistocene age.

The scenery of the western slopes of Lebanon is most varied, magnificent, and beautiful, and well calculated, as indeed it did, to impress

4. Scenery the imagination of the Jeb poets. Only the sea was beauty, at the number of forests of pine, oak and cedars; but these have for the most part long since disappeared, except in the valley of Nahr Ibrahim, which is still thickly wooded with pine, oak and plane trees. Of the
cedars there remain, besides the grove at the head of the Kadisha, only two or three, and they are of less importance. Every available spot on the western flanks of the Lebanon is cultivated, being sown with wheat or planted with the vine, the olive, the mulberry and the walnut. Irrigation is extensively practised. When we let the eye range from the snowy summits of the mountain over all that lies between them and the orange groves of Sidon on the seashore, we understand why the Arabs say that "Lebanon bears winter on its head, spring on its shoulders, autumn in its lap, while summer lies at its feet."

In the more desolate places jackals, hyenas, wolves, and panthers are still found (cf. 2 K 15 9).

5. History Israelites, but was never conquered by them. It seemed generally to have been subject to the Phoenicians. At present it is occupied by various sects of Christians and Mohammedans, of whom the Maronites, Druzes and Orthodox Greeks are most active and prominent. Since 1860 the region has been under the protection of European powers with a Christian governor. No exact figures are available, but the population at present numbers probably about 275,000.

Ruins of ancient temples are numerous throughout Lebanon. Bacon estimates that within a radius of 20 miles of Ba‘albek there are 15 ruined sun-temples, the grandeur and beauty of which would have made them famous but for the surpassing splendor of Ba‘albek.

Anti-Libanus (Jch 1 7; Josh 13 5; Cant 7 4) is an extension northward of the great mountain system facing on the E. the great geological fault most conspicuous in Lebanon the valley of the Jordan (see JORDAN, VALLEY OF), extending from the Gulf of Akabah to Antioch on the Orontes River. The system begins at the Barada River just N. of Mt. Hermon, and, running parallel to Mt. Lebanon for 65 miles, terminates at Hums, the "entering in of Hamath." The highest points of the range reach an elevation of over 8,000 ft. Eastward the range merges into the plateau of the great Syrian desert. South of Ba‘albek the Yahyufah, a stream of considerable importance, empties into the Litig, while the Barada (the "Abana" of Scripture), rising in the same plateau, flows eastward to Damascus, its volume being greatly increased by rivers coming in from the base of the dissected plateau.

LITERATURE. The geographical and geological descriptions are largely obtained by the writer from an extended excursion through the region in the company of George Frederick Wright, who knew the region is most intimate and comprehensive. For more detailed information see Robinson, BEP, II, 435 ff., 493; G. A. Smith, HOB I, 45 ff.; Burton and Drake, Unexplored Syria; Benjamin H. Budge, and F. Wright in Records of the Past, 1906, V. 67-83, 195-204; Bsecker-Socin, Pal.

GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT

LEBAOTH, le‘bo‘oth, -oth (תלְבֹּאָות,  פְּהַדָּאָות): An unidentified city in the S. of the territory of Judah (Josh 15 36). It is the same as Beth-lebooth of Josh 19 6, which, by a clerical error appears in 1 Ch 4 31 as "Beth-biri."

LEBBAEUS, leb‘ba‘us (Λέββαες, Lobbaio): Mentioned in Mt 10 3 AV as "Lhebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddeus" (RV omits); one of the twelve apostles. See THADDAEUS.

LEBONAH, leb‘ona (לְבּוֹנָה, Phabanah): A place on the great north road between Shiloh and Shechem (Jgs 21 19). It is represented by the modern Khân el-Lubbât, about 3 miles W.N.W. of Sidlân ("Shiloh"), on the way to Nobbût. It is a wretched village lying on the slope of a hill, with many rock tombs in the vicinity.

LECAH, le‘ka (לבּא, lêkah): A descendant of Judah (1 Ch 4 21).

LEDGE, lej (לֹאֵגָה, shalahô): The word in the sense of side-projection is used in 1 K 7 28-29 in connection with the bases of Solomon's Molten Sea (O.T.); in vs 35-36, where AV uses the same word, RV has "stay" (yadh, lit. "hand"). RV likewise has "ledge" (round) for AV "compass" (karkôb) in the description of the altar in Ex 27 5; 38 4 (see ALTAR), and ARV substitutes "ledge" for "settle" (mârdî) in Ezek 45 14-17,20; 46 19.

LEEKs, læks (לְקָה, lákt; תָּא פָּרָא, tâ pras): This word, elsewhere translated "grass," is in Nu 11 5 rendered "leeks" in all the ancient VSS, on account of its association with garlic and onions; such a use of the word occurs in the Talm. The leek (Allium porrum) is much grown today in Pal, while in ancient Egypt this vegetable was renowned.

LEES, læs. See WINE.

LEFT, left (לָמוּשׂ, sâma‘l, "to go to the left," "to turn to the left," "the left side," "the left," "left hand," "belonging to the left," "situated on the left"); アペルソソ, απερσός, and euphemistically οὐνόμασθαι, ouonomai, lit. "having a good name," "of good omen"): The words are chiefly used in orientation with or without the addition of the word "hand." So Abraham says to Lot: "If thou wilt take the left hand [sâmal], then I will go to the right; or if thou take the right hand, then I will go to the left. [sâmâl]" (Gen 13 9). Frequently in Heb idiom the right hand and the left are mentioned together in order to express the idea "everywhere," "anywhere," "altogether" (Gen 24 49; Ex 14 22-29; Nu 32 26; Dt 2 27; 5 32; 1864}

Leek (Allium porrum).
2 Cor 6:7. In the geographical sense the left is synonymous with north (Gen 14:15, Josh 19:27; Ezek 16:46; Acts 21:3). While the left hand is considered weaker than the right hand (left-handed), it is the hand which holds the bow (Ezek 39:3). The left hand is the side from which bad omens come, and therefore less lucky and less honored than the right hand (see Hand, note). H. L. E. LERING

LEFTHANDED, lef'hand-ed (παραπρόσωπος, ἐπιμεταξοθέος, amphoterodexios, i.e. "ambidextrous"). The Heb presents a combination of words signifying lit. a man whose right hand is impeded or lame, who therefore uses the left hand instead, or one who by habit prefers the use of the left hand, whereas others use the right. It is interesting to note that in both instances, where the expression occurs in the Scripture, it refers to individuals belonging to the tribe of Benjamin (with "a son of the right hand"!), The first is Euhith, son of Gera, who killed Eglon, king of Moab, and thereby delivered Israel from paying tribute to the Moabites (Jgs 3:15). The other instance is that of the 700 selected Benjaminites, who, though lefthanded, "could sling stones at a hairbreadth, and not miss" (Jgs 20:16; cf 1 Ch 12:2). H. L. E. LURING

LEG (1) [וֶשׁ, נָשָׁה, shēḵ, Aram. נַשָּׁה, shēḵ; (2) נֶשָּׁה, kārā, dual נֶשֶׁב, נֶשֶׁבָּה, regel; θλασσάς, skelos; AV tr. as also נֶשָּׁה, shēbhel, and נֶשֶׁב, נֶשֶׁבָּה, with "leg," but mistakenly: (1) The first Heb word (shēk) denotes the upper leg, and is therefore synonymous with θλός (q.v.). It expresses metaphorically the muscular strength, and the pride of the runner. "He took no pleasure in the legs of a man" (Ps 147:10). "His legs are as pillars, which stand upon sockets of fine gold" (Cant 5:15). If the legs have lost their strength as in the lame or the Beraeri patient, they become a metaphor for anything useless, inefficient or disappointing: "The legs of the lame hang loose; so is a panting in the mouth of fools" (Prov 28:27). The Aram. form is found in the description of the image of Nebuchadnezzar, "its legs of iron" (Dan 2:33). (2) Kārā, dual נֶשֶׁבָּה, the "leg," respecting the legs, mentioned as a portion of the pachal lamb (Ex 11:9) or, usually, in connection with the head and the inwards, as a sacrificial portion (Ex 29:17; Lev 1:9,13; Am 3:12). The word designates also the legs of leaping insects of the orthopterous family, locusts, etc., which were permitted as leavened offerings (Lev 11:21). (3) Regel, lit. "foot" (q.v.), found in this sense only once: "He [Goliath] had greaves of brass upon his legs" (1 S 17:6).

Two passages of wrong tr in AV have been corrected by RV. The virgin daughters of Babylon, "a man of the right hand" (Isa 47:2), RV renders; "Strip off the train [shēbhel], uncover the leg," the idea being that the gentle maid, who has been brought up in affluence and luxury, will have to don the attire of a slave girl and do menial work, for which her former garments are unsuited. The other passage is in Isa 3:20, where AV reads; "the bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs," RV corrects: "the head-tires [שדוקף], and the ankle chains." The word [שדוקף], found only in connection with the breaking of the legs of the persons crucified with the Saviour (Jn 19:31-32, 33). We know from Rom and Gr authors that this was done as a coup de grace to shorten the miseries of criminals condemned to die on the cross. The practice bore the technical name of σκελοστοια, σκελοποίησις, Lat. crucifragium. The vb, σκελοτείνη, σκελοκαπείν ("to break the legs"), is found in the apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter (4:14), where it is distinctly stated that the legs of Jesus were not broken, that His suffering on the cross might be intended, while the two malefactors crucified with Him were mercifully dispatched in this way. The crucifragium consisted of some strokes with a heavy club or mallet, which always materially hastened the death of the sufferer, and often caused it almost immediately.

Edersheim, in L.T.J.M. II, 613, suggests that the breaking of legs was an additional punishment, and that it was always followed by a coup de grace, the perforatio or percursor sub asa, a stroke with sword or lance into the side. This, however, is not borne out by any classical information which is known to me, and is contradicted by the statement of the evangelist that Jesus received the percursor, while the malefactors endured the crucifragium. Cf. on this subject, esp. for parallels from classical authors, Sepp, Das Leben Jesu, VII, 444, and Koeln, Jesus von Nazara (RF), VI, 253, note 3.

LEGION, le'jun. See Army; Army, Roman.

LEGISLATION, lej-is-lə-shən, of SANCTITY. See Astronomy, 1, 5.

LEHABIM, leh-hā'bin (םֶהוֹבִין, Phābibim): Named in Gen 10:13; 1 Ch 1:11 as descendants of Mizraim. They are probably to be identified with the Luvian (q.v.), and the one word may be a corruption of the other.

LEHI, leh'hi. See Ramath-LEHI.

LEMUEL, lem'uels (םָלָמִל, līm'al, or מָלָמִל, līm'mal): A king whose words, an "oracle [taught him by his mother]," are given in Prov 31:1-9; and possibly the succeeding acrostic poem (va 10-31) is from the same source. Instead of translating the word after this name as "oracle," some propose to leave it as a proper name, translating "king of Massa," and referring for his kingdom to Massa (Gen 25:14), one of the sons of Ishmael, supposedly head of a tribe or sheik of a country. It is to be noted, however, that the words of Agur in the previous chapter are similarly called massā" oracle," with not so clear a reason for referring it to a country. See for a suggested reason for retaining the meaning "oracle" in both places, Proverbs, Book of, II, 6.

LEON, loan: The tr of 7 Heb and 2 Gr vbs.:

In the OT: יָמֹל, יָמָה, "to join," "to cause to join," "lend" (Ex 22:25; Dt 28:12,44; Ps 37:26; Prov 19:17; יָשָׁה, יָשָׁבוּ, "to be joined," "lend") (Dt 1:14; 21:1) (1) Lexical 14:21; Jer 15:10; יָשָׁה, יָשָׁבוּ (same Usages regi, as last, though different vb. stem, Hiphil), "to cause to bite," "lend on usury" (Dt 15:2; 24:10); יָשָׁה יָשָׁבוּ, "to bite," "lend" (cause to lend) on usury (Dt 23:19,20); יָשָׁה, יָשָׁבוּ, "to give" (Lev 25:37, RV "to give"); יָשָׁה יָשָׁבוּ, "to cause to borrow," "lend" (Dt 15:6); יָשָׁה יָשָׁבוּ, "to cause to ask," "lend" (Ex 12:36; RV "as last, but different vb. stem, Hiphil"). The last (Ym'lo) is found in above passages and in Neh 5:4; Prov 22:7, and is also in 1:4 and 5:5. In the NT "loan" is two Gr vbs., δανεῖς, δανίζω, "to lend money" (Le 6 34,35, usually in commercial sense); δανεῖς, δανίζω, "to lend money" (Rom 12:14; 1 Cor 16:14). The subst. "loan," יָמֹל יָמָה, occurs only once in the OT (1 S 20:20) and HEB, not at all in the NT.

1) Lending on interest to the poor is prohibited.
The Leopard (Felis pardus).
which, as the specific name implies, is not spotted like the leopard, or striped like the tiger.

**LEPER, LEPÆRA, LEPROSY** (לפרא, lépra; λέπρα, lépra): A slowly progressing and intractable disease characterized by subcutaneous nodules (Heb s'ṭēth; LXX ouët; AV “rising”), scabs or cuticular crusta (Heb sapparath; LXX sēmaota) and white shining spots appearing to be deeper than the skin (Heb baḥereth; LXX tālavγēma). Other signs are (1) that the hairs of the affected part turn white and (2) that later there is a growth of “quick raw flesh.” This disease in an especial manner rendered its victims unclean; even contact with a leper defiled whoever touched him, so the cure of other diseases is called healing, that of leprosy is called cleansing (except in the case of Miriam [Nu 12:13] and that of the Samaritan [Lk 17:15] where the word “heal” is used in reference to leprosy). The disease is described in the Papyrus Ebers as ukhedu (the Coptic name for leprosy is ḍḥt). It is also mentioned in ancient Indian and Japanese history. Hippocrates calls it “the Phoen disease,” and Galen names it “elephantiasis.” In Europe it was little known until imported by the returning soldiers of Pompey’s army after his Syrian campaign in 61 BC; but after that date it is described by Soranus, Aretaeus and other classic authors.

The first OT mention of this disease is as a sign given to God to Moses (Ex 4:6 [J]), which may be the basis of the story in Cap. 1, 31, that Moses was expelled from Egypt on account of his being a leper (see also i, 26 and Ant. III, xi, 4).

The second case is that of Miriam (Nu 12:10), where the disease is graphically described (Ep2). In Dt 24:8 there is a reference to the oral tradition concerning the treatment of lepers, without any details, but in Lev 13:14 (PC) the rules for the recognition of the disease, the preliminary quarantine periods and the ceremonial methods of cleansing are given at length. It is worthy of note that neither here nor elsewhere is there any mention of treatment or remedy; and Jehoram’s excommunication implies the belief that its cure could be accomplished only by miracle (2 K 7:7).

The lepromate stroke inflicted on Uzziah (2 K 15:5; 2 Ch 26:23) for his unwarrantable assumption of the priestly office began in his forehead, and a form of the disease peculiarly unclean (Lev 13:43–46) and requiring the banishment and isolation of the leper. It is remarkable that there is no reference to this disease in the prophetic writings, or in the Haggaiography.

In the NT, cleansing of the lepers is mentioned as a specific portion of Our Lord’s work of healing, and was included in the commission given to the apostles. There are few individual cases specially described, of Lk 17:12; but the leper whom Our Lord touched (Mt 8:2; Mk 1:40; Lk 5:12), but it is probable that these are only a few out of many such incidents. Simon the leper (Mt 26:6; Mk 14:3) may have been one of those cured by the Lord.

The disease is a zymotic affection produced by a microbe discovered by Hansen in 1871. It is contagious, although not very readily communicated by casual contact; in and locality one form is attended with absence of the particles of the patient, and the disease which is the commonest variety now met with in the East, is slower in its course than those forms in which nodular growths are the most prominent features, in which parts of the limbs often drop off. At present there are lepers to be seen at the gates of the cities in Pal. It is likewise prevalent in other eastern lands, India, China, and Japan. Cases are also to be seen in most of the Mediterranean lands and in Norway, as well as in parts of Africa and some parts of South and in South America. In former times it was occasionally met with in Britain, and in most of the older English cities there were leper houses, often called “lazarets” from the mistaken notion that the ezezmatous or varicose ulcers of Lazarus were leprous (Lk 16:20). Between 1096 and 1472, 112 such leper houses were founded in England. Of this disease King Robert Bruce of Scotland died.

There was special mediæval legislation excluding lepers from churches and forbidding them to wander from district to district. Leprosy has sometimes confused with other diseases; indeed the Gr physicians used the name lepra for the scaly skin disease now called psoriasis. In the more precise legislation there was one form of disease (Lev 13:13), in which the whiteness covers all the body, and in this condition the patient was pronounced to be clean. This was probably psoriasis, for leprosy does not, until a very late stage, cover all the body, and when it does so, it is not white. It has been surmised that Naaman’s disease was of this kind. Freckled spots (Heb bōbāk), which were to be distinguished from true leprosy (Lev 13:39), were either spots of herpes or of some other non-contagious skin disease. The modern Arab. word of the same sound is the name of a form of eczema. RV reads for freckled spot “tetter,” an old Eng. word from a root implying itchingness (see Hamid, 5, 11).

The homiletic use of leprosy as a type of sin is not Bib. The only Scriptural reference which might approach this is Ps 61:7, but this refers to Nu 19:18 rather than to the cleansing of the leper. The Fathers regarded leprosy as typical of heresy rather than of moral offences. (See Rabanus Maurus, Allegoria, a.v. “Lepra.”)

1. Leprosy in garments.—The occurrence of certain greenish or reddish stains in the substance of woolen or linen fabrics or in arid these materials is described in Lev 13:47 ff, and when these stains spread, or, after washing, do not change their color, they are pronounced to be due to a fretting group of lepers begging.
leprous (gā'ārēth mam'ěreth), and such garments are to be burnt. Among the specific articles of clothing are worn for years and are often hereditary, it is little wonder that they become affected by vegetable or animal parasites, and that which is here referred to is probably some form of mildew, such as Penicillium or mold-fungus. The destruction of such garments is a useful sanitary precaution. Possibly this sort of decaying garment was in Job's mind when he compares himself to a “rotten thing that consumeth, like a garment that is moth-eaten” (13: 28); see also Jude 23, “the garment spotted [esplōtēmon] by the flesh.”

(2) Leprosy in the house (Lev 14: 34, ff).—The occurrence of “hollow speeches, greenish or reddish,” in the plaster of a house is regarded as evidence that the wall is affected with leprosy, and when such is observed the occupant first clears his house of furniture, for if the discoloration be pronounced leprous, all in the home would become unclean and must be destroyed. Then he asks the priest to inspect it. The test is first, that the stain is in the substance of the wall, and, second, that it is spreading. In case these conditions are fulfilled, it is pronounced to be leprous and the affected part of the wall is torn down, its stones cast outside the city, its plaster scraped off and also cast outside the city; new stones are then built in and the house is newly plastered. Should the stain recur in the new wall, then the whole house is condemned and must be destroyed and its materials cast outside the city. The description is that of infection by some fungus attacking whatever organic material is in the mud plaster by which the wall is covered. If in woodwork, it might be the dry rot (Merulius lacrimarum), but this is not likely to spread except where there is wood or other organic matter. It might be the efflorescence of muriate salt (calcium nitrate), which forms flocculent masses when decomposing nitrogenous material is in contact with lime; but that is generally white, not green or reddish. Considering the uncleanliness of the house of the ordinary fellaith, it is little wonder that such fungus growths may develop in their walls, and in such cases the destruction of the house and its materials is a sanitary necessity.

It should be observed here that the attitude of the Law toward the person, garment or house suspected of leprosy is that if the disease be really present they are to be declared unclean and there is no means of destroying. If, on the other hand, the disease be proved to be absent, this freedom from the disease has to be declared by a ceremonial purification. This is in reality not the ritual for cleansing the leper, for the Torah provides none such, but the ritual for declaring him ceremonially free from the suspicion of having the disease. This gives a peculiar and added force to the words, “The lepers are cleansed,” as a testimony to Our Lord’s Divine mission.

ALEX. MACALISTER

LESHEM, le'šem. See LASHB.

LESSAU, les’ō (Δέσσαο, Lessōa; AV Dessaou): A place mentioned only in 2 Macc 14: 16 as the scene of a battle between Nicanael and the Jews. “Lessaou” of AV arises from confusion of A with A in the Gr. The place may be identified with Adasa (q.v.).

LET (kētīchō, katēchō): Usually in the sense of “permit” (AS letan), but also in Old Eng. with meaning of “hinder” (AS letan). This latter sense is found in 2 Thess 2: 7 AV, “Only be he who now letteth will let,” where RV has, “Only there is one that restraineth now.”

LETHECH, lē'thek (לֶתֶוֹק, lethokh): A liquid measure equivalent to half a homer (Hos 3: 2 m) and containing about 5½ bushels. See Weights and Measures.

LETTER, let’er. See EPISTLE.

LETTERS, let’ērz. See ALPHABET; WRITING.

LETSUSHIM, lē-tō'shim, lē-tā'shim (לְטָשִׁים, l'tishim): A Dedanite tribe in North Arabia (Gen 25: 3). With it are connected the Asshurim and Leummim (q.v.).

LEUMMIM, lē-um'im (לְעָמִים, P'ummim): A Dedanite tribe of North Arabia, connected with the Letushim (q.v.).

LEV, lē'vi (לֵי, lēv; Λευε, Lēue; WH Lēui, Lēuel):

(1) The 3d son of Jacob by Leah. See separate article.

(2) Two ancestors of Jesus in Lk’s genealogy (Lk 3: 24-29).

(4) The apostle Matthew. See MATTHEW.

LEV'I, lēv'i (לֵי, lēv; Λευε, Lēue; Lēuel): The third of Leah’s sons born to Jacob in Paddenaram (Gen 29: 34). In this passage the name is connected with the vb. lāweth, “to adhere,” or “be joined to,” Leah expressing assurance that with the birth of this third son, her husband might be drawn closer to her in the bonds of conjugal affection. There is a play upon the name in Nu 13: 24, where direction is given that the tribe of Levi be “joined unto” Aaron in the ministries of the sanctuary. The etymology here suggested is simple and reasonable. The grounds on which some modern scholars reject it are purely conjectural. It is asserted, e.g., that the name is adjectival, not nominal, describing one who attaches himself; and this is used to support the theory that the Levites were those who joined the Sem people when they left Egypt to return to Pal, who therefore were probably Egyptians. Others think it may be a gentilic form lē'chē, “wild cow” (Wellhausen, Proleg., 146; Stade, GVT, 152); and this is held to be the more probable, as pointing to early totem worship.

Levi shared with Simeon the infancy incurred at Schechem by the treacherous slaughter of the Shechemites (Gen 34). Jacob’s displeasure was expressed at the time (ver 3), and the memory was still bitter to him in his last days (49: 5 f). The fate predicted for the descendants of Simeon and Levi (ver 7), in the case of the latter on account of the tribe’s stedfast loyalty in a period of stern testing, was changed to a blessing (Ex 32: 20 f). In later lit. the action condemned by Jacob is mentioned with approval (Jr 9: 2 f). Levi was involved in his brothers’ guilt with regard to Joseph (Gen 37), and shared their experiences in Egypt before Joseph made himself known (chs 42-46). Three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were born to him in Canaan, and went down with the caravan to Egypt (46: 11). Nothing further is known of the personal history of this patriarch. He died and found sepulture in Egypt. For the tribal history and possessions, see PRIESTS and LEVITES.

LEVIL. E. W. EWING

LEVIATHAN, lē-vi'a-than (לְוֵי-תָּחָן, leviathān; Job 41: 1-34), from דָּחַל, lāweth, “to fold”; cf. Arab. Q'n'l'b.
name of the wry neck, *Lynx tortuilla*, abu-luwah, from kindred *Lynx*, "to bend");

(1) The word "levithan" also occurs in Isa 27 1, where it is characterized as "the swift serpent... the crooked serpent"; in Ps 104 26, where a marine monster is indicated; also in Ps 74 14 and Job 3 8. The description in Job 41 has been thought by some to refer to the whale, while the whale suits better the expressions denoting great strength, the words apply better to the whole to the crocodile. Moreover, the whale is very seldom found in the Mediterranean, while the crocodile is abundant in the Nile, and has been known to occur in at least one river of Pal, the Zarka, N. of Jaffa. For a discussion of the behemoth and levithan as mythical creatures, see EB, s.v. "Belemoth" and "Levithan." The points in the description which may well apply to the crocodile are the great invulnerability, the strong and close scales, the limbs and the teeth. It must be admitted that there are many expressions which a modern scientist would not use with reference to the crocodile, but the Book of Job is neither modern nor scientific, but poetical and ancient.

(2) See ASTRONOMY, II, 2, 5.

**ALFRED ELY DAY**

LEVIRATE, lev'i-rät, LAW. See Marriage.

**LEVIS, lev'is.** See Priests and Levites.

**LEVITICAL, le-viti'kal, CITIES:**

I. Legal Provisions. 
1. Numbers 
2. Deuteronomy

II. WELLAUSEN'S VIEW

III. Alternative View and Evidence.

1. Traces of the Cities
2. Wellhausen's Arguments Answered
3. Van Hoonacker's Reply
4. Ezekiel's Vision
5. Priestly Cities and Cities in Which Priests Dwell

**LITERATURE**

I. Legal Provisions. Nu 35 1-8 provides that 48 cities should be given to the Levites, each surrounded by a pastureage. The exact number details are not quite clear, for in the Heb, ver 4 would naturally be read as meaning that the pastureage was a radius of 1,000 cubits from the city walls, while ver 5 makes each city the center of a square, each side of which was 2,000 cubits long. Extant variants in the VSS suggest, however, that the text has suffered slightly in transmission. Originally there seems to have been no discrepancy between the two verses, and it may be doubted whether the intent was that the city was always to be in the mathematical center of the patch. The Levites were to have the right of redeeming the houses at any time, and in default of redemption they were to go out in the Jubilee. This would not be sold (Lev 25 32 f).

Dt 18 8 undoubtedly recognizes patrimonial possessions of the Levites outside the religious capital, and sees no inconsistency with its earlier statement that Levi had no inheritance with Israel (ver 1). The explanation lies in the fact that those cities were not a tribal portion like the territories of the secular tribes. The area occupied by the whole 48 jointly would only have around 16 miles.

II. WELLAUSEN'S VIEW—Josh 21 relates that this command was fulfilled by the allocation of 48 cities, but it is clear that some of those cities were not in fact reduced into possession; see e.g. Josh 16 10; Jgs 1 29 as to Gazer, and Jgs 1 27 as to Taanach. Wellhausen treats the whole arrangement as fictitious. His main reasons are: (1) that the arrangement is physically impracticable in a mountainous country, and (2) that there is no historical basis for it. Many remained in the hands of the Canaanites till a later period, while others were "important but by no means ecclesiastical towns" (Prolegomena, 190).

Two pages later he says that "four of them were demonstrably famous seats of worship," and conjectures that most, if not all, were ancient sanctuaries. He also regards Ezekiel's scheme of a heave offering of land (ch 45) as the origin of the idea. Yet "Jerus and the temple, which, properly speaking, occasioned the whole arrangement, are buried in silence with a diligence which is in the highest degree surprising" (p. 164).

III. Alternative View and Evidence.—In point of fact, there are traces of some of the Levitical cities in the later history. These are:

1. Traces of Anathoth (1 K 2 26; Jer 1 1; 32), of Jattir (2 S 20 26, where, as shown by the fact, the Jairite), Bethel (1 S 8 13-15; see Priests and Levites as to the text). (From Am 7 17 it appears that Amaziah of Bethel had land, but we do not know that he was of Levitical descent or where the land was.) Further, the fact that many other Levitical cities appear to have been centers of worship points to the presence of priests. Was Arguments the great high place of Gibon (1 K Answered 3 4) unserved by priests? It is surely natural to suppose that during the period between the capture of the Ark and its transport to Jerusalem there was a tendency for high places to spring up in cities where there were priests rather than elsewhere; indeed there would probably be a disposition on the part of unemployed priests to go astray in a direction that would prove lucrative.

With regard to the other objection, Van Hoonacker's answer is convincing: "As to the way in which the measurements were to be carried out in the manner Hoonacker's of Pal, the legislator doubtless knew what method was usually employed. Besides, we are free to believe that he only gives these figures as approximate indications" (Sacred Israelite, 433).

The same writer's reply to the theory that the idea originated with Ezekiel is wholly admirable. "Strictly we could ask... whether Ezekiel's Levit did not find himself on the vision description of the camp of the Israelites in the desert. It is only too manifest that the division and appointment of the territory as presented in ch 48 of the prophet are scarcely inspired by practical necessities, that they have a very pronounced character of ideal vision; and 'from fancy is pure fancy,' we ought also to find the elements which are at the basis of Ezekiel's vision. The tents of the tribe of Levi ranged around the tabernacle explain themselves in the PC; we may doubt whether the Levites, deprived of territory (Ezk 44 29) and nevertheless grouped on a common territory, in the conditions described in Ezk 48, explain themselves with equal facility. A camp is readily conceived on the pattern of a chessboard, but not the country of Canaan. We need not stop there. It is in fact certain that Ezekiel here has in view the protection of the holiness of the temple from all profanation; and in the realm of the ideal, the means are appropriate to the end" (op. cit., 425 f).
Lastly there runs through Wellhausen's discussion the confusion between a city where priests may be dwelling and a priestly city. There are three places in the chronological statement of Exodus 20:24 which may be such Cities and in London or Chicago; but none of these three places can be regarded as a priestly city in the same sense as the Levitical cities. Not one of them has ever been a patrimonial city of priests, nor could be the origin of such an arrangement.

While therefore the whole of the cities mentioned in Josh 21 were certainly not reduced into possession at the time of the conquest, the Wellhausen theory on this matter cannot be sustained.

Literature.—J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 159-63; A. Van Hoonacker, Sacerdotes Jevitis, 423-35 (very brilliant and important).

HAROLD M. WIENER

LEVITICUS, lé-vi-tik'ús:

I. General Data

1. Name
2. Character of Book
3. Unity of Book: Law of Holiness
4. Examination of Critical Theory

II. Structure

1. New Testament analyses
   (1) Theories of Disintegration
   (2) Reasons for Disintegration
   (3) Inconclusiveness of These Reasons
2. Structure of the Biblical Text
3. The Structure of the Individual Pericopes

III. Group

1. Against the Wellhausen Hypothesis
   (1) The Argument from Silence
   (2) The Attitude of Prophets toward Sacrificial System
   (3) The People’s Disobedience
   (4) Indiscriminate Sacrificing
   (5) Dt and PC
2. Connection with Mosaic Period
   (1) PC and Desert Conditions
   (2) Unity and Construction Point to Mosaic Tradition

IV. The Significance

1. Positive
   (1) The Law Contains God’s Will
   (2) The Law Prepares for the Understanding of Christianity
   (3) The Law as a Tutor unto Christ
2. Negative

Literature

I. General Data.—The third book of the Pentateuch is generally named by the Jews according to the first word of the first verse, מנֵבֶית, unaged or עֶבֶית, and by the LXX called μανάσπητα, Levitikon, or Leviticus, by the Vulg., accordingly, “Leviticus” (i.e. Liber), sometimes “Levitiicum”). The Jews have also another name taken from its contents, viz. לְפִּיאֵבַם, תֹּרָתָא כֵּלֶּם, “Law of the Priests.”

As a matter of fact ordinances pertaining to the priesthood, to the Levitical system, and to the cultus constitute a most important part of this book; but specifically the character of Book

2. Character of Book: religious and ethical commands, as we find them, e.g. in chs 18-20, are not wanting; and there are also some historical sections, which, however, are again connected with the matter referring to the cultus, namely the consecration of the priests in chs 8 and 9, the sin and the punishment of two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu (10 1ff), and the account of the stoning of a blasphemer (24 10ff). Of the Levites, on the other hand, the book does not treat at all. They are mentioned only once and that incidentally in 25 32ff. Thus these chapters are stated to have been given bhar śinay (7 38; 25 1; 26 46; 27 34), which expression, on account of ch 11, in which Jeh is described as speaking to Moses out of the tent of meeting, is not to be translated “but at” Mt. Sinai. The connection of this book with the preceding and following books, i.e. Ex and Nu, which is commonly acknowledged as being the case, at least in some sense, leaves for the contents of Lev exactly the period of a single month, since the last chapter, Ex 34 26ff, marks the close of the tabernacle. Of the erection of the tabernacle the 1st day of the 1st month of the 2d year of the Exodus, and Nu 11 1 takes us to the 1st day of the 2d month of the same year. Within this time of one month the consecration of the priests fills out 8 days (Lev 8 33; 9 1). A sequence in time is indicated only by 16 1, which directly connects with what is reported in ch 10 concerning Nadab and Abihu. In the same way the ordinances given in 10 6ff are connected with the events of the same month, the 1st month of the 1st year of the Exodus. The laws are described as being revelations of Jeh, generally given to Moses (of 1 1; 4 1; 5 14; 6 19.24 [Heb 12:17]; 7 22.28, etc); sometimes to Moses and Aaron (of 11 1; 13 1; 14 33; 15 1, etc), and, rarely, to Aaron alone (10 8). In 10 12ff, Moses gives some directions to the priests, which are based on a former revelation (of 6 16 [Heb 9ff]; 7 37ff).

In 10 16ff., we have a difference of opinion between Moses and Aaron, or rather his sons, which was decided on the basis of an independent application of principles given in Lev. Most of these commands are to be announced to Israel (1 2; 4 2; 7 23.39; 9 3ff; 11 2; 12 2; 16 2; 18 2, etc); others to the priests (6 9.25 [Heb 2.18]; 21 2; 22 2, etc); or to the priests and the Israelites (10 15), while the directions in reference to the Day of Atonement, with which Aaron was primarily concerned (16 2), beginning with ver 29, without a special superscription, are undeniably changed into injunctions addressed to all Israel; cf also 21 24 and 21 2. As the Book of Ex treats of the communion which God offers on His part to Israel and which culminates at last in His dwelling in the tent of meeting (40 34ff; of under Ex 25, 1.2), the Book of Lev contains the ordinances which were to be given out by the Israelites in religious, ethical and cultural matters, in order to restore and maintain this communion with God, notwithstanding the imperfections and the guilt of the Israelites. And as this book thus with good reason occupies its well-established place in the story of the founding and in the earliest history of the theocracy, so too even a casual survey and intelligent glance at the contents of the book will show that we have here a well-collated and organic unity, a unity which is now only confirmed and strengthened by the presentation of the structure of the book in detail (see under II, below).

As a rule, critics are accustomed first of all regard chs 17-25 or 26 as an independent section, and find in these chapters a legal code

3. Unity of Book: Law of Holiness was united with the other parts.

It is indeed true that a series of peculiarities have been found in these chapters. To these peculiarities belong the frequent repetition of the formulas: “I am Jehovah your God” (18 24; 19 24, etc); or “I am Jehovah” (13 5.6.21; 19 14.16, etc), or “I am Jehovah, who has separated you” (20 24), or “who sanctified you” (20 8; 21 8.15.23, etc). To these peculiarities belong the references in words, or, in fact, to the land of Canaan, into which Israel is to be led (18 33.24ff: 19 23-29; 20 32ff; 23 25), and also to Egypt, out of which He has led the people (18 3; 19 34; 22 33; 26 13.45, etc); as further, the demand for sanctity in General warning against desecration (19 12; 21 23, etc), both based on the holiness of Jehovah. In addition, a number of peculiar expressions are repeatedly found.

Because of their contents these chapters have, on the Kleinertian interpretation, been given the letter H (i.e. Law of Holiness); or, according to the suggestion of Dillmann, by the letter L (i.e. Sinaitic Law), because, according to 25 1: 26 46, the letter L has been given at Mt. Sinai, and because in certain critical instances it was at the time of the Sinaitic Conquest that the laws contain old laws from the Mosaic period, although these had been changed in form. These earlier views have apparently now been discarded by the critics entirely.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA 1870
Examination of critical theory.—We, however, do not believe that it is at all justifiable to separate these parts from the other chapters. In the first place, these peculiarities, even if such are found here more frequently than elsewhere, are not restricted to these chapters exclusively. The Decalogue (Ex 20 3) begins with the words, "I am Jehovah, the God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex 23 31 contains the demand, "Ye shall be holy men unto me." Ex 29 44.45 contains a promise that God will dwell in the midst of the Israelites, in the Holy Place, even as they shall dwell in their God, who has brought them out of Egypt in order to dwell in their midst as Jehovah, their God (cf., further, Ex 6 6-8; 31 13 f.; Lev 10 10.11; 11 44; Nu 16 37-41; 33 52 f.55; Dt 14 21). It is a more than risky undertaking to find in these and in other sections scattered remnants of H, esp. if these are seen to be indispensable in the connection in which they are found, and when no reason can be given why they should be separated from the collection of laws. Then, too, the differences of opinion on the part of the critics in assigning these different parts to H, do not make us favorably inclined to the whole hypothesis. Hoffmann, esp. (Die wichtigsten Entwürfe für die G 29-Welk- hausenische Hypothese, I), has shown how impossible it is to discern from H the other ordinances of the PC in so radical a manner. In saying this we do not at all wish to deny the peculiar character of these chapters, only we do not believe that ch 17 can be added on to ch 16, as is assumed in this section; for in ch 17 all the characteristic peculiarities of the Holiness Law are lacking; and, on the other hand, in ch 26 the expression "I am Jehovah your God," or a similar one in vs 12.13.44 f., is found. The superscription of ch 26 connects ch 26 with the preceding; and, further, the reference to the Sab- batical year as described in ch 25, found in 26 34 f., 43, is not to be overlooked. Finally, also, other legal codes, such as that in the first Book of the Covenant (Ex 23 20-33) and that of Dt (27 11-26 58) close with the offer of a blessing or a curse.

The chapters under consideration (Lev 18-26) are most closely connected with each other solely through their contents, which have found expression in a particular form, without these facts being suffi- ciently understood. It is the claim of the -legal code. For since in chs 1-17 all those things which separate the Israelites from their God have been considered and bridged over (cf. chs 1-7, the laws concerning sacrifices; chs 8-10, the mediator- ship of the priests; chs 11-15, the unclean things; ch 16, the Day of Atonement; ch 17, the use made of blood), we find in chs 18-26 an account of the God-pleasing conduct, which admits of nothing that desecrates; namely, chs 18-20 contain laws dealing with marriage and chastity and other matters of religious, ethical or cultural kind, together with the punishments that follow their transgression; chs 21 f determine the true character of the priests and of the sacred obligations; chs 23 f., the cons- truction of the seasons, of life and death, etc.; ch 26, the Sabbath and the Jubilee year; ch 26 contains the offer of a blessing or a curse. Chs 1-17 have, as it were, a negative character; chs 18-26 a positive character. In chs 1-17 the consciousness of what is unclean, imperfect and guilty is awakened and the punishment is shown; in chs 18-26 the converse is the case. In chs 18-26 the norm of a holy life is set forth. Even if these two parts at certain places show a great likeness that the occurrence of an interchange of ordinances is possible, yet the peculiar character of each part is mainly recognized; and this is also a very essential argument for the view that both parts have one and the same author, who intentionally brought the two parts into closer connection and yet separated them from each other. On this supposition the peculiarities of chs 18-26 are sufficiently explained, and also the positive contents of these chapters and the fact that just these chapters are referred to in preexilic lit. oftener than is the case with chs 1-7. Further, there is a special connection between Ex 20 and the book of Lev. Hence it is to be regarded as a consequence of the common tendency of both authors and not as the result of their having used a common source (see Ezekiel, II, 2). In 26 46-47 there is a conclusion which corresponds to 25 1; 7 37 f.; 1 1, and accordingly regards chs 1-26 as a unity; while ch 27, which treats of vows and of tithes, with its separate sub- scriptio in verse 34, shows that it is an appendix or a supplement, which is, however, in many ways connected with the rest of the book, so that this addition cannot, without further grounds, be regarded as pointing to another author.

II. Structure.—Modern criticism ascribes the entire Book of Lev, being a special legal code, to the PC. The question which arises in connection with this claim will be discussed under III, below. At this point we must first try to awaken a consciousness of the fact, that in this special particular, too, the author of the PC has been very handy upon the stage of total disintegration; that the reasons assigned for the separation of the sources are constantly becoming more arbitrary and sub- jective; and that the absurd consequences to which they consistently lead from the very outset arouse distrust as to the correctness of the process. Just as in the historical parts the critics have for long no longer content with J (Jahwist) and E (Elohists), but have added a P and J, an E' and E", and as Severs and Gunkel have gone further, and in detail have completely shattered both J and E into entirely separate fragments (see Genesis), so P, too, is beginning to experience the same fate. It is high time that, for both the historical and the legal sections, the opposite course be taken, and that we turn from the dismemberment to the combination of these documents; that we seek out and emphasize those features which, in form and content, unite the text into a clear unity. For this reason we lay aside this section, which deals with the structure of the book, and treat of the matter (1) negatively and (2) positively (see Exodus, II).

(1) Theories of disintegration.—We have already seen in the art. DAY OF ATONEMENT (1, 2, [2]) in connection with Lev 16 an example of these at- tempts at dissection, and here still add several exam- ples in order to strengthen the impression on this subject.

(a) General considerations: If we for the present dis- regard the details, then, according to von Borsche (Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament), not only chs 17- 26 (see, above, under I) at one time existed as a separate legal corpus, but also the so-called "legalistic" chs 1-7, and also the laws concerning the clean and the un- clean in chs 11-15, concerning ch 16 see above. That ch 27 is regarded as a supplement is ascribed to a different author. Finally, the so-called "fundamental document" of P (marked Pg) contained only parts from chs 9 (also a few matters from ch 8), as also one of the three threads of ch 16, for Lev 6 the consecration of the priests demanded in Ex 25 f, which also are regarded as a part of Pg. and ch 16 is claimed to consist again of various fragments of the DAY OF ATONEMENT (1, 2). All these separate parts of Lev (i.e. chs 1-7, 8-10, 11-15, 16-26) are divided into a number of more independent sub- parts; thus, e.g., chs 1-7, containing the sacrificial laws, are regarded as a separate unit; chs 8-10, as made to correspond to Lev 1-7, are also regarded as a separate unit; chs 11-15, containing the laws for the clean and the unclean in chs 11-15 are divided into the separate pieces, chs 11-12, chs 13-14, and these are divided into parts. There are no parts that are at one time and in a certain manner Independently and
separated from each other. But how complicated in detail the composition is considered to be, we can see from chs 17-26.

(b) Chs 17-26 considered in detail: While Baentsech (Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament) accepts, to be based on two strata (H and E), certain portions from chs 23-25; H = chs 21; H = ch 17. Baentsech holds (against von Rad) that the development of the following sections as chapters follows: "... in detail we feel justified in separating the following pieces: (i) 17 3-4 (5.6a); 5.10-14; (ii) 17 15-17; (iii) 19 f. 21 f.; and this uniting with (iv) 19 3 f.l. 27 f. 30.31.33.36, which was probably done by a later editor, and that the former were inserted by the person who united these parts, viz. 18. 27.35.26.25. 33; (iv) 19. 9.10.13-15.9.32.33; (v) 19 8-23.20; (vi) 19 23.30-21; 19 30; (vii) 21 1-28. 15-17.17-32; 22. 3.8.10-14.18-25-27-30; (ix) 23 10-30. 30.31; (x) 23. 15; (xi) except vv 16ab; (vi) 25 7-18. 22-23.38.39.40a.42 f. 47.53.55; (xii) 25. 58,9.10a.13. 14-16.17.24 f. In uniting these pieces Rb (the Redactor of the Law of Holiness) seems to have added de suo the following: 17 5 (beginning); 18 25-21.24.26.28.29; 19 33-35. 29-32. 21 6-7; 21.9.15f.31-33; 23 22; 25 11 f. 26 1 f. At the same time he unite with these an other parenetic section, 26 3-45, which, by insertional of the text, and can do more than hear the dress of this small legal code. All the rest that is found in chs 17-26 seems to be the result of a revision in the spirit of P not, however, as though originally it all came from the hand of Rb (Redactor P). That he rather added and worked together other older pieces from P (which did not belong to Pf) is seen from an analysis of ch 23. ... As the present passage was together considered, we have a reliable terminus ad quem in a comparison of Neh 8 14-18 with Lev 23 36 (P). The context from the outset remembers that, still, after the uniting of these different parts, the marks of the editorial pen are to be noticed in the following sections after this unison of number of additions were yet made to the text. This is so far as chs 26-32 is concerned, and is probable as to chs 24 1-4. 10-14.23: 25 32-34; and that this editorial work even went so far as to put sections from P in the place of parts of H can possibly be concluded from vv 24 1-4.

(c) Extravagance of critical treatment: This is also true of all the other sections, as can be seen by a reference to the books of Bertholet and Baentsech. What should surprise us most, the complicated and external manner in which our Bb. text, which has such a wonderful history back of it, is declared by the critics to have originated, or the keenness of the critics, who, with the ease of child's play, are able to detect and trace out this growth and development of the text, and can do more than hear the dress grow? But this amazement is thrust into the background when we contemplate what becomes of the Bible text under the manipulations of the critics. The compass of this article makes it impossible to give as a general survey of the often totally divergent and contradictory schemes of Baentsech and Bertholet and others on the distribution of this book among different sources; and still less possible is it to give a critical criticism of these. But this critical method really condemns itself more thoroughly than any examination of its claims would. All who are not yet entirely hypnotized by the spell of the documentary hypothesis will feel that by this method all genuine scientific research is brought to an end. If the way in which this book originated had been so complicated, it certainly could never have been again reconstructed.

(2) Reasons for disembarrassment.—We must at this place confine ourselves to indicating and discarding some typical reasons which are urged in favor of a distribution among different authors.

(a) Alleged repetitions: We find in the parts belonging to P a number of so-called repetitions. In chs 1-7 we find a twofold discussion of the five kinds of offerings with repetitions. The oral measures are enacted for deeds which had been described already in ch 18; in 19 3.30; 23 3; 26 2 the Sabbath command is intensified; in 19 f f; 22 29 f. we find commands which had been touched upon already in 15 f f. In 19 we find almost verbatim repeated in 23 22; 24 f f. It repeats ordinances concerning the golden candlestick from Ex 27 20 ff, etc. The existence of these repetitions cannot be denied; but is the conclusion drawn from this fact correct? It certainly is possible that one and the same author could have handled the same materials at different places and that points of agreement by chance 17-4 in regard to the sacrifices. Chs 18 and 20 (miscued and punishments) are even necessarily and mutually supplementary. Specially important laws can have been repeated, in order to emphasize and impress them all the more; or they are placed in peculiar relations or in a unique light (cf, e.g., 24 1 ff, the command in reference to the golden candlestick in the pericope chs 23-24; see below). Accordingly, as soon as we can furnish a reason for the repetition, it becomes understandable; and often in this case, the objections are unremoved if we ascribe the repetitions to a new author, who made the repetition by way of an explanation (see Exodus, 11, 2, (5)).

(b) Separation of materials: Other reasons will join to the ordinance with separating materials that are related. That ch 16 is connected with chs 8-10, and these connect with Ex 25 ff, is said to prove that this had been the original order in these sections. But the materials which are clearly connected be without any reason torn asunder by the insertion of foreign data? Or has the interpolator perhaps had reasons of his own for doing this? Why are these not broken ascribed. The original passage of chs 17-26, which are properly placed before Lev 8-10, because in these latter chapters the sacrifices are described as already being made (9.7.15, the sin offering; 9.7.12.16, the burnt offering; 9.17; 10.12, the meal offering; 9.18, the peace offering). In the same way chs 11-15, through 15.31, are inwardly connected with Lev 16, since these chapters speak of the defiling of the dwelling-place of Jeh, from which the Day of Atonement delivers (16.16f.33). As a matter of course, the original writer as well as a later redactor could have had time also connected parts in a looser or more external manner. In this way, in 7.22 ff, the command not to eat of the fats of or the blood has been joined to the ordinance with reference to the use of the peace offerings in 7.19 ff. This again is the case when, in ch 2, vs 11-13 have been inserted in the list of the different kinds of meal offering; when after the general scheme of sin offerings, according to the hierarchical order and rank in this, special cases are mentioned in 5 f f; and when in 5.7 ff commands are given to prevent too great poverty; or when in 6.19 ff the priestly meal offerings are found connected with other ordinances with reference to the meal offerings in general (9.14 f f; or when the share that belongs to the priest (7.8 f) is found connected with his claim to the guilt offering (7.1 f); or the touching of the meat offering by something unclean (7.10 f) is found connected with the ordinances concerning the peace offerings; or when in ch 11 the ordinances dealing with the unclean animals gradually pass over into ordinances concerning the touching of these animals, as is already indicated by the subscription 11.4.6 f (cf with ver 2). Still more would be natural to unite different parts in other ways also. In this way the ordinances dealing with the character of the sacrifices in 22.17-30 could, regarded by themselves, be placed also in chs 1-7. But in ch 22 they are also placed in 22.17-20. The character of chs 1-7 would have become too complicated if they were inserted here. In such matters the author must have freedom of action.

(c) Change of singular and plural: Further, the frequent change between the singular and plural addresses found in the laws which are given to a body of persons is without further thought used by the critics as a proof of a diversity of authors in the section underco-
sideration (cf 10 12 ff; 19 9 11 ff, 15 ff.). But how each change in number may be explained. In case the pl. is used, the author or the words are regarded as being distributed into individuals; and in the case of a m. pl. the pl. can at once be ascribed to the sing., since the author is thinking now only of separate individuals. Naturally, too, the sing. is the form which the author thinks of when he refers to the people as a whole. Sometimes the change is made simply for the sake of the same verse or run of thought, and this in itself ought to have banished the thought of a difference of authors in such cases. In the case of an Interpolated difference from the outset all the more probable that he would have paid more attention to the possibility of this conclusion. It is true of the Book of the Covenant (Ex 22 20-25 29 ff; 33 9 ff; cf Dt 12 2 ff, 13 ff), In regard to these passages, also, the modern critics are accustomed to do other than the above) a single writer, who was completely absorbed by the subject-matter. Besides, such a change in form was very frequently found in the sense of "remaking," and does not signify "sin offering" at all: at any rate, already in Ex 6 3 we find the characteristic terms used to denote the latter sense. Thus this section is found only in the form which appears as entirely in harmony with the connection.

(c) According to Ex 29 7; Lev 4 3 5 16; 6 20 22; 8 17; 16 32; 21 10 12, the high priest is the only one who is anointed. But the text as it reads does not make it impossible that there was a double anointing. According to the first set of passages, Aaron is anointed in such a manner that the anointing oil is poured upon his head (cf Ex 29 7 and Lev 4 3). Then, too, he and all his sons are anointed in such a way that a mixture of the oil and of the blood is sprinkled upon them and on their garments (cf Ex 29 21 and Lev 8 30). Were we here dealing with a difference in reference to the theory and the facts of the priesthood, as these were current at the time of the exile (see II 111 below), then surely the victorious party would have seen to it, that their views alone were represented in these laws, and the opposing views would have been suppressed. But now both anointings are found side by side in the same chapter, and the same page.

(d) The different punishments prescribed for carnal intercourse with strangers are also easily explained by the fact, that, in the first passage, the periods are spoken of which only in the second passage, those which had already set in before.

(e) As far as the difference in terminology is concerned, it must be remembered that in their claim the critics either overlook that intentional differences may arise between different persons who deliberate or that they ignore the fact that it is possible in almost every section of a writer's work to find some expressions which are always, or at least often, peculiar to him; or finally, they in an inexcusable way ignore the freedom of selection which a writer has between different synonyms or his choice in using these.

All in all, it must be said that however much we acknowledge the keenness and the industry of the modern critics in clearing up many difficulties, and the fact that they bring many questions that demand answers, it nevertheless in the fact that they take the matter of solving these problems entirely too easily, by arbitrarily claiming different authors, without taking note of the fact that by doing this the real difficulty is not removed, but is only transferred to another place. What could possibly be acceptable as satisfactory in one single instance, namely that through the thoughtlessness of an editor discrepancies in form or matter had found their way into the text, is at once claimed to be the regular mode of solving these difficulties—just in itself thoughtlessness. On the other hand, the critics overlook the fact that it makes little difference for the religious and the ethical value of these commands, whether logical, systematic, linguistic or aesthetic correctness in all their parts has been attained or not, to which must yet be added, that a failure in the one particular may at the same time be an advantage in the other. In this respect we need recall only the anachronisms of the apostle Paul.

2. Structure found in the exposition of all those of the Book of Lev shows all the marks of being a well-constructed and organic literary product, which in its fundamental characteristics has already been outlined under I above. And as this was done in the several articles just cited, we can here add further, as a confirmatory factor in favor of the acceptance of an inner literary unity of the book, that the division of the book into its logical parts, even down to minute details, is here, as is so often the case elsewhere, not only virtually self-evident in many particulars, but that the very made only for the sake of apparent logical parts in this adjustment of the parts almost forces itself upon our recognition. In other places the same is at least suggested, and can be traced throughout the book without the least violence to the text. The system need not be forced upon the materials. We often find sections but loosely connected with the preceding parts (cf under I above) and not united in a strictly logical manner, but which are nevertheless related in thought and association of ideas. In harmony with the division of the Book of Gen we find at once that the general contents, as mentioned under I above, easily fall into 10 pericopes, and it is seen that these consist of 2 sets each of 5 pericopes together with an appendix.

(a) Ten pericopes in two parts: Part I, the separation from God and the removal of this separation: (i) chs 1-7; (ii) chs 8-10; (iii) chs 11-16; (iv) ch 16; (v) ch 17.

Part II, the conduct of the people of God: (i) chs 18-20; (ii) chs 21-22; (iii) chs 23-24; (iv) ch 25; (v) ch 26.

Appendix, ch 27; cf for the number 10 the division of Ex 1 8-7 7; 7 8-13 16; 13 17-18 27; also the Decalogue, 20 1 44; 22 18-29; and see Exodus I 11, 22-29 in Lev probably 18 6-18; 19 8-18, and with considerable certainty 19 1-37 (see below).
The above, however, by no means exhausts this list of references and similar thoughts, and we have here given only some leading illustrations. What literary tricks must be resorted to when, over against this overwhelming mass of evidence, critics yet insist that the different parts of the book were originally independent writings, esp. too, when the entire tabernacle and utensils of the Aaronic priesthood, the Day of Atonement, the Year of Jubilee, the whole sacrificial scheme and the laws dealing with the great festivals, the restriction of the slaying of the sacrificial animals to the central sanctuary, are regarded as the products of imagination alone, according to the Wellhausen hypothesis (cf III, below, and see also the references to "Day of Atonement", III, 1; Ezekiel, II, 2). And how little is gained in addition when, as is sometimes done, in a most arbitrary manner, the statements found in chs 1-3 concerning the tabernacle of revelation ("tent of meeting") and concerning Aaron’s sons, or concerning Aaron and his sons together, are regarded as later additions. In Lev and Ex 26 ff., 36 ff., everything is so entirely one and the same character and has so clearly emanated from one and the same spirit, that it is impossible to separate from this product any constituent part and to unite these into groups that were originally independent, then to split up these still further and to trace the parts to their sources, and even to construct a scheme of all religious and historical development on this reconstruction of the sources.

(2) Structure of the individual pericopes.—As the windows and the column capitals of a mediæval cathedral are arranged according to different schemes and this divergence is regarded as an enrichment of the structure, so we find in the Leviticus a structure of the various pericopes of the Book of Lev. These latter, too, possess a certain symphony of different tones, but all are rhythmically arranged, and only when united do they produce the entire symphony.

(a) The laws concerning the sacrifices (Lev 1-
The reference 15-18, what and 22-27. 28-36, In is (i) (iii) With and Ch 22 sacrifices with above) 28-36, 9-17; and the free the with 5 1-7, relating with that they are duplicates, to different authors.

That there is a difference between these two accounts is proved, not only by the fact that the first set of laws are exact, cf 1-7, 8-10; and the second set 6 8; 7 21 to Aaron and his sons (ch 28). the second set has also in common a number of altogether different viewpoints as compared with the first set, so that the same author found himself compelled to write up the facts fresh. On the other hand, the fact that both have the same author is evident from the connection between the two sections. In addition to the fact that both make mention of all five kinds of sacrifices, we can yet compare 3 5 with 6 22 (the fact that the second offering over the burnt sacrifices upon the pieces of wood): and, further, the express reference of 6 17 to ch 4, while 6 30 presumes the distinct separation of the sin offering, the blood of which is brought into the tent of meeting, from the other sacrifices, as these are given in 4 3 ff. 10 over against 4 22 ff. 27 ff. Ch 4, with its reference to the peace offerings (vs 10-13), is again most closely connected with ch 3. We must accordingly insist that the whole account is most intimately interwoven. Over against this, the first set, chs 1-5, is in 14-15 of the ritual for the peace offering, is sufficiently explained only by the fact that this ritual was to be used in the second set (6-7 21), and here for the first time only in ch 15, which fact again speaks for the same author for both sets and against the supposition that they were merely mechanically united by a redactor. The fact that the second set 6 8-7 21 has a different order from that of chs 1-5, by uniting the sin offering immediately with the meal offering (6 24 ff with vs 14-23), is probably one of the minor ordinances in 7 9 and 10 (manner of eating the meal offering and the sin offering). On the other hand, the position of the peace offering in the second set (7 11 ff) furnished the possibility of giving to the piece of the entire pericope embracement a suitable conclusion: 7 22 ff (prohibition of the eating of the fat and the blood), connected with 7 19 ff, contained in 7 25 ff an ordinance designed to limit the peace offering (beef), with the breast and wave-thigh. At any rate, these last two pieces are to be regarded separately from the rest. Since they are no longer addressed to the priests, as is 6 8-7 21, but to all Israel; cf 7 23-29. On some other data less intimately connected with the matter, cf above under 1.

(b) Consecration of priests and related matters (Lev 8-10): In this pericope, as in the following, ch 17 inclusive, but esp. from ch 11 on, the principle of division on the basis of the number of predicates, in many cases in the details, too; so that this could scarcely be regarded as an accidental feature (cf also the history of Abraham in Gen 12-26; further, in Ex 35 4-40 38; and in Exons, II, 2, [7]; Lev 16, under D or Aonx—merx, I, 2, [11]; Dt 12-26, too, is probably to be divided on this principle, even to the minutest details (of finally Lev 21-22 16; 22 17-30; chs 23 f and 26).

(i) Ch 8, treating of the first seven days of the consecration of the priests: The outline is found in ver 2, naming Aaron, the anointing oil, the bull of the sin offering, two rams, unleavened bread (cf vs 6 ff. 10 ff. 11 ff. 18 ff. 23 ff. 26 ff). (ii) Ch 9 the first sacrifices of Aaron and his sons on the 8th day (vs 2-4 contain the outline, after the manner of 8 2; cf vs 7 ff. 11 ff. the sin offering and the burnt offering of Aaron with ver 2; also vs 15-18, treating of what the people brought for the sacrifices, with vs 3 f; but it is to be noticed that the meal offering and the peace offering (vs 17-18) are given in inverted order from that found in 6 1 ff. Here too we find the number seven, if we add the burnt offering for the new moon (ver 17). (iii) 10 1-7, the sin of Nadab and Abihu and their punishment by death; (iv) 10 8-20, ordinances concerning the priests, occasioned by 9 9-10, and added with new superscription in 10 8, namely (a) 10 8, dealing with the prohibition of the use of wine and intoxicants; (b) 10 9 ff, distinction between the holy and the unholy; (c) 10 12-15, the eating of the sacred oblations; (d) 10 16-20, the treatment of the goat for the sin offering.

(c) Laws concerning the clean and unclean (Lev 11-16): (i) ch 11, treating of clean and unclean animals. The outline of the chief contents is found in 11 46 with a free transplantation of one number. There are a few cases of repetition (cf again 8, quadrupeds; (b) vs 9-12, water animals; (c) vs 13-23, birds (with an appendix, treating of contact with the unclean, vs 24-28, which give a summary of the animals not yet mentioned, as vs 29-45, the small animals upon the earth (again in four subdivisions, viz. [i] vs 29-38; [ii] vs 39 ff; [iii] vs 41 f; [iv] vs 44 f).

(ii) Ch 12 treats of women in confinement, also in four pieces (vs 2-4, birth of a male child; ver 5, birth of a female child; vs 6 ff., purification ceremony; ver 8, ordinances in case of extreme poverty). These parts are not joined logically, but in a rather external manner.

(iii) The passage 13 1-14 53, containing the laws of leprosy, with the subscription in 14 54 ff. (Because seven points are to be enumerated, vs 55 [garments and houses], this is not as in its further exposition separated from the other laws and is placed in their midst.) The exposition contains four pieces, viz. (a) 13 1-44, leprosy on human beings (with concluding verses, 45 f), with seven subdivisions, of which the first five longer ones are constructed along fairly parallel lines, and again can be divided into four super-subdivisions: (1) 13 1-8; 9-17; 18-23; 24-28; 29-37; 38-40; 44-50. The significance of the number seven for the structure (see [2], [3], above) is akin to that found, e.g., in Ex 24 18—31 18 (see Exons, II, 2, [5]); Lev 19-25 (see above); I Kings 3 13—3 14; 13-16; 21 1-16; 23 24—31 13. In any case below); finally, the whole Book of Ex is divided into seven parts (see Exons, II, 1). (9) 13 47-59, leprosy in connection with garments, with four subdivisions, namely vs 47-50; 51 f; 53 f; 55 f. The last subdivision can again be readily separated into four sub-subdivisions, viz. vs 55; 56; 57; 58. (g) 14 1-32, purifications (ver 2 being a special superscription), with four subdivisions, viz. (i) vs 28-3a, the leper before the priest; (ii) vs 36-9, the purification ceremony on the seventh days, again divided into 4 sub-subdivisions: vs 3b f; 5-7; 8; 9; (iii) vs 10-20, the ceremony of the eighth day (4 sacrifices, namely vs 12-18, guilt offering; ver 19a, sin offering; ver 19b, burnt offering; ver 20, meal offering; in the 4 sacrifices 12-6 7 there are again 4 different actions: vs 14; 15 f; 17; 18; (iv) vs 21-32 (in cases of poverty) (a) 14 33-53, leprosy in houses, with four subdivisions: vs 33-35; 36-38; 39-42; 43-53.

(iv) Ch 15, sickness or natural issues, with 4 subdivisions, namely, the garments, the sacred, with issues together with their purification (vs 3-12 contain 12 laws: vs 3; 4a; 4b; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9a; 10b; 11; 12); (b) vs 16-18, issue of seed; (c) vs 19-24, periods; (d) vs 25-30, other flows of blood and their
purification. \( a + \beta \) refer to men and \( \gamma + \delta \) to women; and in addition to these implied suggestions, as \( a + \beta \) to dealing with abnormal issues and their purification ceremonies, \( \gamma + \delta \) with normal issues.

(d) The Day of Atonement (Lev 16): See IV, 1, (2), 2, and under Atonement, DAY OF.

(e) Uses and significance of the blood of sacrifices (Lev 17): (i) Vs 3-7, only one place for killing the sacrifices and the rejection of all foreign cults, only one place for sacrifices; (ii) vs 10-14, prohibitive of eating the blood; (iv) ver 15, pertaining to carcases of animals found dead or which have been torn by wild beasts.

Here the form and contents of the section have been uncertain. The author contains a similar formula in reference to the punishment, while logically vs 10 and 13 are evidence only subdivisions of the third part in vs 10-14, which treats of the prohibition of eating blood. In the fourth division, again, while in substance connected with the rest, there is lacking the formal agreement with the first three divisions.

(f) (Lev 18-20, 21): These naturally fall into 2 parts. Chs 18-20 contain (i) chs 18 f, religious and ethical laws; (ii) ch 20, laws dealing with punishments.

(i) Religious and ethical laws (chs 18 f): (a) ch 18: Ordnances with reference to marriage and chastity. (b) 18 1-5, introductory; (b) vs 6-18, prohibition of marriage between kindred of blood; (c) vs 19-23, prohibition of other sexual sins; (e) vs 24-30, warnings.

The subdivision (c) may perhaps be divided into 10 subordinate parts, if it is permitted to combine the different degrees of relationship mentioned in vs 12-14 (vs 10.11.12.14, 13, 15). This manifestly consists of 5 ordinances (vs 19.20.21.22.23); this we are permitted to divide if we are possible to divide (a) into 5 commandments (vs 2.3a.4-5) and (b) also into 5 (vs 24 f. 26-29). All 10 subdivisions, would contain 5x5 words; but this is uncertain.

(b) Ch 19: various commands of the deepest significance. In order to discover the divisions of this chapter we must note the characteristic formula, "I am Jehovah, your God," or similar expression, which often appears at the beginning and at the end of certain divisions, e.g. in series (1) (d) and (10), but which in the middle series appears in each case only once, and which in all the series is found also at the conclusion.

In this way we can compute 10 tetrads. Thus after the text vs 2 containing a summary, we have (i) vs 3-4 (vs 3a.3b.4a.4b); (ii) vs 5-10 (vs 5f. 7 f.9 f.10); (iii) vs 11-16 (vs 11a.12b.13b.14a.14b); (iv) vs 15 f. 15a.15b.16b.16c); (vi) vs 17 f. (vs 17a.17b.18a.18b); (vii) vs 19-25 (vs 19a.19b.20-22.22-25); (viii) vs 26-28 (vs 26a.26b.27a.27b); (ix) 29-32 (vs 29.30.31.32); (x) vs 33-36 (vs 33.34.35.36); ver 37 constitutes the conclusion of the whole. (Note that the number ten here is certain in the conviction of the present writer; but he is not quite so sure of the number of subdivisions within the main divisions: we may have to do with pentads and not with tetrads. If this is the case, then the agreements with ch 18 would under certain circumstances be even greater.)

Possibly groupings of two can yet form a closer union (cf on Ex 1-16, 21-23, Exodus, II, 2, [1-4].) At any rate (iii) and (iv) can be summarized under the general words of defining a man's neighbor; and (v) and (vi) under that of observation of the laws; and (vii) and (viii) under that of heathen abuscs; while (ix) and (x) perhaps intentionally mingle together the religious and cultural and ethical elements, in order to express that all these things are most intimately connected (but if of also vs 12.14. 17, in the middle sections). In vs 5 f. 20.23 f., the author develops his subject somewhat more fully.

(ii) Laws dealing with punishments (ch 20): The regulations in reference to punishments stand in such close relation to the contents of ch 18 and to parts of ch 19, that it is absolutely incomprehensible how the critics can assign these three chapters to different authors. Even if certain regulations of ch 18 are not (as it were) in Lev 17 and 18, 17b-18b, and even if another order has been followed, this variation, which doubtless also hangs together with a new grouping of the materials, is rather an advantage than a disadvantage for the whole. It is impossible to conceive that a redactor would have altered anything in two entirely parallel and similar texts, or would himself have written a parallel text differing from the other. Ch 20 can probably be divided into 4 parts, viz. (i) vs 1-8, punishments for idolatry and witchcraft with a concluding formula vs 7 f.; (ii) vs 9-18, punishment of death for ten crimes, all of which, with the exception of the first, are of a sexual nature (vs 9-18). It is a question whether the first in the second group (vs 14), i.e. the sixth in the whole series, was intended to be made present by the peculiar character of the punishment (burning to death); (iii) vs 19-21, other sexual sins, with lighter punishments; (iv) vs 22-27, with 4 subdivisions (warning, ver 22 f.; punishment of the repetitive repetitions of two commands already given, vs 25 ff.; cf with 11 44 ff. and in general with ch 11; and ver 27 with 19 26.31; 20 6). Perfectly certain in this chapter is the fact that the different kinds of punishment were decided for their order. It is doubtless not to be regarded as accidental that both at the beginning and at the end death by stoning is mentioned.

(g) (Lev 21 1-22 33): (i) Laws concerning the quality of the priests (21 1-22.16); and ii) concerning sacred oblations (22 17-30) with the subscription vs 31-33.

(i) Qualities of priests: 21 1-22 16 in four sections (21 1 f. 10 f. 16 f; 22 1 f; note also in 21 18-20 the 12 blemishes; in 22 4-8 the 7 cases of uncleanness.

(ii) Sacred oblations: 22 17-30 in four sections (22 18-20, 21-25, 26-28.29 f).

(h) Conclusion of seasons, etc (chs 23, 24): (i) ch 23, laws for the feasts (7 sections, viz. 3. 1-14.15-22.23-25.26-32.33-36, with the appendix in that in every particular unit contained in vs 39 ff., added to the feast of the tabernacles); (ii) 24 1-4, treating of the sacred candlestick, which represents the moral conduct of the Israelites, and for this reason suits admirably in the connection; (iii) this is true of 24 5-11, dealing with the showbread, which represents the results of the labor of Israel; (iv) 24 10-23, containing the report of the punishment of a blasphemer of God and of one who cursed.

Probably the example was made of a person who took the name of God in vain at the time which this chapter describes. But possibly there is a still closer connection to be found with that which precedes. The showbread and the candlestick were found in the holy place, which with its utensils pictured the relation of Israel's character to their God; while the utensils in the Holy of Holies indicated God's relation to His people (cf Hengstenberg, Reilgion, III, 644 ff.). Hence in the holy place, in addition to the showbread and the candlestick, contained only the incense altar, which symbolized the prayers of Israel, and as the blasphemer represents the exact opposite of prayer, it is probable that in 24 10 prayer is indicated by its counterpart. This section consists of 4 parts, viz. vs 10-15 grouping a series of punishments for certain wrongdoings which are more or less closely connected with that found in the text; ver 23.

(i) Sabbatic and Jubilee years (ch 25): Sabbatic and Jubilee years in 7 sections, viz. vs 1-7; 8-12; 13-28; 29-34; 35-38; 39-46; 47-55.

(j) Conclusion: Curse and blessing (ch 26): The grand concluding chapter, offering a curse and a blessing and containing all the prophetic utter-
ances of later times in a nutshell, viz. (i) vs 1–2, repetition of four important demands (vs 1a.1b.2a.2b); (ii) 26 3–13, the blessing, possibly to be divided into 7 stages, one more spiritual than the other; (iii) 26 4–39, the curse, possibly to be divided into seven stages, one more intense than the other (cf also the play on words 7 times repeated, in reference to shabbath, possibly found in vs 34 f, and certainly found in vs 18.21.24.27 f); (iv) 26 40–45, the mercy finally shown by Jeh for His covenant’s sake.

(3) The people’s disobedience.—Further, the transgressions of the Levitical laws in the course of Israel’s history cannot be regarded as a proof of the non-existence of the priestly legislation in pre-exilic times. This is clear from an analogous case. Idolatry was forbidden by the Books of the Covenant (Ex 20.24; 34), which are recognized as ancient documents; but according to 2 K 22 the pious king Josiah down to the year 622 BC takes no offence at idolatry. Even after the reformation, which had been inaugurated in consequence of the finding of the Book of the Law in the temple during the reign of Josiah (2 K 22 f), idolatry was again practised in Israel, as is proved by Ezk 8 and Jer 44, notwithstanding that the Books of the Covenant and Dt already were extant at that time, even according to the views of the critics.

But let us pass on to P itself, and not forget that the directions given for the Jubilee Year (Lev 25), according to Jewish tradition, were never actually observed. According to the reasoning of the critics, this law could not be in existence even in the present day. According to all reports the transgressions of the Divine ordinances began even as early as the Mosaic period; cf Ex 32 (J, E, golden calf); Am 5 25; Ezk 20; Dt 12 3 and Jer 7 42 (sacrifice to the Satyrs in PC). This condition of affairs can readily be understood because the religion of Jeh does not claim to be an emanation from the spirit of the people, but the result of a revelation from on high. In both arguments can we be surprised, that in the times of the Judges, when a great prophetic leader was so often not to be found in Israel, the apologety was so great and so widespread? But all of these cases of disobe-
dience, as demonstrated in the light of these facts, in Israel’s history, are not to eliminate the fact that there are many data to prove the existence of a central sanctuary already in the earliest history of the people, which fact presupposes as a matter of course that there were also laws for the cultus in existence (see EXODUS, III. 5). We must further not forget how the sacrifices of the sons of Samuel (1 S 2 11 f), notwithstanding all their arbitrary conduct, presupposes such passages as Lev 7 30–32; 10 15; the letter sacrifice attendant to a late period, is just as difficult to decide whether these passages refer merely to a custom or to a codified set of laws.

(4) Indiscriminate sacrificing.—To this must be added that the transgressions, to which the critics appeal in proof of their claims, and which they abuse for their own purposes, must in part be interpreted differently from what they are. In the case of sacrificing indiscriminately at any place whatever, and by any person whatever, we have in many cases to deal with extraordinary instances of theophanies (cf Jgs 2 1 ff; 6 11 ff; 13 1 ff), as these had been foreseen in Ex 20 24. Even the Book of Dt does not insist throughout (cf 16 21) that the sacrifices must be made at one and the same place (cf also PC: Lev 24 31; Josh 22). After the rejection of Shiloh, at which the central sanctuary had been deposited, as recorded in 1 S 4, the cultural ordinances of PC, as we learn from Jer 7 11 ff; 26 6; Ps 78 59 ff, became more or less a dead letter. Even the Books of Ch, which history from the standpoint of the PC, at this period and down to the dedication of the temple take no offence at the cultural acts of a Solomon in contrast with their attitude toward the conduct of
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3. Leviticus

3.1. General

3.1.1. Introduction

3.1.1.1. The Book of Leviticus

3.1.1.1.1. The Book of Leviticus is a collection of laws and regulations that were designed to establish a system of worship and religious order for the Israelites. It is divided into three main sections: (1) The ceremonial laws (chs 1–10), (2) The sanctuary service (chs 11–26), and (3) The offerings (chs 27–29). These laws were intended to guide the Israelites in their religious practices and to establish a model of divine service that would be followed in the temple.

3.1.1.2. Historical Setting

The book of Leviticus is set in the context of the early history of Israel, particularly during the time of Moses and the Israelites in the wilderness. The book is rooted in the experiences and traditions of the Israelites, and it reflects their desire to establish a clear and distinct relationship with God. The laws in Leviticus provide a framework for understanding the religious practices of the Israelites and the role of the priests in maintaining this relationship. The book of Leviticus is not an historical account of events, but rather a collection of laws and regulations that were designed to establish a system of worship and religious order for the Israelites.
Uzziah (see 2 Ch 1 6; 6 1-4; 7 1-7, as compared with 26 16 ff.). In the same way the pious people in the Northern Kingdom, after it had, by Divine consent, become separated from (cf. the Southern), could do otherwise than erect altars for themselves, since they could not participate in the worship of the calves in Bethel and Dan. Further, modern criticism overlooks the fact that what is regular and normal is much less liable to be reported in historical narrative than that which is irregular and abnormal.

(5) Dt and PC, etc.—It is not possible at this place to enter into further details; we accordingly refer only to Exk, Ezk, Lev, Dt, and P; cf. ABERLAU, II, 2, where the proof has been furnished that this prophet belongs to a later period than PC as far as Ex 30-40 (containing his picture of the future) in general is concerned, and as far as Ezk 44 f (where it is claimed that the prophet first introduces the distinction between priests and Levites) in particular is concerned. All the important problems that are connected with this matter, esp. the difficulties which result from the Wellhausen hypothesis, when the questions as to the purpose, that is the origin of the historical Leviticus, is considered, are discussed in my book, Are the Critical Rights? The result of this investigation is all the more noteworthy, as I was myself formerly an adherent of the Wellhausen school, but was forced to the conclusion that this hypothesis is untenable.

We have here yet to refer to the one fact that the relation of Dt and the PC, as far as Lev in particular is concerned, justifies the scheme of P followed in the history of the desert. The Wellhausen makes D older than P. Dt 10 8 f; 33 8 ff presuppose more detailed ordinances in reference to the priests such as those which have been given in P. The book of Dt further takes into account different kinds of laws, which, from the 16th till the 12th cent., could not be understood at all, except in the light of Lev 17 13. Dt 26 14 ff again expressly takes into account ideas that have been taken from Lev 22 33 ff. As far as the laws dealing with the great feasts in Dt 16 are concerned, it is impossible without Lev 23 15 ff. 10 ff; and the designation "feast of tabernacles" in vs 13 f cannot even be understood without a reference to such a law as we find in Lev 23 39 ff. The other passages to be discussed on this subject lead us to the following results.

Even if the Book of Dt were the product of the 7th cent. BC, the facts that have been stated above would nevertheless disprove the claim of the Wellhausen school (1916) to the effect that Dt 17 13 ff must belong to the Mosaic period.

2. Connection with Mosaic Law. If Dt, even in its essential and period, be regarded as exilic or post-exilic date for the PC, the following results follow:

(1) PC and desert conditions.—This conclusion is in this point confirmed still further by a series of facts. As Dt permits the firstborn to be ransomed (Lev 27 26 ff; cf. Nu 18 15 ff), the latter ordinances could be preferred and enforced only during the wandering in the desert, where the whole nation was in the neighborhood of the sanctuary. The fact that the ordinances deal with offerings and sacrifices in the private houses on the 14th of Nisan and the holy convocation on the 15th of Nisan at the sanctuary could be carried out only during the wanderings in the desert (cf Ex 12 3 ff. 6; Lev 23 5; Nu 28 16; Lev 27 3 ff; Nu 28 17 ff), and that the Passover could be changed in Dt 16 5 ff from the changed conditions, can be seen by reference to Exodus, III, 3. Still more important is a third command in Lev 17 in comparison with Dt 12. The commandment that every animal that is to be slain is to be brought to the central sanctuary can have a purpose only for the Mosaic period, and could not even have been invented at a later period. Because of the entrance of Israel into Canaan, the Book of Dt changes this ordinance in such a way that from this time on the killing of the animals is permitted at any place (12 13 ff. 20 ff). The different commands in reference to the carcasses of animals that have died and of those torn to pieces are all dependent on Lev 17. In Dt 14 21, it was possible to forbid the use of such animals absolutely for Israel, because from now on, and in contrast to Lev 17, the killing of sacrificial animals was permitted at any place (vs 13 ff). In Ex 22 30 all use of such meat could be forbidden, because Lev 17, with its command to bring all blood to the sanctuary, expresses it better.

Our exposition of Lev 17 1 ff is, however, in another respect also of the greatest significance, for in vs 4-6.8 f the tent of meeting is presupposed as existing; in vs 6.8 also different kinds of sacrifices, and in vs 6 the priesthood; so that at once other ordinances concerning the tent of meeting, the sacrificial code, the priesthood, such as we find in Ex 26 ff; 35 ff; Lev 1-7; Ex 29; Lev 8-10 21 ff, were possible and necessary, and these very laws must probably originate in and date from the Mosaic period. This same conclusion is sustained by the following considerations. For what other source or time is it possible in harmony with such statements found very often in other parts of Lev also, as in "into the understand value of the registration, etc." (unconscious contrast to later times): 14 33 ff. 40. 41.45.53; 16 20-28; 24 10-23; or into the desert," in 16 10.21f. In 6 15.18; 6 6 (cf. also 27 22 ff), the words "according to the estimation" are addressed personally to Moses. In 6 20 a calculation is based on the day on which Aaron was consecrated to the priest, and vs 22 is the first that has general coloring. Such hints, which, as it were, have only been accidentally scattered in the body of the laws, and which point to the peculiarities of his times, are of especial value for the argument in favor of the Mosaic origin of these laws. Further, we everywhere find that Aaron and his sons are as yet the only incumbents of the priestly office (cf 1 5.7.8.11; 2 9.13; 6 1-16.16, etc.). All the laws claim to have been given through Moses or Aaron or through both at Mt. Sinai (see I above). And who, in later times, if it was the purpose to magnify the priesthood of Aaron, would have thought of inventing the fact that on the Day of Atonement and on other occasions for Aaron to bring a burnt offering and a sin offering for himself (Lev 16; 8-10; 6 19 ff), or that Moses in his view of a certain cultural act had been mistaken (cf 10 16 ff). The law concerning the Jubilee Year (Lev 25) presents the fact that the tribe is confined in its own district and is not inter-
mingled with the other tribes, a presupposition which was no longer possible after the occupation of Canaan, and is accordingly thinkable only in the Mosaic times. And now let us remember that this fact, when we recall (see II, above) that the unity of the tribes, the exodus (cf. Exodus, Egypt; the Just 3.6 ff. 20-22.23-25.29.30.33f). vs presupposition without prejudice in any way that Israel is not yet in the Holy Land. Accordingly the usual consecutives at this place are to be regarded not as indicating temporal but logical sequences. In the passage 18 27, we further find the archaic form of bā‘ēl for bē‘ēlēh; cf. in the Pent 19 8.25; 26 3.4; Dt 4 42; 7 22; 19 11. Just as little does ch 26 take us into the exilic period. Only dogmatical prejudices can take offence at prediction of the exile. Lev 26 cannot be regarded as a "prophecy after the event," for the reason, too, that the restoration implied by God in this passage is here presupposed (cf vs 40 ff). And, too, the exile is not the only punishment with which Israel is threatened; and finally as far as Israel is concerned, by the side of the statements concerning their dwelling in one single country (vs 34.38.41 ff.) it is also said that they are to be scattered among many nations and countries (cf vs 23.36.39).

(2) Unity and construction point to Mosaic origin.—If to this we yet add the unity of the thought of the external construction, looking at the whole matter, we do not see anything that would lead us to accept a post-Mosaic period for this book. Then, too, it is from the outset in itself only probable that Moses gave his people a body of cultus-laws and did not leave this matter to chance. We need only think of the great rôle which among the oriental peoples was assigned to their religious cultus. It is indeed nowhere said, in so many words, that Moses wrote even the laws of the Pentateuch, but the references made by Dt to TO PC; the fact that Nu 33, which also is credited to Moses, is characterized by the style of PC; further, that the author of Dt could write in the style of P (cf Dt 14 with Lev 11); and, per contra, that the author of Nu had the mastery of the style peculiar to Dt (cf Dt 28)—all this makes it probable that Moses even wrote these things himself; at any rate, no reasons can be cited against this view. Very interesting in connection with the question of the unity of the Pent are the close connecting links between Lev 18 24 ff; 20 22 ff, and JE. The question whether Moses in the composition of the book made use of his own notes or of those of others, cannot be decided; but this is an irrelevant matter. What the facts may be in reference to the development of other ordinances, which have taken different forms in the Books of the Covenant and in PC, or in Dt and in PC, and whether the existence of these differences in the cases of particular laws compels us to accept later additions, cannot be discussed at this place. Yet from the outset it is to be emphasized that already in the Mosaic period there could possibly have been reasons for changing some of these laws; esp. was this so in the Book of Dt, just before the people entered the promised land of Canaan (cf Nu 18 20 ff, or the laws concerning contributions for sacrifices, Dt 18 3; Lev 7 29 ff).

Then, too, the decision whether this development took place as early as the time of Moses or not is not to be made dependent on the possibility of our being able to explain the reason for such changes. We lack both the daily practice in these cultural institutions, as well as the oral instruction which makes these ordinances intelligible. The manner in which in Lev 1 ff the different kinds of sacrifices are introduced seems to us to show that they were already known to the people and were practiced by them, except for claims. It is, as though the entire book dates from the Mosaic period. As far as Lev at least is concerned, there is nothing found in the book that calls for a later date. Lev 18 24 ff can be regarded as post-Mosaic only if we translate these verses thoughtlessly, as though the inhabitants of the country were here described as being expelled earlier. On the other hand, in vs 24, just as the case with the parallel passage, 20 22 ff, the idea is, without any doubt, that Israel is not yet in the Holy Land. Accordingly the usual consecutives at this place are to be regarded not as indicating temporal but logical sequences. In the passage 18 27, we further find the archaic form of bā‘ēl for bē‘ēlēh; cf. in the Pent 19 8.25; 26 3.4; Dt 4 42; 7 22; 19 11. Just as little does ch 26 take us into the exilic period. Only dogmatical prejudices can take offence at prediction of the exile. Lev 26 cannot be regarded as a "prophecy after the event," for the reason, too, that the restoration implied by God in this passage is here presupposed (cf vs 40 ff). And, too, the exile is not the only punishment with which Israel is threatened; and finally as far as Israel is concerned, by the side of the statements concerning their dwelling in one single country (vs 34.38.41 ff.) it is also said that they are to be scattered among many nations and countries (cf vs 23.36.39).

IV. The Significance.—(1) The law contains God's will, although in transitory form. In the T. Law, under II, 2, (3) we have referred to the fact that Leviticus is an important and necessary stage in the development of true religion, and that the entire OT did not advance beyond this stage and is intended to go beyond it. The leading prophets (Isa 40 ff, Jer, Ezek), even in their visions of the future, cling to the temple, sacrifices, holy obligations, sacred seasons and persons. Christianity was the first to discard this external cult and it had repined the kernel that was concealed in this shell (cf worship in the spirit and in the truth, Jn 4 20-24). Down to this time, kernel and shell were inseparably united. This must not be forgotten, if we would appreciate this Book at all properly. It is true that this book to a large extent deals with laws and ordinances, to which we Christians should not and need not return (cf. the voice from heaven to Peter, Acts 10 15, "What God hath cleansed, make not thou words of men, and Paul's opposition to all work-righteousness that was based on compliance with these external institutions, e.g. in Rom, Gal, Col, as also his independent attitude over against the Jewish law in those cases where it could not be taken into consideration as the way to salvation; cf Acts 21 17 ff; Rom 14 1 ff; 1 Cor 9 19 ff.). But these laws and ordinances were something more than merely external matters, since they contained the highest religious thoughts. We surely should not leave the outset that Lev 19 contains also the word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (ver 18), a command which in vs 33 f is even made to cover the strangers too, and which by Jesus, next to the absolute love demanded for God, is designated as the chief commandment of the law (Mt 22 39); and when in 19 17 f the hatred of the brother and desire for revenge on him are forbidden, we already seem to breathe the atmosphere of Christianity. The entire ch 19 is, in addition, the source on almost all of the commandments of the Decalogue, the abiding authority of which the Christian, after the example and interpretation of Jesus, will at once recognize. But as the Decalogue itself is found inclosed in the specifically Jewish national shell (of Ex 20 2, exodus out of Egypt; ver 8, Sabbath commandment; ver 12, promise of the holy land; ver 17, slaves), so, too, this is the case in Lev 19 (cf vs 3.6 fl.20-22.23-25.29.30.33 f). But how little the specific is here meant in the narrower sense of the term, exclude the spiritual factor, and how closely they are interwoven with the deepest of thoughts, can be seen from ch 26, according to which all merely external sacrifices, into which formalism naturally the Levitical legal code degenerated, do not profit from it, if the heart remains uncircumcised (vs 30 f.11).
Above all, there are four leading thoughts which are emphasized forcibly, particularly by the legal system. In reality and in all places, all property, all persons are sacred to God. But as it is impossible that this ideal should be realized in view of the imperfections and guilt of man, it was decided that certain particular seasons and places, gifts and persons should be separated from others, and that in these this sacredness should be realized as far as possible, and that these representatives should by their mere existence continually remind the people of God's more comprehensive claims, and at the same time arouse and maintain the consciousness that for its entire life was to be saturated by the thoughts of a holy God and His demands. From this point of view, none of the particular laws are worthless; and when they are once appreciated in this their central significance, we can understand that each law has its share in the eternal authority of the law (cf Mt 5:17 f.). Paul, too, who absolutely rejects the law as a way to salvation expresses no doubt that the law really contains the will of God (Rom 8:3); and he declares that it was the purpose of the sending of Jesus, that the demands made upon us by the law should be fulfilled; and in Rom 13:10 he tells us that love is the fulfillment of the law (cf ver 8); and according to Rom 7:12 it is certain that the law is holy and the commandment is holy, righteous and good.

(2) The law prepares for the understanding of Christ.—But the ceremonial law, too, contains not only the demands of God's will. It prepares the understanding of the work, the person and the mission of Jesus. In Ex 25:8; 29:45 f.; 40:34 ff the indwelling of God in the tent of meeting is declared, which prophesies the incarnation of God in Christ Jesus (Jn 1:14); and then the indwelling of God through the Holy Ghost in the Christian congregation (1 Pet 2:5; Eph 4:12) and in the individual (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Jn 14:23). Through the sacrificial system in Lev 1—7, and the ordinances of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16), we are enabled to understand the character of sin, of grace and of the forgiveness of sin (cf ATONEMENT, DAY OF II). Let us remember to what extent Jesus and Paul, the Ep. to the He, and the other NT writings operate with OT thought and understanding. We shall not distinguish particularly with those of Lev (priesthood, sacrifices, atonement, Passover, signification of blood, etc), and Paul correctly says that the righteousness of God was prophesied, not only by the prophets, but also by the law (Rom 3:21).

(3) The law is a tutor. Finally, the ceremonial law too has the purpose to protect Israel from the errors of the heathen, a thought that is esp. emphasized in the Law of Holiness (cf Lev 18:32 ff; 19:26 ff; 20:22 ff; 26:1) and which is in agreement with the elementary stage of Israel's education in the OT, when the people still stood in need of the "tutor . . . unto Christ" (Gal 3:23; 4:1). This already leads us over to the negative side, which Paul particularly emphasizes.

The law is in itself holy, and the commandment is holy and righteous and good (Rom 7:12), but it has lost its power because the flesh.

2. Negative of man is sinful (cf Rom 8:3); and thus it happens that the law is the occasion for sin and leads to a knowledge of sin and to an increase of sin (cf Rom 3:20; 4:15; 5:20; 7:13); and this shall be brought about according to the purposes of God in order that in upright hearts the desire for forgiveness should arise. It is true that nothing was so well adapted as those decrees to bring to bear upon the untutored mind that in which man yet came short of the Divine commands. And as far as the removal of the guilt was concerned, nothing was needed except the reference to this in order to make men feel the imperfection of their action, and merely out of grace was for the time being contented with the blood of goats and of calves as a means for atonement; He was already counting on the forgiveness in Christ (Rom 3:28). All the sacrifices in Lev 1—4, e.g., did not make "the ritual of the Day of Atonement" (Lev 16), and in this case the very man who brought the sacrifice was also a sinful creature who must first secure the forgiveness of God for himself. Only Jesus, at once the perfect priest and the perfect sacrifice, has achieved the perfect atonement by an act which apparently remains a fact that the righteousness which avails before God can be secured only through faith in Jesus Christ, and not through the deeds of the law (Rom and Gal).

The law with its incomplete atonement and with its arousing of the consciousness of sin drives man to Jesus; and this is its negative significance. Jesus, however, who Himself has fulfilled the demands of the law, gives us through His spirit the power, that the law with its demands (1, 11 above) may no longer stand threateningly over against us, but is now written in our hearts. In this way the OT law is fulfilled in its transitory form, and at the same time becomes superfluous, after its eternal contents have been recognized, maintained and surpassed.

LITERATURE.—Comms. by Ryssel, Lange, Kell, Strack, Bassethe, Bertholet; esp. for the Law of Holiness see Horst, Lev 17—26 and Shk. Worster, Ex 21, 1884, 112 ff; Bassethe, Das Heiligtumsgesetz; Klostermann, Der Pentateuch, 358 ff; Delitzsch, Die geschichtliche und historische Bedeutung der talmudischen Interpretationen des OT by Baudisie, Strack, Kuesen, König, Cornill, Driver, Sellin; Archäologie, by Bernstein; History of Israel, by Köhler, König, Oetel, Klostermann, Stade, Wellhausen; for kindness laws in Babylonia, cf Zimmern, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babyl. Religion; against the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, Möller, Die wahren Grundlagen gegen die Graf-Wellhausen'sche Hypothese; Keel, Witk, Yale, and the Graf-Wellhausen'sche Hypothese.

WILHELM MÖLLER

LEVY, lev'i. See WAR.

LEWD, lüd, LEWDNESS, lüd'nes (הָוִית, zimmāh, מִזְמָמָה, מִזְמַמָּה, נַבְּחֲלָת, טוֹפָרָה, πονιέρα, φασίστρυμα, ραδίονογράμμα): There are three Hebrew words tr. "lewd," "lewdness": (1) Māzāmāh, meaning a "plan," a "purpose," so tr. several times and then shifting off into the "evil plot," "evil crime," "wicked purpose or device.

1. In the OT. It is the most frequent word for "lewdness": Ezek 16:27, "lewd way"; found in Jgs 20:40; Ezek 16:27.48: 22:9.11; 23:27.29.35.44. 48; 21:16; Hos 6:5. (2) Māzāmāh means a "plan," generally "evil machination;" used only in Jer 11:15, "lewdness." (3) Nabḥālah, meaning "disgrace" in reference to females. Found only in Hosea 2:10, ARV "shame.

The word tr. "lewd," "lewdness" in AV occurs only twice in the NT, and in each instance is more correctly tr. in RV by another word:

2. In the NT. (1) Pronēros, found in Acts 17:5, tr. in NT ARV "vile." The Gr word elsewhere is tr. "bad," "evil," "wicked," "harmful," "unrighteous," "wicked." AV "lewd" gives the wrong impression. The idea of uncleanness is not present in the text or context. (2) Rhadiorōgēma likewise occurs only once, viz. Acts 18:14, and is correctly tr. in RV and ARV "wicked villainy." The thought of impurity or lewdness is foreign to the meaning in this connection.

WILLIAM EDWARD RAPPETTY
LIBANUS, lib'a-nus. See Lebanon.

LIBATION, lib'a-shun. See Sacrifice.

LIBERAL, lib'er-al, LIBERALITY, lib'er-al'i-ty, LIBERALLY, lib'er-al-ly: The different forms of the word all refer to one who is generous, bountiful, willing and ready to give and to help. Both the Heb words of the OT and the Gr words of the NT translate into the Eng. The word "liberal" has a deeper and nobler meaning than the word "rich" is generally conveyed by the Eng. word. In Prov 11 25, the liberal soul (nephesh brakhah) means a soul that carries a blessing. In Isa 32 5, AV has "bountiful" where AV has "liberal," and in vers 8 "liberal" takes the place of "rich" (adoph). The principal Gr word are ἀρετή, kaiplaía, lit. "simplicity," "sinserity," and χρηστία, charis, "grace," "favor." In 1 Cor 16 3, "bounties" substitutes "liberality." It is well to bear in mind that a Bib. liberal can spring only out of a noble soul, and is Godlike in its genesis and spirit. G. H. GILBERT

LIBERTINES, lib'er-tinz, li-burt'zin (legates, Liberali); These were among Stephen's opponents: "There were three or four hundred of them of the synagogue called [the synagogue] of the Libertines, and of the Cyrenians, and of the Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and Asia, disputing with Stephen" (Acts 6 9).

How many synagogues are denoted? The answer may aid in the interpretation of "of them of the synagogue of the Libertines (Acts 15:3)." The word means "synagogue" in the sentence, "The second εἷς (of them) seems to denote two parties, the one concurring in 'of them that were of the synagogue called the [synagogue] of Libertines and Cyrenians and of them of Cilicia and Asia' (Winer, Wendt, Holtzmann). The second εἷς is dependent on synagogue. As Cyrenians and Alexandrians both belong to towns, a change of designation would be necessary when the Jews of whole provinces came to be mentioned: this being the case, the article could not but be repeated, without reference to the εἷς before (Aiford). (3) There were three synagogues called "of the Libertines, (b) that of the Cyrenians and Alexandrians and (c) that of Cilicia and Asia" (Aiford). There is no grammatical reason for this division, but it is based on an interpretation of "Libertines. There were "Libertines. As Cilicia and Asia (4) Each party had a separate synagogue (Schürer, Haussrat). The number of words together, the different origin and conditions, and the number of synagogues in Jews give weight to this view.

(1) They are "freedmens," liberated slaves or their descendants. Against this it is held that the Gr equivalent (apelletheron) would have been used in this case. However, the interpretation of "Libertines" should be common all over the empire. In what sense were they "freedmen"? Various answers are given: (a) they were freedmen from Jewish servitude (Lightfoot); (b) they were Italian freedmen who had become proselytes; (c) they were the "freedmen of the Romans" (Chrysostom), the descendants of Jewish freedom at Rome who had been freed. Tactitus relates that the senate decreed (19 AD) that a certain number of Roman citizens should be transported to Sardinia, and that the rest should leave Italy, unless they renounced, before a certain day, their Roman customs (Ann. ii, 85; see also Jos, Ant., XVIII, iii, 5). Many would naturally seek refuge in Italy and build there a synagogue.

(2) They are an African community. There were two synagogues, one of which was Asiatic. In the other were men from two African towns (Cyrene and Alexandria), therefore the Libertines must have been African also, all forming an African synagogue. Various explanations are given: (a) They were inhabitants of Libertum, a town in Africa proper: an Episcopus Ecclesiae Catholico Libertinatis" sat in the Synod of Carthage (411 AD). (b) Some emend the text; Veletin and Blass, followed into Libnana, for Libertinum, "of the Libyntines." Schultz reads for "Libertines and Cyrenians" (Libertinon kat Kiriakont) "Libyans, those about Cyrene" (Libdión ton kai Kyrênion) (cf Acts 2 10).

These emendations are conjectural; the MSS read "Libertins." It seems, therefore, that 2, (1) (c) above is the correct interpretation.

S. F. HUNTER

LIBERTY, lib'er-ti (τῆς τύχης, δικαιοσύνης, ἐλευθερίας): The opposite of servitude or bondage, hence applicable to captives or slaves set free from oppression (thus δικαιοσύνης, Lev 25 18; Isa 61 1 etc.). Morally, the power which enslaves is sin (Jn 8 34), and liberty consists, not simply in external freedom, or in possession of the right of choices, but in the complete leaving apart the cares of the mind, the tyranny of sinful lusts and the enthrallment of the will, induced by a morally corrupt state. In a positive respect, it consists in the possession of holiness, with the will and ability to do what is right and good. Such liberty is possible only in a renewed condition of soul, and cannot exist apart from godliness. Even under the OT godly men could boast of a measure of such liberty (Ps 119 45, ἀνέστησεν); but it is the gospel of Christ, which bestows it in full fulness, in giving a full and clear knowledge of God, discovering the way of forgiveness, supplying the highest motives to holiness and giving the Holy Spirit to destroy the power of sin and to quicken to righteousness. In implanting a new life in the soul, the gospel lifts the believer out of the sphere of external law, and gives him a sense of freedom in his new filial relation to God. Hence the NT expressions about the glorious liberty of God's children (Rom 8 17); of Gal 2 4; 5 13, etc., about liberty as resulting from the possession of the Spirit (2 Cor 3 17), about the "perfect law of liberty" (Jas 1 25). The instrument through which this liberty is imparted is the "truth" (Jn 17 17), (c) the "child of truth" (Jn 18 37; 19 17); it is one of the cities given to the "children of Aaron" (Josh 21 13; 1 Ch 6 57). In the reign of Jeroboam, Libnah joined the Ezonites in a revolt against the king of Judah (2 K 15 22; 2 Ch 21 10). In the reign of Hezekiah, Libnah was besieged by Sennacherib (2 K 19 8; Isa 37 8). The wife of King Josiah
was "Hamutal the daughter of Jeremiah of Libniah," she was the mother of Jehoshaz and Zedekiah (2 K. 23 21; 24 18; Jer 52 1).

The site of this important stronghold remains unknown. In the Onom it is described, under the name Lobana or Lobnas, as near Eleutheropolis (Bet Jebrin). All the indications point to a site in the S.W. territory of Shephelah, not very far from Lachish. The Palestine Exploration Fund surveyors suggested (PEF, III, 259) the commanding site 'Arūd el Menaytkē, or rather the white chalky mound 250 ft. high to the N. of this village, and Stanley proposed Tell es Šāfī. (Both these identifications are due to the misinterpretation of Libnaseh meaning "whiteness.").

In the PEF's (1897, Sh XX) Conder suggests a ruin called el Bendaw, 10 miles S.E. of Lachish. E. W. G. Masterman

**LIBNII, ūb'nī (ליבנית, libnith):**
1. Son of Geraiah (Ex 6 17; Nu 3 18; 1 Ch 6 17 20).
2. Family who traced their descent from Libnare (Nu 3 21; 26 58).

**LIBNITES, ūb'nītēs (ליבניטים, ha-libnith).** See Libnii.

**LIBRARIES, ḇrēt-rēs, ḇrēr-ēs:**
1. The Bible as a Library.
2. Bibliology and Apocryphal Libraries
3. Libraries for the Dead
4. Memory Libraries
5. Prehistoric and Primitive Librarians
6. Mesopotamian Period
7. Egyptian Period
8. The Exodus
9. The Conquest
10. Library at the Court of Judah
11. Library to the Maccabees
12. NT Times
13. Bookcases and Buildings

**LITERATURE**
A library is a book or books kept for use, not for sale. A one-book library is just as much a library as a one-cell animal is the animal. The earliest libraries, like the earliest plants and animals, were very simple, consisting of a few books or perhaps only a single tablet or manuscript. An archive is a library of official documents not in active use; a registry, a library of a system of books. The Bible is itself a library. During the Middle Ages it was commonly called, first, "the Divine Library," and then, "the Library" (Bibliotheca), in the same exclusive sense as "the Book" (Biblia). A "Library" (biblia) is a collection of books rather than a single work.

This fact that the Bible is itself a library is increasingly mentioned of late, esp. in OT studies (Kent, *Narratives of the Beginnings of Heb History*, 1, 4, 6; *Library*, Bibletisch Babel, 4, "the Old Testament, that small library of books of the most multifarious kind"). Its profound bearing on the theory of the composition and inspiration of the Bible (cf Book) has given the fact new significance and makes an understanding of the nature of a library one of the best tools for the interpretation of the Bible in the face of modern problems. While it is not possible to elaborate this within these limits, it may be said briefly that the logical end of the application of the doctrine of evolution to books is that of the Bible is, like man, the result of natural selection, and is as unique among books as man among the animals. And, whatever may be true of men, in the case of books the formation of a book-library by natural selection tends toward the elimination of the inferior.

The more numerous the individuals the longer the period, the greater the reduction of error, so that the logical inference as to the Bible is that on purely natural grounds it may be, or is, the nearest approximation to inerrancy among books, because of the artificiality of the selection. This is at least applicable to the position that the Bible is as unique among books as Jesus Christ among men, but under the doctrine of a creative Providence, it does imply what may be called real superhuman authorship and authority.

Somewhat apart from historical libraries, but closely connected with the Bible study, are the alleged superhuman libraries, libraries of, or written by, the gods, libraries for the dead and apocryphal libraries. The Vedas are said to have existed as a collection even before the Creator himself (Man. 1 21). All religions have their book-gods—Thoth and Sekhmet, Apollo, Hermes, Minerva, Idas, Bridges, Soma, Brahma, Odin, Ysir, Yggdrasil and many others. To the ancient Babylonians the whole firmament was a library of "celestial tablets." The mythological ideas often have important bearing on the epics, the histories, the doctrines, e.g. the Creation, the Book of Life, the Book of Life, the Holy Spirit. Apocryphal libraries include the library which Jeh is alleged to have formed on the 7th day of creation on the summit of the Garden of Eden, and other libraries ascribed to Enoch, Noah and Seth. See for this the "pseudoprophets,"

Another class of collections of real books, written or gathered for mythological purposes, is what may be called libraries for the dead. It is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and among rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple, it is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and amongst rather simple. These books were either in the hands of the dead things which friends thought would be useful in the Elysian fields or happy hunting grounds, or on the way thither, or in the hands of the whiteness."

This motive is still found in books of the dead. For long periods in the history of Egypt every Egyptian of any position was buried with one or more books. These books were not the chance possessions, buried with him as, in some burials, all a man's personal belongings are, but books selected for their usefulness to him after death. For the most part these were of the nature of guides and to the heavenly world, magic formulæ for the opening of doors, instructions as to the right method of progress toward, or introduction into, paradise, etc. These books were afterward gathered together and form what is now known as "the Book of the Dead," and other such books. In modern times thebest of the professed Orientalists, it is often has in memory a collection of remembered books. This is in effect a library, and a library of a very distinctive sort, the medicine-man's medicine-library, as it is called, a library of tribal-man's traditions. The priests of India and the medicine-men of India of the Middle Ages often had a large repertory. By the term "library" it is usually meant that the books of the OT such memory traditions, transmitted orally, were the chief source of the Hebraic, but in view of what is now known of the library situation of the time, this must be doubted.

In general terms it may be said that when man began not only to make but to keep records, libraries began. Even a memorial stone contains the form of a mnemonic library. The primitive medicine-man's collection of notched sticks, tallies, or woven cords or reed marks, a great advance in complexity on these, and the simplest collection of pictures, was already, according to the early records of the American Indian, an advance on this. A combination of pictures with signs is still another step, and this step is already to be found in the Pyrenean caves of the Stone Age (see *Writing*). Most of these earliest libraries were kept in human hands, gathering together of books in libraries had its origin in the ideas of (1) preservation, (2) gathering together of books in human hands, and (3)－the great modern expansion of the idea of the owner of books and his belongings, his receipts for purchases and record of sales, whether these are written on the walls of his cave or on wooden tablets or on clay tablets gathered in little jars and buried under the floor of his house. Large libraries are among the temples of Egypt and Assyria gathered large stores of these archival records and with them records of tributary, oracles, etc. At early ages the account of King Dareker of Israel, his archival library and
his librarian Sunezemli. The annals of Thutmos III were preserved in the palace library as well as cut in stone on the temple itself. A few years later
and we know that the archive records were kept in a special room in the palace at Amarna—and many of the
records themselves were found there. All this was before
the year 1300.

Bible history through the 10th chapter of Gen
covers the whole civilized world, but its main line up to about 2000 BC is almost wholly
Mesopotamian. Up to the time of
Aram's migration from Haran, the
history of Bib and Sumerian libraries are one.

6. Mesopo-
tamian
Period

Most of the cities mentioned in this period and now known to have had collections of books were,
those days. At the time when Abram left Haran
there were hundreds of collections of written doc-
ments in scores of different geographical localities
and containing millions of tablets.

From Abram's emigration out of Haran to Jacob's
emigration to Egypt was, on the face of Bib, data,
mainly a time of wandering in Pal, but
this was not wholly nomad nor wholly
Patriarchal. Palestinian. Whether there were li-

eraries in Pal at this time or not, the
Patriarchal were all in daily contact with
the libraries lands of Babylonia and Egypt. Abram
himself was familiar with both Mesopotamia and

Egypt. His son Ishmael married an Egyptian,
is son Isaac a Mesopotamian. His grandson Jacob
married two wives from between the rivers, and had
himself 20 years' residence in the region. While it
does not appear that Isaac lived at any time either
in Syria or Egypt, during most of his life all the
members of his nearest family, father, mother, wife,
sons' wives, had had from one to three score years'
life in the mother-country. Whether there were
public records in this region at this time is another
matter, but it would seem that the whole region
during the whole period was under the influence of
the Bab civilization. It was freely traversed by

trading caravans, and the Hittite and Mesopo-
tamian records extend at least a little back into
this period.

The Egypt period of Bible history begins with the
immigration of Jacob and his sons, but fringes back
to the visit of Abram (Gen 12 10–20).

8. Egyptian if not to Miriam of Gen 10 6. On
Period

the other hand, it ends properly with the
exodus, but fringes forward through frequent points of contact in
the Virgin and Pentecost. Whether the sojourn
was 430 or 215 years, or less, it was a long residence
at a time when libraries were very flourishing in
Egypt. Already at the time of Abram's visit, col-
lections of books, not only of official accounts, but
of religious texts, medical texts, annals, and the like,
had been common in Egypt for nearly 1,000 years,
and had perhaps existed for 1,000 years or more
before that.

Under the elder of the modern datings of the
exodus, the period of the sojourn included the
times of Thothmes III (Thutmoso), and in this reign
there are peculiarly interesting records, not only of the
existence of temple and palace libraries, but of
the nature of their contents. The official recorder of
Thothmes III, accompanying him on his campaign
in Syria and Pal, set down each day the events of
the day, while he or others also made lists of tribute,
spoils, commissary matters, etc. These daily rec-
ords were deposited in the palace library, as
annals, but a narrative compiled from these and
written on a leather roll was deposited in the temple
library, and from this roll in turn an abstract was
engraved on the walls of the temple, where it remains
to this day. This probably gives the library sit-
ation of the time in a nutshell: (1) the simple
saving of utilitarian documents, often on papyrus
or wood tablets, (2) the gathering of books written
for information on more durable material, (3) pre-
serving choice books for posterity by a local series
of inscriptions.

The rolls must have been kept in chests or in
small boxes, like the box containing the medical
papyri of King Neferikere some 1,300 years before,
or the "many boxes" at Edfu long after. Many
pictures of these book-chests or bookcases are found
in the monuments (Birt, Bookchests 12, 15 ff).

Again, the palace library of King Akhnaton (c
1360 BC) at Amarna, which contained collections
of the royal foreign correspondence on clay tablets,
had been excavated. Its bricks bear the inscription,
"Place of the records of the palace of the king," and
some hundreds of tablets from this spot have been
recovered.

At the time of the exodus there were thus prob-
lably libraries in all palaces, temples and record
offices, although the temple libraries were by no
means confined to sacred writings or the palace to
secular. There were also at least archives, or regis-
ters, in the royal treasury and in all public depart-
ments. Schools for scribes were, it would seem,
commenced as early as 2000 BC.

There were, therefore, apparently, at this time
millions of documents or books, in hundreds of
organized collections, which could be called archives
or libraries.

9. The

Under the Egypt taskmasters (Ex 5
Exodus

were in the scribal schools, were of course quite familiar with the Egypt
ways of keeping their books. It is not surprising,
therefore, to find the first and chief provision which
Moses made for the Tabernacle was a book-chest
for the preservation of the sacred directions given by
Jeh. It makes little difference whether the
account is taken in its final form, divided horizon-
tally into Ex, Lev, Nu, Dt and Josh, or divided per-
pendicularly into J, E, D, P, the fact of the ark and

enough of its details are given even in the very oldest
sources to the effect that the ark to be a glorified book-chest in or near which
were kept written documents; the tables of stone,
the inscribed rod, all the testimony given from
the mercy-seat which formed its lid, and perhaps
the Book of Dt. to the high priest. In fact the
shape of a portable bookcase, and the LXX trans-
renders the word by the ordinary technical Gr
word for the book-chest (kibōlos; cf Birt, op. cit., 248–49).
It appears also to have been the later Heb word for
book-cabinet (cf Jēw 'ēk, II, 107 ff). At the exodus,
whenever that may have been, Moses is alleged to
have made the ark the official library, and in it
apparently he is thought to have kept the
oracles as uttered from time to time and the record of his
travels from day to day (as well as the tablets of stone), precisely as the scribe of Thutmoso recorded
his Syrian campaigns from day to day. This
record (if it was a record) was in all likelihood on a
leather roll, since this became the traditional form
of books among the Hebrews, and this too was like
the annals of Thutmoso. When the tribes sepa-
rated to N. and S., the books may have been either
separated or copied, and doubtless they suffered
much wear and tear from the harsh times until we
appear Find Dt turnin library, as

in a temple in a temple (2 K
22 8 ff; 2 Ch 34 14 ff).

The evidence from Egypt, Bab, Mitannian,
Amorite and Hittite documents shows the exist-
ence of official chancelleries and by implication of
archives throughout the whole region of Syria and
Pal at the time when the "Hebrew" invasion

Libri

Libraries
began (Winckler, *Tell el-Amarna Tablets*). The Am
Tab and the tablets from the Hittite archives at
Amrunning (DOG Mittteilungen 1907, no. 35) include actual letters from
the princes, elders and governors of dozens of regions, scattered all over this
region from Egypt to the land of the Hittites and the Mitannians. These places include
among others Jerah, Damascus, Tyre, Sidon, Acco,
Ashkelon, Gaza, Lachish, Keilah and Aijalon.

Remains of two of such archival libraries have been
dug up—one at Lachish and one at Tzanach near Megiddo, both dating back to the 14th cent.

Whether there were temple libraries as well does not
appear so clearly from external evidence but may probably be inferred from the names, Deir, Deir (and perhaps) Nebi, as well as from the well-known fact that they also were not destroyed or even
occupied for a long time, but were surrounded by the
Hittites, and finally occupied and assimilated.

It follows, therefore, that the archival system remained
and, under this theory, for a long time after the
destruction of the archives of the ancient time the names of
the countries and their neighbors—and, by inference, libraries with
the rest.

(4) Taking the evidence of the documents as a
stand, the matter is simple enough; various
works were kept in or near the ark. Joshua added
to these records and the contents of the scrolls in the
sanctuary, and Samuel “laid up” the book that he
wrote “before Jeh” i.e. at the ark. Moreover,
the Books of Jasher, the Wars of Jeh, etc, imply a
library, which in turn implies libraries. Wherever or
howsoever composed, there is no good reason to
distrust their historical existence. (5) Even on the
extreme critical hypothesis, “Most of the stories
found in the first 8 books of the OT originated before
the time of song and story (c. 1250-1050)” (Kent,
*Beginning", 17). (6) To this may also be added, with all reservations, the mysterious
metal ephod which appears only in this period.
The ephod seems to have been either (a) a
case (DBB, 66) or (b) an instrument for consulting an
oracle (DBB, 65). The linen ephod had a pouch for
the Urim and Thummim. The metal ephod seems to be distinguished from the image and may have contained the written oracular instructions
in the form of the oracular instruments, (7) The
Kemite scribes of Jabe (1 Ch 2 65); the simple
fact that a chance captive from Succoth could write
out a list of names and some one at least of the
rupest border frontier times could read
it, the reference to the staff of the master-mother,
whether it be *Thummim* or *Mace*
(Deborah's Song, point in the same direction).

While, therefore, the times were doubtless wild,
the political unity very slight, and the unity of
worship even less, there is evidence that there were
both political and religious libraries throughout
the period.

Beginning with the monarchy, the library
situation among the Israelites appears more and more
clearly to correspond with that of the
surrounding nations. The first record after the choice and
procurement of Saul as king was the
writing of a constitution by Samuel and
the depositing of this in the sacred archives
(1 Sa 10 25). This document (LXX *bidwa") was
perhaps one of the first, general, or local ("words") of
Samuel whose words (1 Ch 29 29, history, chronicles,
acts, book, etc) seem to have been possible a register
kept by him, perhaps from the time that he
accompanied the latter (as later the high-priestly register of the
later records) and these were mainly kept from the
beginning of his high-priesthood (1 Mace 16 24).

Whether these "words" of Samuel were equivalent
to the technical register or "book of the
words of days" or not, such registers were undoubtedly kept from the time of David on, and there is nothing so illuminating as to the actual library conditions of
the times as the so-called chronicles, histories or acts—the registers, journals or archives of the
time. The roll-register seems to be called in full
"the book of the words of days," or with explanatory
fullness "book of the records of the words of days," but this appears to be an evolution from "words of days" or even earlier, as well as the abbreviations "book of days" and "book" are
used of the same technical work, which is the
engrossing in chronological book-form of any series
of individual documents—all the documents of a
register considered as a whole.

The "word" in Heb is used of books, speeches,
sayings, oracles, edicts, reports, formal opinions,
agreements, judgments, judicial decisions, stories,
records, regulations, sections of a discourse, lines
of poetry, whole poems, etc, as well as acts, deeds,
"matters," "affairs," events and words in the
narrowest sense. It is thus very exactly, as well as
literally stated in the LXX by *lpyra", which as a technical
book-term (Brock's *Biblica* 28 29) means
any distinct composition, long or short, whether
a law, an epicram, or a whole complex work. The
best Eng. equivalent for this "work-complete-in-
itself," in the case of public records, is "document," and in the case of literary matters, it is "work
or writing." The "words" of Samuel or David thus
are his "acts" or "deeds" in the sense, not of doing,
but of the individual documentary records of those
doing quite in the modern sense of the "acts
and proceedings" of a convention, or the "deeds"
in the property.

In the pl. *dbr h" and *lpyra or *lpyra alike mean
a collection of documents, works or writings, i.e. "a
library." Sometimes this is used in the sense of
archives or library, at other times as a book containing these collected works.

These collected documents in register-form constituted apparently a continuous series until the time when the Book of Ch was written and were extant at that time. The "words" of David (1 Ch 23:27; 27:24), the "book of the words [acts] of Solomon" (1 K 11:41), the book of the words of days of the kings of Judah, and the book of the words of days of the kings of Israel—the kingdoms after division each having naturally its own records.

The general situation during the period as to archival matters is pretty well summarized by Moore in the EB. From the time of Solomon, and more doubtfully from the time of David, he recognizes that "records were doubtless kept in the palace," and that "the temples also doubtless had their records," while there may have been also local records of cities and towns. These records contained probably chief events, treaties, edicts, etc.—probably brief annals "never wrought into narrative memoirs." The temple records contained annals of succession, repairs, changes, etc (EB, II, 2021-28). The records were, however, probably not brief but contained treaties, etc., verbatim in full. To this should moreover be added the significant fact that these archives contained not only business records but also various works of a more or less literary character. Those mentioned include letters, prophecies, prayers, and even songs and Wisdom literature. The "words" of the kings of Israel contained prayers, visions and other matter not usually counted archival. The "acts" (words) of Solomon also contained literary or quasi-literary material. According to Jos the archives of Tyre contained similar material and this was also true of the Amarna archives (c 1380 BC) and those at Boghaz-keui, as well as of the palace archives of Nineveh and the great temple archives of Nippur and Abu Habb (Sippar). So, too, in Egypt the palace archives of King Neferkare contained medical works and those of Rameses III, at least, magical works, while the temple archives in the time of Thutmose III (Breasted, Ancient Records) contained military annals, and those of Denderah certainly many works of a non-registrial character. The temple of early Greece also contained literary works and secular laws as well as temple archives proper.

In short, the palace collections of Israel were no exception to the general rule of antiquity in containing, besides palace archives proper, more or less of religious archives and literary works, while the temple collections contained more or less political records and literary works.

This record system in Israel and Judah, as appears from the OT itself, was the system of Persia in OT times. It was the system of the Jews in Maccabean times, of Egypt during this whole period and for centuries before and after, and of Northern Syria likewise at about this time (Zakar-Baal, of Ghabal, c 1113 BC). The books of Ex, Lev, Nu and Dt, whenever written, reveal the same system, Ex to Nu being in the form of a register, and Dt represented as an abstract prepared for engraving on stone, a use which Joshua is said to have made of it. We have, therefore, the same system existing before and after and on all sides geographically.

All this neighboring practice points to a system of (1) archival collections, (2) contemporary book registers, (3) contemporary publication by inscription, and, in the light of these, the OT method, from the time of David at least, becomes clear, certainly as to archival collections and registers and hardly less so as to the setting-up of inscriptions in permanent material. Even if it is not earlier than 621 BC, it assumes public inscription long before that time, quite comparable in extent to the inscriptions of Thutmose III or King Mesha of Moab, and, although few long inscriptions have been recovered thus far, there is at least the Egyptian inscription (cf also Isa 30:8; Job 19:23,24; Isa 8:1; Jer 17:1; also the Decalogue). Each one of these three elements (even the collection of inscriptions in the temple) was, it must be remembered, called in antiquity a "library.

The reference to "the books" in Dn 9(2) may possibly point to or foreshadow the synagogue library.

Little weight is generally and properly given to the statement of 2 Mace 2:13, that Nehemiah founded a library and gathered into it the writings "about the kings, the prophets and David, and the letters of the kings concerning votive offerings," but it is, as a matter of fact, evident that he, as well as Judas Maccabaeus, who is linked with him in the statement, must have done just that.

From the time of the LXX, the idea of the library (bibliothékē) and even the public library ("books of the people," i.e. public records) was familiar enough, the LXX itself also, according to Jos, linking the temple library of Jerusalem with the Alexandrian library through the furnishing of books by the former to the latter for copying.

With the Rom conquest and the rise of the Idumaean, naturally the methods developed in accordance with Rom practice. It appears from the frequent references of Jos that the public records were extensive and contained genealogical records as well as official letters, decrees, etc. The true method of record continues. It appears, further (Blau, 96; Krauss, III, 179), that there were libraries and even lending libraries in the schools and synagogues, not of Pal only, but wherever Jews were settled. Jos and Chrysostom were among the Mithraeans and the already very clear inference from St. Luke's account of Our Lord's teaching in the synagogue that at this time, and probably from the beginning of the synagogue, the books, the manner of their keeping and the ritual of their using were already essentially as in the modern synagogue. The Synagogue-places of the Christians were the synagogues, and when churches succeeded these, the church library naturally followed, but whether in Bible times or not is a matter of conjecture; they appear at least in very early churches.
Whether the rich secular lit. to which Jos had access was in public or private libraries does not appear directly. It is well known that it was as much a part of the Roman policy in Herod's time to found public libraries in the provinces as it was to restore temples. Twenty-four such provincial libraries, chiefly temple libraries, are known.

The Roman practice of the time still mixed literary with the archival material, and it is likely therefore that the public records of the Jewish temple had in them both Gr and Lat secular books in considerable quantity, as well as the Gr Apoc and a large amount of Aram. or late Heb lit. of Talmudic character.

As to the receptacles and places in which the books were kept, we have reference even in the Heb period to most of the main forms used among the nations: the wooden box, the clay box or pot, the pouch, and on the other hand, once, the "house of books" so familiar in Egypt use and apparently referring to an individual chamber or semi-detached building of temple or palace. Most significant, however, is the statement that the books were kept in the palace and temple treasuries or store-houses.

The sacred ark (בָּרוּן, whatever it may have originally contained, was looked on when D was written as a sacred wooden book-chest, and the ark in which the sacred priests carried the laws about for public reading was in fact likewise a chest.

Such chests were common among the Jews later, some with lids and some with side-opening (Jeu Ena, II, 107–8; Blau, 178). It is tempting to find in D where the book is to be put "by [AV 'in'] the side of the ark" (Dt 31.26), a chest having both lid and openings in the side, but more likely perhaps D means a separate chest, like the coffee or pouch with the golden mice, which was also put by the side (מִיכָכָד) of the ark (1 S 6.8).

In the NT the "cebox" which Paul left behind at Trosos (2 Tim 4.13) was probably (Wattenb., 614, see to Birt and Githaathausen), if not a wooden "casea," at least some sort of bookcase or cover.

The earthen vessel in which Jeremiah (32.14) puts the two 'books' (תָּרָנִים, one sealed and one unsealed, was one of the commonest bookcases of the ancient world. This information has lately been widely reinforced and associated with Bib. history by the discovery of the Elephantine papyri, which were, for the most part, kept in such clay jars (Meyer, Papyraegraf. 15). The word Pentateuch maps back to a five-roll jar, but more likely to a basket or wooden box with five compartments (Blau, 65; Birt, Buchrolle, 21, 22). It was the collective label of a five-roll case, whether of earthenware, wood or basket work.

The pouch or bag bookcase has perhaps its representative in the phylactery (Mt 23.5), which was a sort of miniature armarium in that each of the four little rolls of its compartments was technically a "book" (סֵפֶר). This name is commonly explained as an amulet guarding against evil spirits, but the term actually occurs in the papyri (Bibliophylax) of the preservation of books.

The "house of books" (Ezr 6.1m) or "place of books" is a very close parallel to הַבּוּרֵי, by which (in the pl.) it is used in the LXX. The phrase was a common term in Egypt for library, perhaps also sometimes for scrip torium or evenregistry, and it points to a chamber or semi-detached room or building where the book-chests, jars, etc., were kept. That at Edfu is a semi-detached room and contained many such cases.

While there is little record of libraries in Bib. times, the very formation of the Canon itself, whether by the higher critical process, or by natural processes of gathering whole literary works, implies the gathering together of books, and the temple libraries common to both Egypt and Assyria-Babylonia are almost inevitably implied wherever there was a temple or sanctuary, whatever may be the facts as to the temple libraries. According to Hilprecht there were certainly such libraries and from very ancient times. The palace library of Assurbanî-pal, though itself a discovery of the last times, brings the story down to the times of the written history. For the rest of the story see lib. below, esp. Dzialoszko, Bibliotheken, and the art. on 'Libraries' in the Enc Brit. See also Nineveh, Library of.

In the earlier period at least and including for the Jews the NT times, the particular locality in palace or temple seems to have been the treasury. In the Book of Ezr, search for the decree of Cyrus was to be made in the king's treasure-house (Ezr 5.17), and was made in the "house of books where the treasures were laid up" (Ezr 6.1m). The document was finally found in the palace at Ecbatana—so too in 1 Mac 14.49 the archives are placed in the treasury.

In NT times there had already been a good deal of development in the matter of library buildings. A general type had been evolved which consisted of (1) a colonnade, (2) a lecture-room, a reading-room or assembly room, (3) small rooms or cellars. Such accounts as we have of the Alexandrian libraries, with the excavations at Pergamus, Athens and Rome, reveal the same type—the book-rooms, the colonnade where masters walked or sat and talked with their pupils, the rooms for assembly where the senate or other bodies sometimes sat. In short, as long before in Egypt, whether in palace or temple, the place of teaching was the place of books.

It is significant thus that Our Lord taught in the Treasury, which in Herod's Temple was in the court of the temple proper—probably the porticoes under the women's gallery, some of the adjoining rooms being used for books. As this was within the barrier which no Gentile could cross, Herod must have had also a library of public records in the outer colonnade. See further, Nineveh, Library of.


E. C. RICHARDSON

LIBRARY OF NINEVEH. See Nineveh, Library of.

LIBYA, lib'i-a, LIBYANS, lib'i-anz: In the OT the word occurs in AV in 2 Ch 12.3; 16.8; Nah 3.9 for "Libium" (thus RV). RV, however, retains "Libyans" in Dn 11.43. In Jer 46.9; Ezk 30.5; 38.5, the word is repeated in RV by PUT (q.v.). In the NT the word "Libyans" (Αἰγύπτιοι, Lübû) occurs, in close connection with Cyrene (q.v.) (Acts 2.10). Gr and Rom writers apply the term to the African continent, generally excluding Egypt. See Libium.

LICE, Is (ץ'כ, kûnum [Ex 8.17.18]; Ps 106.31); ץככ, kûnum [Ex 8.16]; ץככ, kûnum [Ex 8.17.18]; LXX σκυτή̂s, skûphes [Ex 8.16.18], τῷ̂
LIEUTENANT, lit-ten'ant, lef-ten'ant. See SATRAPS.

LIFE, hif ( Heb. ha-yah ash, nkb, nephesh, nph, ru/ph, hph, hagah; Lue, z6w, psuch9, psuchh, Bios, bios, psuchw, psuchh):
I. THE TERMS.
II. THE OT TEACHING.
1. Popular. Use of the Term.
III. IN THE APOCRYPHA.
IV. IN THE NT.
1. In the Synoptic Gospels
2. In the Fourth Gospel
3. In the Acts of the Apostles
4. In the Writings of Paul
5. In the Writings of John
6. In the Other Books of the NT

LITERATURE.
I. The Terms.—Of the Heb terms, ha-yah is the vb which it is to have life, or the vital principle. To continue to live, or to live prosperously. In the Pid it signifies to give life, or preserve, or quicken and restore life. The Hiphil in much like the Piel. The noun ha-yah generally used in the pl. is an abstract noun, i.e., the possession of the vital principle with its energies and activities. Nephekh often means living being or creature. Sometimes it has the sense of a seat but other times it refers to the seat of the soul, the personality, the emotional self—appetites—passions and even mental activities. Frequently it means life, the seat of life, and in this way it is used about 171 in the OT, referring to the principle of vitality in both man and animal, and signifies wind, breath, principle or source of vitality, but is never used to signify life proper.

II. The OT Teaching.—The term "life" is used in the OT in the popular sense. It meant life in the body, the existence and activity of man in all his parts and energies. Use of the Term. It is the person complete, conscious and active. There is no idea of the body being a fetter or prison to the soul; the body was essential to life and the writers had no desire to be separated from it. To them the physical sphere was a necessity, and a man was living when all his activities were performed in the light of God's face and favor. The secret and source of life to them was relationship with God. There was nothing good or desirable apart from this relation of fellowship. To overcome or be rid of all ties to life. The real center of gravity in life was in the moral and religious part of man's nature. This must be in fellowship with God, the source of all life and activity.

The conception of life is very complex. Several meanings are clearly indicated: (1) Very frequently it is refers to the vital principle itself, or man and made him a nephesh or living being (see also Gen 1 30; 6 17; 7 22; 45 5, etc.). (2) It is used to denote the period of one's actual existence, i.e., "lifetim" (Gen 23 1; 25 7; 47 9; Ex 6 16; 18 20, etc.). (3) The life is represented as a direct gift from God, and dependent absolutely upon Him for its continuance (Gen 1 11-27; 2 r 16 22). (4) In a few cases it refers to the conception of children, denoting the time when conception was possible (Gen 18 10.14 m; 2 K 4 16.17 m.). (5) In many cases to the vitality, or life, or activity, of individuals, and all of which make up life (Dt 32 47; 1 8 26 29; Job 10 1, etc.). (6) In a few instances it is used synonymously with the means of sustaining life (Dt 24 6; Prov 27 27). (7) Many times to the validity or absolute of the marriage relations and activities, all of which make up life (Dt 32 47; 1 8 26 29; Job 10 1, etc.). (8) In a few instances it is used synonymously with the means of sustaining life (Dt 24 6; Prov 27 27). (9) Many times to the vitality or absolute of the marriage relations and activities, all of which make up life (Gen 30 15.19; Esr 6 10; Ps 16 11; 30 5; Prov 2 10, and frequently). (8) It is always represented as a very precious gift, and offences against life were to be severely punished (Gen 4 4; Lev 17 14; 24 17).

Capital punishment is here specifically enjoined because of the value of the life that has been taken (Ez 18 16; 23 25; Dt 19 21); and this even applies to the beast (Lev 24 18). The life of the man was represented as abiding in the blood. If the blood be not shed, the life must perish (Lev 17 15; Dt 12 12). The Decalogue forbids murder or the taking of human life wrongfully (Ex 20 13; Dt 5 17). Garments taken in pledge must not be kept over night, for thereby the owner's life might be endangered (Dt 24 6). That life was considered precious appears from such verses as Gen 24 20; Job 2 4; Prov 23 26. The essence of sacrifice consisted in the fact that the life (the nephesh) rested in the blood; thus when blood was shed, life was lost (Dt 12 23; Lev 17 11). Oppression on the part of judges and rulers was severely condemned because oppression was detrimental to life.

(9) Long life was much desired and sought by the Israelites, and under certain conditions this was possible (Ps 91 16). The longevity of the antediluvian patriarchs is a problem by itself (see ANTE-DILUVIANS). It was one of the greatest of calamities to be cut off in the midst of life (Isa 38 10-12; 53 8); that a good old age was longed for is shown by Ex 20 12; Ps 21 4; 34 12; 61 6, etc. This long life was possible to the obedient to parents (Ex 20 12). It bids God to be kind to God (Dt 4 4; Prov 3 1 2; 10 27).; to the wise (Prov 3 16; 9 11); to the pure in heart (Ps 34 12-14; 91 1-10; Eccl 3 12-13); to those who feared God (Prov 10 27; Isa 65 18-21; 38 15-19). (10) The possibility of a life immortal is dimly hinted at in the earliest writing, and much more clearly taught in the later. The Tree of Life in the midst of the garden indicated a possible immortality for man upon earth (Gen 2 9; 3 22-24) (see TREE OF LIFE).

Failing to partake of this and falling into sin by partaking of the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil"; they were driven forth from the garden lest they should eat of the tree of life and become immortal beings in their sinful condition. To deprive man of the possibility of making himself immortal while sinful was a blessing to the race; immortality without holiness is a curse rather than a blessing. The way to the tree of life was henceforth guarded by the cherubim and the flame of a sword, so that men could not partake of it in their condition of sin. This, however, did not exclude the possibility of a spiritual immortality (Is 63 17). Enoch's fellowship with God led to a bodily translation; and Job also Elijah, to a similar translation. The death of the dead, God called Himself the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, implying that they were really alive then. In Isa 26 10 there is a clear reference to transfiguration, and an end of death. Dan 12 2 asserts a resurrection of many of the dead, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt. Some of the psalmists firmly believed in the continuity of the life in fellowship with God (Ps 16 10.11; 17 15; 23 6; 49 15; 73 24.25). The exact meaning of some of these statements is difficult to understand, yet this much is clear: there was a revolt against death in many pious minds, and a belief that the life of fellowship with God could not end or be broken even by death itself. See IMMORTALITY.

(11) The fundamental fact in the possession of life was vital relationship with God. Men first lived because God breathed into them the breath of life (Gen 2 7). Man's vital energies are the outflowing of the spirit or vital energies of God, and all activities are dependent upon the vitalizing power from God. When God sends forth His spirit, things are created, and live; when He withdraws that spirit, they die (Ps 104 30). "In his favor is life; and his presence makes all things glisten" (Ps 39 5 AY). "God created man in his own image, male and female he created them" (Gen 1 27). "A magnificent gift, a crown of splendor and honor, a crown of glory and beauty, a crown of life in the presence of the Lord" (Ps 9 10 AY). See IMMORTALITY.
cease. They felt that such a relationship could not cease, and God would take them out of Sheol.

III. In the Ancephalos.—A similar conception of life appears here as in the OT. Zodh and psuchh are used and occur most frequently in the books of Wisd and Eccles. In 1 Esd 1.20 (the pre-exilic use is little used; 2 Esd 10.23; 16.61 is but a quotation from Gen 2.7, and refer to the vital principle; 2 Esd 1.19, 30, Tob. 48.26, Ad Est, use it in the same sense also. Wisd and Eccles use it several times; closely resembling the use in Prov (cf Eccles 4.12; 14.10, 13.4). It is evident that there is no additional meaning attached to the word. The Ps Son refer to everlasting life in 3.16; 13.10; 14.26.

IV. In the NT.—The term used at times as the equivalent of the Heb hayyim. It refers to life externally, i.e. the sum total of one's existence, a lifetime, also to the means of sustaining life, such as wealth, etc. Psuchh is also equivalent to hayyim at times, but very frequently to ne'orah and sometimes to ruah. Thus it means the vital principle, a living being, the immaterial part of man, affections, desires and appetites, etc. The term zodh corresponds very closely to psuchh, and means the vital principle, the state of one who is animate, the fulness of activities and relationship both in the physical and spiritual realms.

The content of the word zodh is the chief theme of the NT. The life is mediated by Jesus Christ. In the OT this life was through fellowship with God, in the NT it is through Jesus Christ the Mediator. The NT teaching is similar to that of the OT, its higher development of meaning, being enriched by the supreme teaching and revelation of Jesus Christ. In the NT as well as in the OT, the center of gravity in human life is in the moral and religious nature of man.

The teaching here regarding life naturally links itself with OT ideas and the prevailing conceptions of Judaism. The word is used in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 2.20; Mk 10.45; Lk 12.22; 14.28). It also is the period of one's existence, i.e. lifetime (Lk 1.75; 16.25).

(1) It may mean the totality of man's relationships (Lk 15.15) which do not consist in abundance of material possessions. (4) Generally it means the real life, the vital connection with the world and God, the sum total man's highest interests. It is called "eternal life" (Mt 19.17; 20.16), it is called "life" (Mt 18.5; 19.17; Mk 9.43.45.46). In these passages Jesus seems to imply that it is almost equivalent to "laying up treasures in heaven," or to "entering the kingdom of God." The entering into life and entering the kingdom are precisely the same, for they are both spiritual realms where God controls, where the principles, activities and relationships of heaven prevail, and hence to enter into these is to enter into "life." (5) The lower life of earthly relationship and activities must be subordinated to the higher and spiritual (Mt 10.39; 18.25; Lk 19.24). These merely earthly interests may be very desirable and enjoyable, but whoever would cling to these and make them supreme is in danger of losing the higher. The spiritual being into which one should be brought should even if the other relationship should be lost entirely. (6) Jesus also speaks of this life as something future, and to be realized at the consummation of the age (Mt 19.29; Lk 18.30), or the world to come.

This in no wise contradicts the statement that eternal life can be entered upon in this life. As Jesus Himself was in vital relationship with the spiritual world and lived the eternal life, He sought to bring others into the same. This life was far from being perfect. The perfection could come only at the consummation of the age. The life carried in this life was entered into and perfected by the risen Christ in the world, the Church, the Body of Christ. Into the perfect fellowship with God and connection with the spirit-world and its blessed experiences. This is seen here in the teaching, in the Seer's teaching, in the symbol of the children of Zion. As Jesus Himself was in vital relationship with the spiritual world and lived the Eternal Life, He sought to bring others into the same. This life was far from being perfect. The perfection could come only at the consummation of the age. The life carried in this life was entered into and perfected by the risen Christ in the world, the Church, the Body of Christ. Into the perfect fellowship with God and connection with the spirit-world and its blessed experiences. This is seen here in the teaching, in the Seer's teaching, in the symbol of the children of Zion. As Jesus Himself was in vital relationship with the spiritual world and lived the Eternal Life, He sought to bring others into the same. This life was far from being perfect. The perfection could come only at the consummation of the age. The life carried in this life was entered into and perfected by the risen Christ in the world, the Church, the Body of Christ. Into the perfect fellowship with God and connection with the spirit-world and its blessed experiences. This is seen here in the teaching, in the Seer's teaching, in the symbol of the children of Zion.

(7) The conditions which Jesus lays down for entering into this life are faith in Himself as the one Mediator of the life, and the following of Him in a life of obedience. He alone knows the Father and can reveal Him to others. One who follows Him can give true rest and can teach men how to live (11.28). The sure way to this life is: "Follow me." His whole ministry was virtually a prolonged effort to win confidence in Himself as Son and Mediator, to win obedience, and hence bring men unto these spiritual relationships and activities which constitute the true life.

The fullest and richest teachings regarding life are found here. The greatest word of this Gospel is "life." The author says he wrote the Gospel in order that "ye may have Fourth life" (20.31). Most of the teachings Gospel recorded, circle around this great word "life." This teaching is in no way distinctive and different from that of the dead state, but is supplementary, and completes the teaching of Jesus on the subject. The use of the word is not as varied, being concentrated on the one supreme subject. (1) In a few cases it refers only to the vital principle which gives rise to the present life (10.11.15-18; 15.37; 16.13). (2) It represents Jesus the Logos as the origin and means of all life to the world. As the preincarnate Logos He was the source of life to the universe (1.4). As the triumphal Logos He said His life is eternal; He is originally from the Father (5.26; 6.57; 10.18). He then was the means of life to men (3.15.16; 4.14; 5.21.39.40); and this was the purpose for which He came into the world (6.33.34.51; 10.3). (3) The prevailing reference is to those activities which are the expression of fellowship with God and Jesus Christ. These relationships are called "eternal life" (3.15.16.36; 4.14, etc). The nearest approach to a definition of eternal life is found in 17.3. Though not a scientific or metaphysical definition, it is nevertheless Jesus' own description of eternal life, and reveals His conception of it. It is thus more valuable than a formal definition. It is "to know God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent."

This knowledge is vastly more than mere intellectual perception or understanding. It is moral knowledge, it is personal acquaintance, it is fellowship, a contact, a union, as if we may say spiritually by the same, for the inner affinity and sympathy, an experience of similar thoughts, emotions, purposes, aspirations, the shared change of the heart's deepest feelings and experiences. It is a bringing of the whole personality of man into right relationship with the personality of God. This relation is ethical, personal, binding the two together with ties which nothing can separate. It is this experience that Jesus came to bring men. Such a life Jesus says is satisfying to all who hunger and thirst for it (4.14; 5.38); it is the source of light to all (1.4; 8.12); it is indestructible (6.58; 11.26); it is like a well of water in the soul (4.14); it is secured by personally partaking of those qualities which belong to Jesus (6.53).

(4) This life is a present possession and has also a glorious future fruition. (a) To those who exercise faith in Jesus it is a present experience and possession (4.10; 6.24.40). Faith in Him as the Son of God is the psychological reality by which persons are brought into this vital relationship with God. Those who exercised the faith immediately experienced this new power and fellowship and exercised the new activities. (b) It has a glorious fruition in the future also (4.36; 6.20; 6.39.44.54). Jesus does not leave the disciples here in the eschatological phase of Jesus' teachings as to the present reality and actual possession of this blessed life.

(5) It has been objected that in speaking of the Logos as the source of life John is pursuing a metaphysical line,
whereas the life which he so much emphasizes has an ethical basis, and he makes no attempt to reconcile the.

Two. To be consistent with the idea of performing the impossible task of attaining the impossible metaphysics from the two. It will not appeal very strongly to the average Christian.

It is a purely academic objection. The ordinary mind will wonder that if the life is the source of both physical and eternal life it is because He possesses something of the essence and being of God, which makes His work for men possible. The metaphysical and the ethical must exist together, may run concurrently, the one being the source and sustaining the other. There is no contradiction.

Both metaphysics and ethics are a legitimate and necessary exercise of the human mind.

In his intercessory prayer (Jn 17), Jesus said his mission was to give eternal life to all who would be called (Jn 17:2 the Father had given him (Jn 17:2).

3. In the record in Acts is the carrying out of the purpose. The word "life" is used in several senses: (1) the vital principle which gives physical vitality and existence (Rom 8:6; 11:38; Gal 6:8). It comes through obedience to the word (Rom 7:10; Phil 2:16) and through faith (1 Tim 1:16). It may be apprehended in this life (1 Tim 6:12; 17). It is brought to light through the gospel (2 Tim 1:10). It is a reward to those who by patience in well-doing seek it (Rom 2:7). It gives conquering power over sin and death (Rom 5:17). It is the end or reward of a sanctified life (Rom 2:7). It is person possession and a hope of glory (1 Cor 1:2; 3:7). It will be received in all its fulness hereafter (Rom 2:7; 2 Cor 5:4). Thus Paul’s use of the word substantially agrees with the teaching in the Gospels, and no doubt was largely based upon it.

In the Johannine Epistles and Rev, the contents of the term “life” are the same as those in the Fourth Gospel. Life in certain passages (Jn 3:16; Rev 8:9; 11:11; 12:11) Writings of John is more physical vitality and existence upon earth. The source of life is Christ Himself (Jn 1:1f; 5:11f.16). The blessed eternal life in Christ is a present possession to all those who are in fellowship with the Father and the Son (Jn 11:25). Here is an echo of the words of Jesus (Jn 17:3) where John describes the life, the eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us. It is virtually fellowship with the Father and with the Son (1 Jn 1:2). The eternal life is promised to those who are faithful (Rev 2:7). It is person possession and a hope of glory (Rev 2:10). The crown of life doubtless refers to the realization of all the glorious possibilities that come through fellowship with God and the Son. They are the thrills of life that were given to the writer of the life of Christ (Rev 21:6; 22:17). The river of life flows through the streets of the New Jerusalem (22:1), and the

tree of life blooms on its banks, bearing twelve manner of fruit (22:14). See Tree of Life.

The Ep. to the Hebrews of our lifetime or periods of existence upon earth (2:15; 7:9), likewise wise of the power of an indwelling Holy Spirit, one being the source and sustaining the other. There is no contradiction.

Both metaphysics and ethics are a legitimate and necessary exercise of the human mind.

6. In the life (7:16); James promises the crown of life to the faithful (1:12). This book of life is the fulness of life’s possibilities afterlife. Our lifetime is preparation in God’s eyes and represent a chiefly as a vapor. Peter in 1 Pet 3:7 speaks of man and woman as joint-heirs of the grace of life, and of loving life (3:10), referring to the totality of relationships and activities. The “all things that pertain unto life and godliness” (2 Pet 1:3) constitute the whole Christian life involving the life eternal.
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LIFE, TREE OF. See Tree of Life.

LIFT: To make lofty, to raise up. A very common word in EV representing a great variety of Heb and Gr words, although in the OT used chiefly as the tr of נֶאֶב, nēḇā’. Of none of these words, however, is “lift” used as a technical tr, and “lift” is interchanged freely with its synonyms, esp. “exalt” (cf Ps 75:5; 89:24) and “raise” (cf Ecc 4:10; 2 S 12:17). “Lift” is still perfectly good English, but not in all the senses in which it is used in EV; e.g. such phrases as “men that lifted up axes upon a thicket” (Ps 74:5); “lift up thy feet unto the perpetual ruins” (Ps 74:3), and even the common “lift up the eyes” often distinctly archaic. However, almost all the uses are perfectly clear, and only the following need be noted.

To lift up the head (Gen 40:13.19.20; 2 K 25:27; Ps 3:5; Sir 11:13; Lk 21:28) means to raise from a low condition (but only Ps 24:7.9 see GATE). To “lift up the horn” (Ps 75:5) is to assume a confident position, the figure being taken from fighting oxen (see Horn). “Lift up the face” may be meant lit. (2 K 9:32), or it may denote the bestowal of favor (Ps 4:6); it may mean the attitude of a righteous man toward God (Job 22:26), or simply the attitude of a suppliant (Ezr 9:6).

BURLINGTON EASTON

LIGHT, lit (לְיָה, lēyāh; mā‘or; φῶς, phōs; many other words):

1. Origin of Light

2. A Comprehensive Term
   1. Natural
   2. Artificial
   3. Miraculous
   4. Mental, Moral, Spiritual

3. An Attraction of Holiness
   1. God
   2. Christ
   3. Christians
   4. The Church

4. Symbolism

5. Expressive Terms

The creation of light was the initial step in the creation of life. “Let there be light” (Gen 1:3) was the first word of life formed upon the primary matter out of which He created the heavens and the earth, and
which lay, until the utterance of that word, in the chaos of darkness and desolation. Something akin to all-luminous, all-pervasive electro-magnetic activity of the aurora borealis penetrated the chaotic night of the world. The ultimate focusing of light (on the 4th day of creation, Gen 1 14) in sun, stars, and solar systems brought the initial creation to completion and brought the essential condition of all organic life. The origin of light thus finds its explanation in the purpose and very nature of God whom John defines as not only the Author of light but, in an all-inclusive sense, as light itself: "In him was the light" (John 1 5).

The word "light" is Divinely rich in its comprehensiveness and meaning. Its material splendor is used throughout the Scriptures as the symbol and synonym of all that is luminous and radiant in the mental, moral and spiritual life of men and angels; while the eternal God, because of His holiness and moral perfection, is pictured as "dwelling in light unapproachable" (1 Tim 6 16). Every plan of the word, from the original light in the natural world to the spiritual glory of the celestial, is found in Holy Writ.

1. Origin of Light

(a) Natural light.—The light of day (Gen 1 5); of sun, moon and stars; "lights in the firmament" (Gen 1 14; Ps 136 7; 136 3); Eccle 12 7). The characteristics are beauty, radiance, utility. It "rejoiceth the heart" (Prov 15 30); "Truly the light is sweet" (Ecc 11 7); without it men stumble and are helpless (Jn 1 9-10); it is something for which they wait with inexpressible longing (Ps 30 26; cf Ps 130 8). Life, joy, activity and all blessings are dependent upon light.

Light and life are almost synonymous to the inhabitants of Paul, and in the same way darkness and death. There is the land of sunshine. When they go to other lands of clouded skies their only thought is to return to the brightness and sunshine of their native land. In Paul there is hardly a day in the whole year when the sun does not shine for some part of it, while for five months of the year there is scarcely an interruption of the sunshine. Time is reckoned from sunrise to sunset. The day's labor closes with the coming of darkness. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening" (Ps 104 23).

The suddenness of the change from darkness to light was terrible and so was the disappearance of the sun in the evening more striking than in more northern countries, and it is not strange that in the ancient days they should have arisen a worship of the sun as the giver of light and happiness, and that Job should mention the sunrise worship when he "beheld the sun" (Job 31 26), or the sun rising in brightness (Job 31 26). The severest plague in Egypt (Ex 10 1) was the plague of darkness which fell upon the Egyptians (Ex 10 23). This love of light finds expression in both OT and NT in a very extensive use of the word to express those things which are most to be desired and must helpful to man, and in this connection we find some of the most beautiful figures in the Bible.

(b) Artificial light.—When natural light fails, man by discovery or invention provides himself with some temporary substitute, however dim and inadequate. The ancient Hebrews had "oil for the light" (Ex 25 6; 35 8; Lev 24 2) and lamps (Ex 35 18; Mt 5 16). "There were many lights [lamp] in the upper chamber" at Tros, where Paul preached until midnight (Acts 20 8); so Jer 25 10 RV, "Light of the lamp," AV "candle."

(c) Miraculous light.—When the appalling plague of "thick darkness," for three days, enveloped the Egyptians, they rendered them helpless, "all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings" (Ex 10 23). Whether the darkness was due to a Divinely ordered natural cause or the light was the natural light of day, the process that preserved the Israelites from the encompassing darkness was supernatural. Miraculous, also, even though through natural agency, was the "pillar of fire" that gave light to the Israelites escaping from Pharaoh (Ex 13 21; 14 20). Ps 78 18 declares, "God the light of the people, the pillar of fire." Supernatural was the effulgence at Christ's transfiguration that made "his garments . . . white as the light" (Mt 17 2). Under the same category Paul classifies 'the great light' that 'suddenly shone round about him from heaven' on the way to Damascus (Acts 22 6; cf 9 3). In these rare instances the supernatural light was not only symbolic of an inner spiritual light, but instrumental, in part at least, in revealing or preparing the way for it.

2. A Comprehensive Term

(a) A few passages, however, refer to the light that comes chiefly to the intellect or mind through Divine instruction, e.g. Ps 119 130. The opening of thy words giveth light" (Ps 6 33, "law of light," and here the instruction includes moral as well as mental enlightenment.

(b) Moral: Job 24 13-16 has to do exclusively with man's moral attitude to truth: "rebel against the light" (cfr Ps 10 12, "He gave light to man" (Ps 18 25) describes a moral fusion and blindness, which cannot distinguish light from darkness.

(c) For the most part, however, light and life go together. It is the product of salvation: "Jeh is my light and my salvation" (Ps 27 1). "Light," figuratively used, has to do preeminently with spiritual life, including also the illumination that floods all the faculties of the soul: intellect, conscience, reason, will. In the moral realm the enlightenment of these faculties is dependent wholly on the renewal of the spirit. "In thy light . . . we see light" (Ps 36 9); "The life was the light of men" (John 1 4).

Light is an attribute of holiness, and thus a personal quality. He who is "enlightened" is "God light," in Deity.

1. God.—"God is light, and in him darkness was no darkness at all" (1 John 1 5).

2. Attribute Darkness is the universal symbol and of Holiness condition of sin and death; light the symbol and expression of holiness: "God is light and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1 5).

3. An "The light of Israel will be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame" (Isa 10 17). God, by His presence and grace, is to us a "marvellous light" (1 Pet 2 9). The glory of His holiness and presence is the "everlasting light" of the redeemed in heaven (Isa 60 19-20; Rev 21 23-24; 22 5).

Christ, the eternal Word (Logos, λόγος, as 1 1), who said "Let there be light" (Gen 1 3), is Himself the "effulgence of [God's] glory" (He 1 3), "the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world" (Jn 1 9) (cf the statements concerning Wisdom in Wisd 27 5 f and concerning Christ in He 1 3; and see CREEDS; LOGOS; JOHANNINE THOLOGY; WISDOM). As the predicted Messiah, He was to be "for a light of the Gentiles" (Isa 49 6). His birth was the fulfilment of this prophecy (Lk 2 32). Jesus called Himself "the light of the world" (Jn 8 12; 9 5; 12 46). As light He was "God . . . manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim 3 16 AV). "The Word was God" (Jn 1 1). Jesus as Logos is the eternal expression of God as a substantial impress of a thought. In the threefold essence of His being God is Life (ζωή, ἀνεφαίρετη) (Jn 5 20; 6 57); God is Love (ἀγάπη) (1 Jn 4 8); God is Light (κίες) (Ex 29 43; 39 22; Ezek 43 2; Zech 14 1; Rev 21 4; 22 3).
(φῶς, φῶς) (1 Jn 1 5). Thus Christ, the logos, manifesting the three aspects of the Divine Nature, is Life, Love and Light, and these three are inseparable and constitute the glory which the disciples beheld in Him, "glory as of the only begotten from the Father" (Jn 1 14). In revealing giving life, Christ becomes "the light of men" (Jn 1 4). God gives "the light of the knowledge of [his] glory in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor 4 6), and this salvation is called "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ" (4 4). Christ is thus the Teacher, Enlightener ("Christ shall give thee light," Eph 5 14 AV), Guide, Saviour of men.

(3) All who catch and reflect the light of God and of Christ are called "light," "lights" (a). John the Baptist: "a burning and a shining light," (Jn 8 12 AV). It is significant that this pre-Christian prophet was termed a light, a symbol of the new dispensation, the new dispensation.

(4) The church.—Zion was to be "shining" because her light had come (Isa 60 1). The Gentiles were to come to her light (Eph 4 6). Her mission as the enlightener of the world was symbolized in the ornamental proclamations of her priesthood. The Urim of the high priest's breastplate signified light, and the name itself is but the pl. form of the Heb 'or. It stood for revelation, and Thummim for truth. The church of the Christian dispensation was to be even more radiant with the light of God and of Christ. The seven churches of Asia were revealed to John, by the Spirit, as seven golden candlesticks, and as seven stars, "as seven lamps burning with the face of God" (Rev 2 1). The church is a temple of God's presence and fellowship (2 Cor 6 15; and a king's favour (Prov 19 13); (9) life (Ps 13 3; 49 19; Jn 1 4).

Expressive terms are: (1) "fruit of the light." (Eph 5 9). I.e. goodness, righteousness, truth; (2) "light in the darkness" (Eph 5 8; Hos 6 3). Indicating the source of light (cf Isa 2 5); (3) "inheritance of the light" (1 Cor 1 12). A present possession in heaven; (4) "Father of lights": (Jas 1 17), signifying the Creator of the heavenly light; (5) "light in the dark" (1 Pet 2 9), the light of God's presence and fellowship; (6) "Walk in the light" (1 Jn 1 7), in the light of God's teaching and companionship; (7) "lights of darkness" (Eph 5 8); (8) "light of love, Divine and fraternal; (5) "light of the glorious gospel of Christ," (Eph 5 2; 1 Cor 4 6 AV). Light, Lightness, lit'ness: "Light" is used in Scripture, as in ordinary speech, in the sense of what is small, slight, trivial, easy, "lightness" with the connotation of vacillation or lassivousness. Thus in the OT, "a light thing," a small, easy, slight thing (nehem, kábal, 2 K 3 18; Isa 49 6; Ezek 8 17; 22 7, in the last case "to treat slightly"). "Lightness" (légh, kág) occurs in Jer 3 9 ("the lightness of her whoredom"); in 23 32, RV changes "lightness" (a different word) to "boasting." In the NT the phrase occurs in Mt 22 5, "made light of it" (*size, amelhô), i.e. "treated it with neglect"; and St. Paul asks (2 Cor 1 17), "Did I show lightness?" (RV "fickleness"). These examples sufficiently illustrate the meaning.

James Orr

LIGHTNING, lit'ning (Phób, bárab, Théii, hâdz; charaxos, astraphe): Lightning is caused by the discharge of electricity between clouds or between clouds and the earth. In a thunder-storm there is a rapid gathering of particles of moisture into clouds and forming of large drops of rain. This gathers with it electric potential until the surface of the cloud (or the enlarged water particles) is insufficient to carry the charge, and a discharge takes place, introducing a brilliant flash on the earth. The common thunder-clap. Thunder-storms are common in Syria and Pal during the periods of heavy rain in the spring and fall and are often severe. Lightning is usually accompanied by heavy rainfall or hail, as at the time of the plague of hail (Ex 9 24). See Hail.

In the Scriptures it is used: (a) indicating the power of God: The power of God is shown in His command of the forces of Nature, and He is the only one who knows the secrets of Nature; "He brings down lightning from the skies" (Job 36 29); "He directs . . . his lightning" (Job 37 3 AV); "Canst thou send forth lightnings, that they may go?" (Job 38 35); "Ask ye of Jehovah that maketh lightnings" (Zec 10 1). See also Ps 16 14; 97 4; 136 7; Job 36 22; Jer 10 13; (b) figuratively and poetically: David sings of Jehovah, "He sent . . . lightnings manifold, and discomfited them" (Ps 18 14); used for speed: "The chariots . . . run like the lightnings" (Nah 2 4); "His arrow shall go forth as the lightning" (Zec 9 14); "The living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning" (Ezk 1 14). The coming of the kingdom is described by Jesus as the shining of the lightning from one part of heaven to another, even so is the coming of the kingdom of God (Mt 24 27; Lk 17 24); (c) meaning bright or shining: Daniel in his vision saw a man and "his face [was] as the appearance of lightning" (Dan 10 6). See also Rev 4 5; 8 5; 16 18. ALFRED H. JOY

LIGN-ALOES, lin-ål'oz, lig-nål'oz. See Aloes.

LIGURE, lig'ur (Ex 25 19; 39 12 AV, RV "jacinth"). See STONES, PRECIOUS.

LIKE, liken, LIKEN, lik'n, LIKENESS, lik'nes, LIKING, likening: (1) As a noun, "like" in modern Eng. is virtually obsolete, except in the phrase "and the like," which is not found in RV. The like, however, occurs in 1 K 10 20 [2 Ch 9 19; 2 Ch 1 12; Ezek 5 9; 18 10 (RV "any one of these things"—the text is uncertain)]; 46 25; Joel 2 2; Wisd 16 1 (RV "creatures like those"); Sir 7 12. His like is found in Job 41 33; Sir 13 15; "their like" in Sir 27 9 (cf Gal 5 21) is only slightly archaic, but "doth not such like" (Ezk 18 14) is quite obsolete.

(2) As an adj. "like" is common in AV in such combinations as "like manner" (frequently), "like weight" (Ex 30 34), "like occupation" (Acts 19 26), etc. Modern Eng. would in most cases replace
light" by "the same," as has been done in 1 Thess 2:14 RV (cf Rom 15:5; Phil. 2:2). So RV has modernized the archaic "like," excepting 2 Pet 1:1 by inserting "a" before "like." AV's rendering of 1 Pet 3:21, "the like figure whereunto he could not have been very clear at any time, and RV has rendered completely into "after a true likeness" (in "the antitype").

(3) As an advb. "like" is used in Jer 33:9, "He is like to die"; Jon 1:4, "like to be broken." RV could have used "likely" in these verses. Most commonly all the uses of "like" is the quasi-propo-

sitional construction in "He is like to be broken," etc. This is of course good modern Eng., but not so when "like" is enlarged (as it usually is in EV) into the forms "like to" (Dnl 7:5), "like unto" (very common), "like as" (Isa 28:17, etc). These forms and the simple "like" are entirely indistinguishable from the old Greek, and the RV has attempted little systematizing beyond reducing the occurrences of "like as" (cf Mt 12:13, and ARV Isa 13:4; Jer 23:29).

(4) The vb. "like" has two distinct meanings, "to be pleased with," "to have pleasure in." The former sense occurs in Dt 25:16 (AV, ERV), "in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best," and in Est 8:8; Am 4:5 AV, Sir 33:13 (AV has "pleaseth" in the first OT passage). The other use of "like" belongs also to modern Eng., although in a much weakened sense. On account of this weakening, 1 Ch 28:4 AV, "liked me to make me king," and Rom 1:28 AV, "did not like to retain God," have become in RV "took pleasure in" and "refused to" (in "thee not approved" if 1 Ch would have been better if Dt 25:7, 8, "like not to have," had been modified also into "hath no wish to take." From this use of "like" is derived liking in the modern sense in Wind 16:21, "liking itself to every man's liking" (RV "choice"). In 1 Esd 4:39, "All men do well like of her works" is a further obsolete use.

(5) Liken and "make like" are common. To be noted only is that, in He 7:3, "made like unto the Son of God," the old rendering of "represent" by the writer with the qualities of. Likeness normally means "a copy of," but in Ps 17:15 it means the actual form itself ("form" in AV, ERV's); of Rom 6:5; 8:3; Phil 2:7, and perhaps Acts 14:11. Common "likeness" is an obsolete use of "like" (quite distinct from that above) in Job 39:4 AV, ERV, "Their young ones are in good liking;" Dnl 10:10, "see your faces worse liking." The meaning is "appearance," "apparition," and "ARC renders "their young ones become strong." When used as a "thing" used in looking. Likeness varies in meaning from the simple conjunction "and" to a strong advb., in "exactly the same way," RV has made some attempt to distinguish the various forces (e.g. cf AV with RV in Lk 22:36; 16:7; 22:22). But complete consistency was not attainable, and in certain instances was neglected deliberately, in order to preserve the familiar wording, as in Lk 10:37, "Go, and do thou likewise." BURTON SCOTT EASTON

LIKHÉ, likhê (לְקֶה, לְקֶה): A descendant of Manasseh (1 Ch 7:19).

LILLITH, l’ilith, l’ilith. See Night-Monster.

LILY, l’ilí [šōphēn, šōphēn] [1 K 7:19], šōphēn, šōbānānū [2 Ch 4:5; Cant 2:1; Hos 14:5]. pl. [Cant 2:14; 4:5; 5:13; 6:2; 7:2; Eccles 39:14; 50:8]; kāpōn, kāpōn [Mt 6:28; Lk 22:27]). The Heb is probably a loan word from the Egypt, the original s-h-n denoting the lotus-flower, NYCTAGINACEAE. This was probably the model of the architectural ornament, tr'd "lily-work," which appeared upon the capitals of the columns in the temple porch (1 K 7:19), upon the top of the pillars (ver 22) and upon the turned-back rim of the "molten sea" (ver 26).

Botanically the word shōbānānū, like the similar modern Arab. Sūsān, included in all probability a great many flowers, and was used in a way at least as wide as the popular use of the Eng. word "lily." The expression "lily of the valleys" (Cant 2:1) has nothing to do with the plant of that name; the flowers referred to appear to have been associated with the rank herbage of the valley bottoms (Cant 4:5); the expression "His lips are as lilies" (5:13) might imply a scarlet flower, but more probably in oriental usage every pretty flower; the sweet scent of the lily is referred to in Ecclus 39:14, and in 50:8 we read of "lilies by the rivers of water." The beauty of the blossom is implied in Hos 14:5, where JEH promises that repentant Israel shall "blossom as the lily." A "heap of wheat set about with lilies" (Cant 7:2) probably refers to the smoothed-out piles of newly threshed wheat on the threshing-floors decorated by a circle of flowers.

The reference of Our Lord to the "lilies of the field" is probably, like the OT references, quite a general one.

The Heb and the Gr very likely include not only any members of the great order LILICIACEAE, growing in Pal, e.g. asphodel, squill, hyacinth, ornithogalum ("Star of Bethlehem"), fringed squill, tuberose, cynth, but also the more showy irises ("Tabor lilies," "purple irises," etc) and the beautiful gladoli of the N.O. Iridaceae and the familiar narcissi of the N.O. Amaryllidaceae.

In later Jewish lit. the lily is very frequently referred to symbolically, and a lotus or lily was commonly pictured on several Jewish coins.

LILY-WORK: The ornament on the capitals on the bronze pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in front of Solomon's temple (1 K 7:19-22). See LILY; TEMPLE; JACHIN AND BOAZ.

LIME, l’im [Heb. לִים, לִים; cf. Arab. نِم, šādād, "to plaster"; 2] ʿām, gīr; cf Arab. جلر, gīr, "gypsum" or "quick-lime"; [3] ʿōbān, ʿābān-ghār: šādād is tr'd "limes" in Isa 33:12, "And the peoples shall be as the burnings of lime, as thorns cut down, that are burned in the fire," and in Am 2:1, "He burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." It is tr'd "plaster" in Lk 22:27. Likewise varies in meaning from the simple conjunction "and" to a strong advb., in "exactly the same way," RV has made some attempt to distinguish the various forces (e.g. cf AV with RV in Lk 22:36; 16:7; 22:22). But complete consistency was not attainable, and in certain instances was neglected deliberately, in order to preserve the familiar wording, as in Lk 10:37, "Go, and do thou likewise." BURTON SCOTT EASTON

Everywhere in Pal limestone is at hand which can be converted into lime. The lime-kiln is a thick-walled, cylindrical or conical, roofless structure built of rough stones without mortar, the spaces between the stones being plastered with clay. It is usually built on the side of a hill which is slightly excavated for it, so that the sloping, external wall of the kiln rises much higher from the ground on the lower side than on the upper. The builders leave a passage or tunnel through the base of the thick wall on the lower side. The whole interior is filled with carefully packed fragments of limestone, and large piles of thorny-burnet and other shrubs to serve as fuel are gathered about the kiln. The fuel is introduced through the tunnel to the base of the lime-kiln in the kiln, and as the fire rises through the mass of broken limestone a strong draft is created. Relays of men are kept busy supplying fuel day and night. By day a column of black smoke rises from the kiln, and at night the flames may be seen
bursting from the top. Several days are required to reduce the stone to lime, the amount of time depending upon the size of the kiln and upon the nature of the fuel. At the present time, mineral coal imported from the Union is employed, and requires much less time than the shrubs which are ordinarily used. See CHALKSTONE; CLAY.

ALFRED ELY DAY

LIMIT, lim'it (ἐχθη, 'bound'): Occurs once in Ezek 23:12 ("limb of holy mountain"). "Limit" (Ps 78:41) and "limith" (בּיָה, הַרִים) (He 4:7) are changed in RV to "provoked" (m "retains "limited") and "defineth" respectively.

LINE, lin (ץ', כֹּו, כָּה, הַבָּה): Usually of a measuring line, as Jer 31:39; Ezek 47:3; Zac 1:16 (קָו), Ps 78:55; Am 7:17; Zac 2:1 (קָהָל). Other Heb words mean simply a cord or thread (Josh 18:21; 1 K 7:15; Ezek 40:3). In Ps 19:4 (קָו), "Their line is gone out through all the earth;

LINEAGE, lin'ē-āj (πατρία, πατριάδ): Found only once in Lk 4:4 (AV, RV "family"), and signifying the line of paternal family descent. A word pregnant in meaning among the Jews, who kept all familial records carefully, as may be seen from the long genealogical records found everywhere in the OT.

LINEN, lin'ēn (ץ', בָדָק, "white linen"); used chiefly for priestly robes, ἀμβώματα, "byssus," a fine white Egyptian linen, called in the earlier writings ἀμβώμ, ἀμβώμα, ἀμπώμ, and ἁμβώμα, and sometimes, ἀμβώμος, ἀμπώμος (in II Esdr. 2:17), or ἀμπᾶς, ἀμπᾶς (in I Pet 5:1); linen, σινθέα, σινθέα: Thread or cloth made of flax.

Ancient Egypt was noted for its fine linen (Gen 41:42; Isa 19:9). From it a large export trade was carried on with surrounding nations, including the Egyptians, who had learned the art of spinning from the Egyptians (Ex 35:25) and continued to rely on them for the finest linen (Prov 7:16; Ezek 27:7). The culture of flax in Pal probably antedated the conquest, for in Josh 2:6 we read of the stalks of flax which Rahab had laid in order upon the roof. Among the Egyptians, as apparently among the Canaanites, the spinning and weaving of linen were carried on by the women (Prov 31:13-19), among whom skill in this work was considered highly praiseworthy (Ex 35:25). One family, the house of Ashbee, attained eminence as workers in linen (1 Ch 4:21; 2 Ch 2:14).

Linen was used, not only in the making of garments of the finer kinds and for priests, but also for shrouds, hangings, and possibly for the hangings (υἱοθετικά, προσερήμονα; Ex 26:6, 36; 1 Pet 5:1) of the tabernacle (Ex 25:1). Fine linen, white and pure, was ascribed to the same (1 Ch 29:4), and the same was given to the Levites (Ex 28:39; 39:26; 28:37; Ezek 44:17). Egypt, the land of "byssus," supplied the raw material (Deut 25:14; Ps 80:14; 106:31). Linen, both imported and domestic, was doubtless used in the temple (2 Ch 4:21; 31:10; Ezek 44:17). It seems to have been very popular among the Jews (Isa 55:10; Mal 1:16; 2:16).

2. General Uses of linen, highly prized cloth of antiquity would naturally be desired.
his defence of orthodox doctrine against the Gnostics "appeals esp. to the bishops of Rome, as depositaries of the apostolic tradition." The list of Irenaeus commences with Linus, whom he identifies with the person of this name mentioned by St. Paul, and who, he affirms, has been entrusted with the office of the bishopric by the apostles. (1) With the many possibilities of error, no more can safely be assumed of Linus . . . than that he held some prominent position in the Rom church" (Lightfoot's "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry" in Comm. on Phil, 220 f).

"Considering the great rarity of this Gr mythological name as a proper name for persons, we can hardly doubt that here, as Irenaeus has directly asserted, the same Rom Christian is meant who, according to ancient tradition, became after Peter and Paul the first bishop of Rome. Among the mythical characters in Apos Const, vii, 46 occurs Linos ho Klaudios, who is declared to have been ordained by Paul as the first bishop of Rome. He is thus represented as the son or husband of Claudia whose name comes after his in 2 Tim 4 21.

"These meager statements have been enlarged upon by Eng. investigators. The Claudia mentioned here is, they hold, identical with the one who, according to Mart., married a certain Pudens (86-90 AD), and she, in turn, with the Claudia Rufina from Britain, who is then made out to be a daughter of the British king, Cogidumnus, or Titus Claudius Cogidubnus. For a refutation of these assumptions, which, even chronologically considered, are impossible, see Lightfoot, St. Clement. L. 76-79" (Zahn, Intro to the NT, 207).

1. Names found less often.

Cf Λινός, ἀργεύ, πλ. Λινίων, ἀργάδης. Another form, Λυν, ἄρτ, πλ. Λυνίων, ἀργάδυμ. 1. Names

2. Natural History

its present range extends throughout Africa, and it is also found in Mesopotamia, Southern Persia, and the border of India. There is some reason to think that it may be found in Arabia, but its occurrence there remains to be proved. The Asiatic male lion does not usually have as large a mane as the African, but both belong to one species, Felis leo.

Lion (Felis leo).

Lions are mentioned in the Bible for their strength (Jgs 14 18), boldness (2 S 17 10), ferocity (Ps 7 2), and stealth (Ps 10 9; Lam 3 3)

3. Figur-10. Therefore in prophetic references to the millennium, the lion, with the bear, wolf, and leopard, is mentioned as living in peace with the ox, calf, kid, lamb and the child (Ps 8 13; 8 12; 8 11 6-8; 66 25). The roaring of the lion is often mentioned (Job 4 10; Ps 64 11; Is 31 4 [RV "growling"]; Jer 31 38; Ezek 22 25; Hos 11 10). Judah is a "lion's whelp" (Gen 49 9), likewise Dan (Dt 33 22). It is said of certain of David's warriors (1 Ch 12 8) that their "faces were like the faces of lions." David's enemy (Ps 17 12) "is like a lion that is greedy of his prey, and the king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion" (Prov 19 12). God in His wrath is "unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judash (Hos 5 14). The devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet 5 8). "Lion" occurs in the figurative language of Ezek, Dn, and Rev. The figures of lions were used in the decorations of Solomon's temple and throne (1 K 7 29; 7 30; 7 18).

Nearby all references to the lion are figurative. The only notices of the lion in narrative are of the lion slain by Samson (Jgs 14 5); by David (1 S 17 34 f); by Benaah (2 S 23 20; 1 Ch 11 22); the prophet slain by a lion (1 K 13 24); also I K 20 36); the lions sent by the Lord among the settlers in Samaria (2 K 17 25); Daniel in the lions' den (Dn 6 16). In all these cases the word used is 'ayrēh or 'ārē.

The Arab. language boasts hundreds of names for the lion. Many of these are, however, merely adj., used substantively. The commonest Arab. names are sab', 'asād, laith, and labāw, the last two of which are identified above with the Heb lāyish and lābi'. As in Arabic, so in Heb, the richness of the language in this particular gives opportunity for variety of expression, as in Job 4 10 11:

"The roaring of the lion (lāyish), and the voice of the fierce lion (šəḥāl)."
LIP. Lit. Sub-apostol. THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

And the teeth of the young lions [kafarit], are broken. The old lion [layish] perisheth for lack of prey, and the whirlwinds of the lioness [bene lashah] are scattered abroad.

In Jgs 14 5–18, not less than three different terms, kaphar, ‘arayoth, ‘argah, and ‘ar, are used of Samson’s lion.

ALFRED ELY DAY

LIP (σᾶφθα) saphhāk, τῆς, saphhēth, σάφθα, lips, "language," "speech," "talk," also "rim," "border," "shorn," "bald," etc., [Lk. 19:9, σᾶφθα, "upper lip," "moustache," "beard"]; Χαλκ. chellos, "lip" [also once, "shore" in the quotation He 11:12 = Gen 22:17]: (1) Lips stand in oriental idiom for speech or language, like "mouth," "tongue"; therefore they stand in parallelism. The lip of truth shall be hewn; but lying tongue is hewn for a moment" (Prov 12:19). "To shoot out the lip" (Ps 22:7) means to make a mocking, contemptuous, scornful face. As the lips are the chief instrument of speech, we find numerous idiomatic phrases for "speech" such as: "The utterance of the lips" (Nu 30:6), "to proceed out of the lips" (Nu 30:12), "to open the lips" (Job 32:20), "to go out of the lips" (Ps 17:1). These expressions do not convey, as a rule, the idea that the utterance of the words proceeds out of the lips, and that it lacks sincerity and the concern of the heart, but occasionally this is intended, e.g. "This people draw nigh unto me, and with their mouth and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me" (Lev 26:16). The "fruit of the lips" (Isa 57:19 = He 13:15) and "calves of the lips" (Hos 14:2 AV) designate the praise and thanksgiving due to God. "Fervent" [AV] or "exulting" [LXX] (Prov 25:20) are synonymous with eloquence. "To refrain the lips" (Ps 40:9; Prov 10:19) means to keep silence, where the godless or unwise would wish to assert his rights.

Numerous other expressions need no further explanation, such as "presseverence" (Ex 6:12:30), "tongue opened" (Acts 1:21), "lips crying" (Ps 10:18; Prov 17:1), "lying lips" (Ps 31:16; Prov 10:18; 12:22), "wicked for false lips" (Prov 17:4), "unclean lips" (Isa 6:5), "strange" [AV] "stammering" [LXX] "lips" (Isa 28:11), "stumbling" [LXX] "lips" (Ps 12:23; Prov 7:21), "righteous" [LXX] "lips" (Acts 10:16). (2) The Heb word saphām is found only in the phrase "to cover the lip or lips," which is an expression of mourning, submission and shame. The Oriental covers his lips with his hand or a portion of his hand if he has been sunk into grief and sorrow. He expresses, thereby, that he cannot open his mouth at the visitation of God. Differently, however, from common mourners, Ezekiel was forbidden of God "to cover his lips" (Ezk 24:17; see also ver. 22), i.e. to mourn in the usual way over Israel’s downfall, as Israel had brought these judgments upon himself. The leper, victim of an incurable disease, walks about with rent clothes and hair disheveled, covering his lips, crying: "Unclean!" [Lev 13:45]. The thought here is that even the breath of such a one may defile. The prophet calls upon all seers and diviners, to whom God has refused the knowledge of the future, to cover their lips in shame and confusion (Mic 3:7).

H. L. E. LEBRINO

LIQUOR, lik’er: Every sort of intoxicating liquor except the beverage prepared from the juice of the grape (gaiyn), according to the usage of the OT, is comprehended under the generic term γαϊν, shēkār, (cf shakhar, to ‘be drunk’), rendered "strong drink" (cf Gr. stēkos in Lk 1:15). The two terms, gaiyn and shēkār, "wine" and "strong drink," are often found together and are used by OT writers as an exhaustive classification of the beverages in use among the ancient Hebrews (Lev 10:9; 1 S 1:15; Prov 20:1, etc.). See Wine; Drink, Strong.

LIST: A variant of "lust" (see Lust), meaning "to wish," found in AV of Mt 17:12 [MK 9:13], Jn 3:8, as tr of θέλω, thēlō, and in Jas 3:14 as tr of φιλαμια, filamia. The last case ERV has rendered "will," and ARV has made the same change throughout. The word is obsolete in modern Eng., but Jn 3:8 is still used proverbially, "the wind bloweth where it listeth.
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LITERATURE

The Sub-apostolic Age is usually held to extend from the death of St. John, the last surviving apostle, about 100 AD, to the death of Polycarp, St. John’s aged disciple (155–165 AD). The Christian literature of this period, although as a whole of only moderate intrinsic value, is of historical interest and importance. This is owing to the light which it throws back on apostolic times, and the testimony borne to Christian life, thought, worship, work and organization during an age when the church was under the guidance, mainly, of men who had been associated with the apostles and who might be supposed, therefore, to know their mind. Some writings are omitted from this review, having been dealt with in previous articles. For the Protevangelium of James and the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter see APOCRYPHAL Gospels; APOCRYPHAL ACTS For an account of extant fragments of Basiliades and Valentinus see Gnostic Literature. For pseudo-Clementine writings see Peter, Clement, SIMON MAGUS.
1. Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.—Only the larger part had previously been extant, when the complete ep. was discovered in 1875 by Bryennios, bishop of Nicomedia. The high honor in which it was held by early Christians is attested (1) by its position in Codex A, between the Catholic and Pauline Epistles; (2) by its being publicly read in many churches down to the 4th cent. (HE, III, 15). The work is anonymous, but referred in the name of the Rom. church. Dionysius of Corinth (170 AD) refers to it as written by the author of (dict) Clement (HE, IV, 23); Clement of Alexandria states distinctly the Clementine authorship (Strom., iv,17). The writer is evidently the leading office-bearer of his church, and is identified with the Clement whom Eusebius designates as third “bishop” (or chief presbyter) of Rome after St. Peter, and as holding office between 92 and 101 AD (HE, III, 34). Clement is further identified by Origen (Comm. on St. John) and in HE, III, 15 with the Clement of Phil 4; but the name is too common and the interval too long to render this identity more than possible. Some conjecture the weight of his name to be that of Flavius Clemens, who is Domitian’s (his cousin) put to death in 95 AD for alleged “atheism,” i.e. probably, profession of Christianity (see Harnack, Gesch. Lit., I, 253, note 1). But Clement the “bishop” is never otherwise referred to as a martyr, and a member of the imperial family would hardly have been the head of a Rom. church without some fact being noted by some contemporary or later writer. Lightfoot, with some probability, supposes (Apostolic Fathers, I, 61) that Clement was a “freedman or the son of a freedman, belonging to the household of Flavius Clemens.” From St. Paul’s time (Phil 4:22) the imperial household included Christians; and many slaves were men of culture. To such a Christian freedman’s influence the consul’s conversion may have been due. Internal evidence points to Clement having been a Hellenist Jew or proselyte of Judaism; for he writes with some classical culture and with knowledge of OT history and of the LXX; his style, moreover, has a “strong Hebraistic tinge” (Lightfoot, p. 59). The date of the ep. is fixed approximately by a reference to a persecution at Rome in progress or very recent; this persecution (during Clement’s “episcopate”) was doubtless that by Domitian in 95 AD. Clement’s Ep. is thus not strictly apostolic but apocalyptic, and it is uniformly included in sub-apostolic literature. The occurrence was a church feud at Corinth, and the expulsion of some faithful presbyters. The writer seeks to procure their restoration and as a pattern the peace and harmony of Nature. In this connection occurs an anticipation of geographical discovery, when the author writes (ch xxv) of the “impossible ocean and the worlds beyond it” (of Seneca, Medea ii,375; Strabo i,4; Plut. Mor., ix,41). St. Paul’s warnings in 1 Cor about party spirit are recalled; a not unworthy echo of 1 Cor 13 is embodied; and the erring community is solemnly admonished. In the course of the letter, with obvious reference to 1 Cor, the resurrection, for which he argues from the OT and from natural analogies. He refers to the phoenix which lives 500 years, and, when dissolution approaches, builds a nest of spices into which it enters to die. As the flesh decays, however, a “worm” is surprised which is nurtured from the dead bird’s moisture and puttheth forth wings.” The fable is mentioned by Herodotus and Pliny.

A lengthy prayer of intercession for “all sorts and conditions of men” is abruptly introduced near the end, in order, presumably, to imbue Corinthian Christians with that charity which they needed and which is the chief incentive to intercession. The twofold Christian and apostolic hope of restored concord and peace.

Apologetic testimony is found to (1) books of the NT, viz. to the Pauline authorship of 1 Cor; to St. Mark’s Gospel, through which the work is apologetically testifying of St. Mark’s variations from the LXX.; to Acts, through which he similarly quotes (ch xvii) 1 S 13:14; to Rom, Eph, 1 Tim, Tit, Jas, 1 Pet (chs xxxv, xiv, xx, ii, xvi, xlix, respectively). The rr is between Clement and Hes are so numerous that the latter work has from early times been ascribed to him by some (HE, VI, 25). But the general type both of thought and of diction is dissimilar; (2) against the Tübingen theory of essential divergence between the doctrine of St. Peter and of St. Paul. The chief presbyter of Rome could not have been ignorant of such divergence; yet he refers the partisanship of which the two apostles were victims entirely to the Corinthians, not all to the apostles (ch xlix).

Doctrinal testimony is found: (1) to the Trinity, “As God liveth and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit” (ch lvi); (2) to 4. Doctrinal the personality of Christ, “The Lord Testimony Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the majesty forever. The union and communion with Christ we have life, are sanctified, possess love, manifest godliness (ch i, xxxvi); (3) to the atonement: Clement ascribes to Christ’s death not merely subjective moral influence, but objective vicarious efficacy in securing reconciliation, without any attempt, however, to explain the mystery. Christ hath “given his flesh for our flesh, his life for our lives” (ch xlix); (4) to justification which is distinctly enunciated as before God through faith (ch xxii). But this faith (as in St. Paul’s writings) is a “faith which worketh” (ch xxxv), and such justification is consistent with our being justified by works before men; (5) to the inspiration of Scripture, which is real (“the Holy Spirit saith”), but not always in our hearts. Apocryphal books are quoted, but not with a formula indicating Divine authority.

(1) The basis of authority is not sacerdotal, but a combination of official succession and popular appreciation is appreciated by the apostles or afterward by men of office. The epistles and with consent of the whole Church, there is no distinct separation between presbyter and bishop. Office-bearers designated as presbyters (chs xlii, liv) are referred to (chs xlii, xliv) as filling the office of bishop. Addressing a church on congregational strife and insubordination, he refers to no single bishop in authority over the church. Had the episcopate, in the post-NT sense of mono-episcopate, been apostolically enjoined, surely the injunction would have been obeyed or enforced in Corinth. (3) None the less we discern in Clement’s own position and action the anticipation of the later episcopate. Clement is an example of how, through the personal qualities and ecclesiastical services of the man, the presbytery developed out of seniority into superiority, out of representativeness into official authority.

(4) The early germ of the papacy is disclosed in the passage: “If certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by God through us, let them understand that they will excommuni themselves in no slight transgression and peril” (ch lix).
Such assumption by a revered man like Clement might give no offense, and the Corinthians plainly needed correction. Still we have here the first stage in the process which ultimately led to the formation and establishment of an spiritual supremacy. The assumption, however, is not grounded on Clement’s own official position (as he speaks always in the person of), but on the superior dignity of the Rom church. The later theory of supremacy built up by the Bishops of St. Peter and his successors; but here the authority of the leading presbyter, in dealing with a provincial church, rests on the power invested in the ecclesia in which he presides.

(1) The long prayer (chs lix-lix) bears internal evidence of liturgical character, through its balanced and rhythmical style, its somewhat restrained and mute relevance to the special object of the ep., and greater suitability for congregational worship than as part of a counsel to a sister church. This internal testimony is confirmed by the correspondence of the prayer in certain verbal details with the earliest extant liturgies, particularly those of St. Mark and St. James, pointing to the early unity of the Rom church. A prayer afterward incorporated into these liturgies. While there is evidence that down at least to the time (148 AD) of Justin’s Ist Apology (ch lxvii) a minister offered up prayers of his own composition, this prayer seems to be that before the close of the Apostolic Age, forms of supplication had begun to be introduced, not to the exclusion of “free prayer,” but simply as a mode of congregational devotion countenanced by a venerated leader of the church at Rome. (2) In ch lviii Clement writes about “compassionate remembrance of them [i.e. the erring brethren] before God and the saints.” By the saints, however, are most probably meant, not the beatified dead, but the living Christian brotherhood, as in 1 Cor 4:2; 2 Cor 8:4. This ep. leaves on readers’ minds two different yet mutually compatible impressions—impressions both apparently made on the early church, by which the latter was widely read at public worship. NT’s mode and excluded form of worship, that of the Canon of Scriptures. We realize, on the one hand, the inferiority of this writing to that of apostles. Clement’s mind is receptive, not creative; and the freshness of thought characteristic of NT writers is absent. What NT book, moreover, contains such a foetid legend as that of the phoenix? On the other hand, this ep. breathes much of the spirit, as it adopts in its measure the phraseology and style of apostolic writings. It is as it were the sum of special inspiration had sunk below the horizon, there remained to the church for a while a spiritual afterglow.

II. The “Didache” or Teaching (longer title, “The Teaching of the Lord, by [did] the XII Apostles, to the Gentiles”).—This work is quoted as “Scripture,” without being named, by Clement of Alexandria (c 170 AD, in Strom., 1.20). It is mentioned in H.E. III, 25 as the “Teachings so-called of the Apostles,” “recognized by most ecclesiastical writers,” although “not a genuine” composition of apostles. Athenasius (Fest. Ep., 39) denies its canonicity, but acknowledges its utility. The latest ancient reference to the work from personal knowledge is by Nicephorus (9th cent.) who includes it among apocryphal writings. Thereafter it disappears until its recent recovery in 1875 by Bryennios.

There is no reliable external testimony to date. Resemblances too considerable to be accidental exist between the Didache and the Ep. of Barnabas, but one is fixed as to priority of composition. Lightfoot and others favor a common lost source. As to internal evidence the simplicity of the Euchist and of baptism as here described, with no formal admission to the catechumenean (ch vii), but the omission of the Fifth Commandment was included in the First Table. (Devolotional: worship and rites (chs vii–z, xii).—The Lord’s Prayer is to be used three times a day. “Heaven” and “earth” are found instead of “heaven” and “earth” (Matt vi:6, 10). The “kingdom” omitted—it’s earliest recorded use in this connection. Christians are to fast on Wednesday and Friday, the days of betrayal and crucifixion. Fasting is enjoined for a day or two
before baptism, both on baptizer and on baptized; it is recommended to "others who can." There is no mention of oil, salt, or exorcism. The baptismal formula, "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is commanded, confirming the historical truth of the Mitchell of Mt 28:19. Triple immersion in "living water" is assumed to be normal; but where this is impracticable, other water and affusion are permitted (see Trine Immersion). The Lord's Supper is dealt with only on its eucharistic aspects, and is an object not being to nourish the nature of the rite, but to give models of thanksgiving.

The phrase, "after being filled give thanks," suggests that the Agape was still associated with the sacrament: the disassociation had begun when Pliny wrote to Trajan in 112 AD. A liturgical element in sacramental worship is indicated by the presence for the cup, the broken bread, and spiritual mercies. "Give thanks thus." The thanksgiving for the cup is as follows: "We give thanks to thee our Father, for the holy wine of David, thy servant, which thou hast made known to us through Jesus Christ." But nothing suggests that the entire service is liturgical, and the forms supplied are not rigidly imposed; for prophets are to officiate in such forms as they choose. On the Last Day congregational worship and eucharistic bread-breaking, after confession to God and reconciliation with men, are distinctly enjoined.

(3) Ecclesiastical (chs xi-xii, xv).—Of church office-bearers, two classes are mentioned, ordinary and extraordinary. Of the former (essential to congregational organization) only bishops and deacons are mentioned, i.e. those invested with rule and oversight, with their assistants. Presbyter and bishop appear to be still identical, as the former is not specified (cf Phil 1 1). Popular election of these functionaries is indicated: "Elect for yourselves," with the denial, however, of those already in office having a share in the settlement. In the second class, apostles, prophets and teachers are included. "Apostle" is used, not in the narrower sense of men called to the office personally by Christ, but in the wider sense which embraces all whose call to be his ambassadors has been signalized by Divine gifts—specially accredited evangelists unconnected with any particular community. (Among Jewish Christians the designation survived to the 4th cent., for the Theodosian Code of the 5th and 6th cent. illustrates vectors and to those "quos ipsi apostolos vocant."). These apostles were to be received "as the Lord," and hospitably entertained; but, unlike apostles in the special sense, they were not to remain anywhere long; their function was to scatter the seed widely, and any expression of desire to remain longer was to be discouraged, while a demand for salary from a particular community would be evidence of false apostleship. The special function of prophets and teachers, on the other hand, was the instruction and comfort of church members. They accordingly might be encouraged to settle in a community and receive "first-fruits" for their support. These prophets and teachers, however, were not to supercede the bishops or presbyters in ruling, but were to undertake only those functions for which they were specially qualified. On the other hand, bishops and deacons were not to be excluded from preaching and teaching by the settlement of prophets and official teachers in particular communities; and in the Did., may be traced the transition, then being gradually accomplished, of the preaching and teaching functions from extraordinary to ordinary office-bearers. "They also [the bishops and deacons] ministry you to the ministry of prophets and teachers: therefore despise them not." Even before the close of St. Paul's ministry, the episkopos, whose essential function, was rule and oversight, was expected, if not required, also to be didaskalos, "qualified to teach," i.e. along with teachers specially set apart for the purpose (1 Tim 3 2; 5 17). By the middle of the 2nd cent., the prophets had disappeared, and their preaching function had been vested in the office of bishop or presbyter, assisted by the deacons.

(4) Eschatological (ch xvi).—This concluding section consists chiefly of exhortations to watchfulness in view of the Second Advent. The premonitory signs of that Coming are given, with reminiscences from Christ's eschatological discourses, viz. the appearance of false prophets, decline of love, persecution, lawlessness, and the appearance of Antichrist, who is designated the World-deceiver. Without definitely stating chiliasm doctrine, the writer suggests it: for in referring to the immediate signals of Christ's advent (opening in his "immediate truth", i.e. resurrection of dead) he is careful to add "Not of all the dead; but the Lord shall come, and all the saints with Him"—implying that the general resurrection would take place at an after-stage, presumably, as Millennialists did, after the 1,000 years had expired. Without dogmatic authority, and with only moderate spiritual value, the Did. is important historically as a witness to the church's beliefs, usages and condition during the transition between the Apostolic and the Post-apostolic Age. During this transition period, we see much of the freedom of primitive Christianity mingled with rudiments of ecclesiastical regulations and formalities; and while we cannot assume that every belief and usage recorded in it can be properly ascribed to apostolic times, and regard them as not opposed by those apostles within whose view they must have come.

III. Epistles of Ignatius.—Ignatius was bishop of Antioch early in the 2d cent. Origen (Hom. vi on Lk) refers to him as 'second after St. Peter'; Eusebius came between 100 and 130; Thrasybios between 2d cent. and 3d cent. (HE, III, 22). As he calls himself Episcopus Antiochiae, "highest priest," 101 he was probably converted in mature life: the legend of his being the "child" of Mt 18 3 rests on misinterpretation of his designation Theophorus. Traditions current in the 4th cent. represent him as a disciple of John the Baptist (Acts 19 12), and ordained by St. Paul (Apost. Coni. v, 7, 8).

The Martyrdom of Ignatius (6th cent.) dates his trial at Antioch in the 9th year of Trajan's reign (107-8 AD) and represents it as conducted before the emperor. Only a short visit, however, of Trajan is alluded to (Martyr. 111-15); neither any Ignatian letter nor Eusebius, nor the other early or two datable. Their function was to scatter the seed widely, and any expression of desire to remain longer was to be discouraged, while a demand for salary from a particular community would be evidence of false apostleship. The special function of teachers and other, was the instruction and comfort of church members. They accordingly might be encouraged to settle in a community and receive "first-fruits" for their support. These prophets and teachers, however, were not to supercede the bishops or presbyters in ruling, but were to undertake only those functions for which they were specially qualified. On the other hand, bishops and deacons were not to be excluded from preaching and teaching by the settlement of prophets and official teachers in particular communities; and in the Did. may be traced the transition, then being gradually accomplished, of the preaching and teaching functions from extraordinary to ordinary office-bearers. "They also [the bishops and deacons] minister you to the ministry of prophets and teachers: therefore despise them not." Even before the close of St. Paul's ministry, the episkopos, whose essential function, was rule and oversight, was expected, if not required, also to be didaskalos, "qualified to teach," i.e. along with teachers specially set apart for the purpose (1 Tim 3 2; 5 17). By the middle of the 2nd cent., the prophets had disappeared, and their preaching function had been vested in the office of bishop or presbyter, assisted by the deacons.

(4) Eschatological (ch xvi).—This concluding section consists chiefly of exhortations to watchfulness in view of the Second Advent. The premonitory signs of that Coming are given, with reminiscences from Christ's eschatological discourses, viz. the appearance of false prophets, decline of love, persecution, lawlessness, and the appearance of Antichrist, who is designated the World-deceiver. Without definitely stating chiliasm doctrine, the writer suggests it; for in referring to the immediate signals of Christ's advent (opening in his "immediate truth", i.e. resurrection of dead) he is careful to add "Not of all the dead; but the Lord shall come, and all the saints with Him"—implying that the general resurrection would take place at an after-stage, presumably, as Millennialists did, after the 1,000 years had expired. Without dogmatic authority, and with only moderate spiritual value, the Did. is important historically as a witness to the church's beliefs, usages and condition during the transition between the Apostolic and the Post-apostolic Age. During this transition period, we see much of the freedom of primitive Christianity mingled with rudiments of ecclesiastical regulations and formalities; and while we cannot assume that every belief and usage recorded in it can be properly ascribed to apostolic times, and regard them as not opposed by those apostles within whose view they must have come.

III. Epistles of Ignatius.—Ignatius was bishop of Antioch early in the 2d cent. Origen (Hom. vi on Lk) refers to him as 'second after St. Peter'; Eusebius came between 100 and 130; Thrasybios between 2d cent. and 3d cent. (HE, III, 22). As he calls himself Episcopus Antiochiae, "highest priest," 101 he was probably converted in mature life: the legend of his being the "child" of Mt 18 3 rests on misinterpretation of his designation Theophorus. Traditions current in the 4th cent. represent him as a disciple of John the Baptist (Acts 19 12), and ordained by St. Paul (Apost. Coni. v, 7, 8).

The Martyrdom of Ignatius (6th cent.) dates his trial at Antioch in the 9th year of Trajan's reign (107-8 AD) and represents it as conducted before the emperor. Only a short visit, however, of Trajan is alluded to (Martyr. 111-15); neither any Ignatian letter nor Eusebius, nor the other early or two datable. Their function was to scatter the seed widely, and any expression of desire to remain longer was to be discouraged, while a demand for salary from a particular community would be evidence of false apostleship. The special function of teachers and other, was the instruction and comfort of church members. They accordingly might be encouraged to settle in a community and receive "first-fruits" for their support. These prophets and teachers, however, were not to supercede the bishops or presbyters in ruling, but were to undertake only those functions for which they were specially qualified. On the other hand, bishops and deacons were not to be excluded from preaching and teaching by the settlement of prophets and official teachers in particular communities; and in the Did. may be traced the transition, then being gradually accomplished, of the preaching and teaching functions from extraordinary to ordinary office-bearers. "They also [the bishops and deacons] minister you to the ministry of prophets and teachers: therefore despise them not." Even before the close of St. Paul's ministry, the episkopos, whose essential function, was rule and oversight, was expected, if not required, also to be didaskalos, "qualified to teach," i.e. along with teachers specially
Further external evidence is supplied by Irenaeus (v. 577), who says from the Rom., iv, as that of a martyr, and who uses 8 notable phrases borrowed apparently from him. The external testimony (only he got rid of by an arbitrary assumption of Polycarp's Ep. being wholly or partly spurious) is supported by strong internal evidences:

1. Frequent grammatical dislocation, natural in letters written on a hurried basis, but unaccountable on the supposition of a late forgery (Rom., iv, ii; Eph., i).

2. Geographical particulars: e.g. Ignatius goes by land from Tralles to Ephesus (Rom., viii, 2), a journey which the party of Trajan causing extensive orders for human victims from all parts.

3. Historical illustrations: e.g. conveyance of prisoners from Rome to Rome harmonizes with the account by Dion Cassius (xxvii, 15) of the magnitude of the orders for human victims from all parts.

4. Theological evidence: e.g. those opp. to Judeo-Metaphysical a belief in a type of doctrine denying any real incarnation—a combination which ceased after Ignatius' time.

5. Ecclesiastical usage: thus, the Agape still includes the Eucharist (Smyr., viii), whereas soon after Ignatius' death these were separated (Pliny, Ep. 96; Justin, 1 Ap., 65, 67).

6. Personal references:—The writer shows an excess and affection of self-deprecation—"last of Antiochene Christians (Trall., iii)" not worthy to be counted among the brothood (Rom., ix) such as a later forger would hardly have introduced.

(1) Joy and glory of martyrdom.—Heroic courage and loyalty to Christ are united with fanatical craving after a martyr's death: "I warn you, therefore, that you die for Christ rather than for Ideas over the whole earth" (Rom., vi).

(2) Evil and peril of heresy and schism.—Astonished from heresy; ""These heretics mix up Jesus Christ with their own poison" (Trall., vii). Vile those evil beasts, which produce death-bearing fruit" (Trall., xi); "Avoid all divisions as the beginning of evil"; "Nothing is better than unity" (1 Ap., vii, 13).

(3) Submission to office-bearers, esp. to the bishop.—"Do nothing without your bishop, and be subject to the presbyters" (Mag., vii).

(4) On your guard against heresy: and this will be, if ye continue in the words which I taught you with the bishop and deacons" (Trall., iii).

(5) He who does anything without the bishop's knowledge suffers the devil" (Smyr., ix). The bishop here is higher than "primus inter pares"; he is a new and separate office-bearer. Yet, without going beyond these epistles, we discern that such an episcopate was not an express apostolic institution.

For had Ignatius been able to magnify the office as apostolically enjoined, so zealous a champion of episcopal authority would have added such injunction as the most cogent reason for submission. His seal for the episcopate apparently sprang only from its high ecclesiastical prerogatives as the most effective agency for maintaining the church's unity against heresy and schism.

1. The Gospel of Jn. is never quoted, but numerous phrases suggest that it was in the writer's hands. He speaks of Christ, "proceeding from the Father," "doing nothing without the Father," "in the Father," "the piecing Him who sent Him." Christ is the "Door of all water," Satan is the "Prince of this world," the "Holy Spirit knoweth what He cometh and whither He goeth." The writer repeatedly assumes Christologically Jesus' true Divinity: "Our God" (Ep., xvii; Trall., vii). The Trinitarian dogma is assimilated in modified form as the presupposed from 1 Jn, which is a kind of appendix to the Gospel (Lightfoot), 1 Jn 4:3).

2. At a time when Ignatius had been emphasizing the Father, and the Spirit." With strong support of episcopal authority no such practice of redeeming Christ's person occurs only once. "The priests are good: but Christ, the High Priest, is better than they." In addition, the imperfect Levitical priesthood is contrasted with the perfect high-priesthood of Christ.

3. Eclesiastical usage.—Ignatius contains one of the latest references to the Agape as still continued with the Eucharist. The letter to Polycarp (ch, iv) contains the insertion of some of the practice of redeeming Christ's person for slaves at the cost of the congregation. Slaves are not to "long to be freed, which is a former occupation, while not required as a duty, was often conferred as a privilege.

4. General characteristics.—Ignatius presents a striking contrast, as a writer, to Clement. Clement is pedagogic, cultured, but muddled; his purpose is place and deficient in originality; his best passages are echoes of Scripture. The diction and style of Ignatius are impassioned, rugged, turgid, but pithy, fresh and individualistic.

IV. Epistle of Polycarp.—Polycarp was born not later, perhaps considerably earlier, than 70 AD; for at his martyrdom, of which the 1. Date and acceptance date is 155 or 156 Genuine—(Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, ii, i, 629), he declared, when invited to abjure his faith, that he had "served Christ for 86 years" (Mart. Pol., ix). He was a disciple of St. John, who ordained him as bishop or leading presbyter of Smyrna before 100 AD (Iren., iii, 3, 4). Of several letters by Polycarp, only this ep. remains: it professes (ch, xii) to have been written soon after the martyrdom of Ignatius. The genuineness of the letter is attested by the Polycarp's own disciple (I.c.), whose evidence cannot be set aside on the ground of its testimony to the Ignatian letters without an obvious begging of the question. The supposition that the Ignatian letters and Polycarp's Ep. are parts of one continuous work is otherwise negatived by the very marked difference of style and standpoint between those writings (Lightfoot, i, 577). The ep. replies to a letter from the Philippine church inviting his counsel, and asking for ep. of the recently martyred Ignatius. He 2. Occasion acknowledges their kind ministry to and congratulates them that martyr and to others, "entwined with saintly fetters," who had "set a pattern of all patience." He sends what he has of the letters of Ignatius and asks in return for any information which they might possess. He commends to their careful study St. Paul's ep. to themselves, acknowledging his inability to attain to the apostle's wisdom. With profound reverence he interprets his letters, and giving to his letter the semblance of an apostolic echo, he exhorts his readers to righteousness and godliness, charity and mercy, and warns them against covetousness, evil-speaking and revenge. He dwells on the mutual relations and obligations of presbyters and deacons, on the one hand, and of the congregation on the other. He repeats St. John's admonition against teachers who denied the reality of the incarnation. Every spirit that confesseth not, etc. (1 Jn 4:3). He grieves over the lapse of a Philppine presbyter, Valens, who, along with his wife had flagrantly sinned; but he bids his readers not count such as enemies, but seek to recall them from their wanderings.

1. Polycarp mentions only one book of the NT, viz. Phil. but within the brief compass of 200 lines he quotes verses or reproduces phrases from 12 NT Epp., including three whose early date has been doubted (2 Tim and Eph. 1 and 2 Tim and Eph.). The absence of any quotation from the Gospel of Jn is notable, considering his relation to the apostle; but the shortness of the letter prevents any conclusion being drawn against the authenticity of that epistle, and his not quoting from 1 Jn, which is a kind of appendix to the Gospel (Lightfoot).
the paramount duty of submission to the bishop. Polycarp (dying subjecting to presbyters) does not mention a bishop. These two inferences are irre-
sound. (2) there was then no episkopos in the post-NT, sense, as Philip (3) Polycarp did not consider the defect (7) sufficiently important to ask the Philippians to supply it. He instituted the mono-episcopate, as the one proper form of church government, surely his disciple Polycarp would have embraced the opportunity, when the Philippians was invited, to inform them of the apostolic ordinance, and to join its adoption.

V. Papias Fragments.—Papias is called by his younger contemporary Irenaeus (v.33) a "disciple of John and friend of Polycarp," as of Hierapolis in Phrygia. The Chronicon Paschale (7th cent.), but embodying materials from other documents) states that he was martyred about the same time as Polycarp (155-56). His work, Exposition of Our Lord's Sayings, was extant in the 12th cent., but only fragments quoted by Irenaeus, Eusebius, etc., remain. These bear the twofold description of Papias by Eusebius, as a "man of little judgment" yet "most learned and well acquainted with the Scriptures.

(HE III, 33, 36). (But the words of praise in ver 36 may be a gloss.) Papias states that he subjoins to his expositions "whatever I learned carefully from the elders and treasured up in my memory . . . . I will not put those questions regarding the words of the elders [i.e. presumably men of an earlier generation], what Andrew or Peter said, or what Philip or Thomas, or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples said, as well as reports, his own, and the presbyter John, the disciple of the Lord, have to say:"

It is disputed whether Papias here refers to two Johns, the apostle and another disciple of the same name; or to John the apostle in two different relations, i.e. first as one about whom Papias heard oral traditions; and second, as one with whom, also, he held personal communication. In favor of the first view is: (1) Euse-
bius' own opinion (i.e.); (2) the alleged unlikelihood of the same John being twice mentioned in one sentence; (3) a statement by Eusebius (HF III, 39) that in his day two monuments (monument) of "John" existed at Ephesus. For the latter view is: (1) no other writer until Eusebius hints the existence of a presbyter John distinct from the apostle; (2) the change in the quotation from "said" to "say" may result from a confusion between John being twice mentioned; some things stated by John, according to Papias through "elders," others having been told him by the apostle himself. The fact that John is called presbyter, instead of apostle, is no contradiction since John so designates himself in 2 and 3 Jn.; and Jerome denies that the two men are the same. Hence, Papias, and Nicol, Four Gospels, 157 ff, who come to divergent conclusions.

2. Testi-
momony to St. Matthew and St. Mark

(1) According to Eusebius, Papias relates the story of "a woman accused before Our Lord— the story, presumably, which eventually crept into Jn 8; so that to him, in part, is due the preservation of a narrative, which, whether reported by Papias or not, helps to elucidate the union in Our Lord's holy and merciful charity.

(2) Papias is quoted by the Chronicle of Georgios Hamartolios (in MS of the 9th cent.): "It is said that St. John was put to death by the Jews," and a similar quotation is made by Philip of Side (Epitome MS of the 7th cent.): "it is said that the hearing of the apostle's residence after John, the Apostle. (3) Irenaeus (III 32) quotes Papias as writing about Polycarp's resurrection millenium, and as reporting, on St. John's authority, how the Lord said, "The days will come when no tree shall bring its 10,000 branches, nor each branch 10,000 twigs, and on each twig 10,000 shoots, etc."

This may be an exaggerated record containing some paraphrastic utterance of Christ, indicating prophetically the wonderful extension of the church.

VI. Epistle of Barnabas.—This book is first expressly quoted by Clement of Alexandria (c 190 AD) as the composition of Barnabas, companion of St. Paul (Strom., i.6). Origen concurs, and calls it a "Catholic ep." (Con. Celsum, i.63), thus suggesting canonical position; Eusebius (HE III, 24.1), in his Life of Barnabas, assigns a composition of it to Barnabas, although he himself regards it as "spurious." Cod. Sin places it immediately after the NT, as being read in churches, and thus suggests its composition by or for the apostles. Against this external testimony, however, to authorship by the Barnabas of Acts, is strong internal evidence: (1) apostolic sinfulness prior to discipleship is spoken of in exaggerated forms hardly credible in a writer who knew the Twelve—"exceedingly lawless beyond all [ordi-


cinary] sin." (2) an echo apparently of St. Paul's "sinners of whom I am chief!" (2) ignorance of Jewish rites incomprehensible in a Levite who had lived in Jerus, e.g. the priests are said to eat goat's flesh on the great Day of Atonement; (3) extreme anti-Judaism (see below), inconsistent with the representation of Barnabas in Acts and Gal.

The writer may have been some other Barnabas, a converted Alexandrine Jew, or, more probably, a converted gentile proselyte. He was a part of the Jewish school, but ignorant of Jewish rites as practised at Jerus, and possessing little real sympathy with Judaism.

The epistle was dated after 70 AD. All the destruction of Jerus is referred to (ch xvi); also after the publication of the Gospel of Jn, of which there are several reminiscences. But the absence of any reference to the rebuilding of Jerus under Hadrian, in 120 AD, in a passage (ch xx) where such a reference might have been expected, suggests a date prior to that year. We may place the writing between 90 and 120 AD.

The object is to deter both Jewish and gentile Christians from Judaistic lapse by a bold application of the allegorizing method to the OT.

3. Object far beyond what Philo would have and sanctioned. Jewish sacrifices, festi-

vals, Sabbath enactments, temple-

worship, are held to be distinctions of un-
clean food, are not only not of perpetual obligation, but never were binding at all, even on Jews. Be-

lief in their obliteroriness rests on a slavishly liberal exegesis of the OT, which, properly interpreted, is not a preparation for a new dispensation, but is a re-

newing of the old.

Cleremones are simply allegorical enforcements of spiritual worship; distinctions of clean and unclean are merely pictorial representations of the necessity of separa-
tion from vice and vicious men; interdict of swine's flesh means no more than "associate not with swinish men." The only circumcision really commanded by God is circumcision of the heart. Barnabas ignores what St. Paul realized, that Jewish laws and rites, even lit., interpreted, are a divine discipline of wholesome self-

restraint, neighborly consideration and obedience to God. Similarly, Papias's allegorizations are foreign to an understanding that finds in trivial OT statements Christian fact and truth. Thus, in Abraham's circumcision of the 318 men of his house, the 10 and 8 are significantly denoted by timber, a

gemeral, and the initial letters of Jeusus (Jesu); while the 300 represent the 300 points to the cross. The writer self-complacently intimates that "no one has been admitted by me to a more genuine piece of knowledge than this!" (ch 15).

When Barnabas, however, leaves obscure allegory for plain exhortation, he writes effectively of the "two ways" of light and darkness. Among edifying admonitions the following are outstanding: "Thou shalt not go to prayer with an evil conscience;" "Thou shalt not let the word of God issue from lips stained with impurity;" "Herod's palace was a garret; stretch forth thine hands to take, while thou contractest them to give;" "Thou shalt not issue orders with bitterness to thy servant, lest
thou fail in reverence to God who is above you both”; “Thou shalt not make a False, but shalt bring together them who contend”; “The way of darkness is crooked”; “In this way are [among others mentioned] those who labor not to aid them with help, with work, with soil” (chs xix, xx).

4. Notabilia

(1) The Divinity of Christ is emphasized: “Lord of all the world”; “Joint Creator, with the Father, of mankind” (ch v).

(2) The writer, while following the Alexandrian method of allegorical interpretation, is free from the Alexandrian doctrine of the essential evil of matter; the necessity of a real incarnation is affirmed (ch v).

(3) In ch xi, he writes: “We go down into the water for bread and fish, and come up after eating fruit in our heart, having the fear of God and trust in Jesus in our spirit.” This has been interpreted as involving the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; but the reference may be rather to the regeneration which baptism signifies as union with Christ.

(4) The Lord’s Day is a memorial of Our Lord’s resurrection. This observance is distinguished from Jewish Sabbath-keeping which is called an error; the Sabbath really intended to be kept being a period of 11 years in which 11 commandments are finished (ch xv).

(5) Testimony to NT Books, (a) the existence and canonical authority of the Gospel of Matthew is intimated by the quotation of Mt 20:34-42.

“Many are called, but few chosen,” introduced by the formulation of a Gospel passage, and together testify to the writer having the Gospel of John in his hands: “Whose eatheth of these shall live for ever” (ch vi i. 38).

(6) In Jn 8:58; “the new law of Our Lord and helper” and Jn 13:24; “a reference to the brazen serpent as a type of Christ’s suffering, glory and healing power” (ch xi 14: 9).

(7) The writer, speaking of a period of approximately 12 years, seems to be an echo of 2 Pet 3:8, and, if so, is the earliest testimony to the existence of that writing, and thus proves its great antiquity, although not its canonicity.

VII. Pastor (Shepherd) of Hermas.—This work is the earliest example, on a large scale, of Christian allegory, and was hardly less popular in the early church than the Pilgrim’s Progress in later times. It was reckoned by many almost, by some altogether, as “Scripture.” Irenaeus quotes it as “Scripture” (iv. 20; Clement of Alexander refers to it as the “decrees revealed Divinely imparted” (Strom., i. 29); Origen regards it as “Divinely inspired” (Comm. on Rom ii 14). It is placed with the Ep. of Barnabas in the Cod. Sin. at the close of the NT, and was read in many church services or “Lectures on God” and “Lectures,” ii, 2, ii, 3. The writer represents himself as a slave sold to a Roman Christian lady. He afterward obtained freedom, lived with his family in Rome, became earnestly religious, and saw visions which he imparted to the community in this book with a view to repentance and spiritual well-being.

Origen (followed by Eusebius, Jerome, etc.) ascribes the work to the Hermes of Rom ii 14 but his opinion is pure conjecture (pudor). The Canon Muratori, the Roman authontship describes the work as “recently composed at Rome by the brother of Pius during the latter’s episcopate” (137-54). This distinct local testimony has been widely accepted (Hefele, Lightfoot, Charteris, Crusswell, etc.). Yet the writer represents himself (Strom., ii, 4) as enjoined to send his book to Clement as a man in authority in the church, whom it is natural to identify with the chief presbyter of Rome between 92 and 101. This reference, along with the absence of such allusions as the following the Apos.-episcopate, has led Schaff, Zahn, and others to fix the date of the work at about 100 AD. The external and internal evidence, thus apparently divergent, may be reconciled by supposing (with Kuiper and Harnack) that the book was not written in a single draft; that portions were issued successively during Clement’s episcopate; and that under Pius (c. 140) the separate issues were gathered into a volume under the title of The Pastor. In Rome, where the author was known, the Canon Muratori attested at once its religious usefulness as a “book to be read,” and the absence of any claim to canonical authority.

The purpose of the book is not doctrinal but ethical; it is an allegorical manual of Christian duty with earnest calls to individual repentance and church revival in view of the near Advent.

2. Object

(1) Montanistic affinity.—Hermas, indeed, differs from Montanists in permitting, though not encouraging, second marriage, and recognizing one possible repentance after post-baptismal flagrant sin, but he is also their fore-runner, through his disallowance of readmission after second lapse, through emphatic expectation of an impending Advent, and through his rigorous view of fasting: “On the fast day taste nothing but bread and water.”

(2) Pastoral, however, is regarded not as an end but as a means—a discipline toward humility, purity, charity. Fasting for charity is enjoined, that all who dwell in flesh, by whom “the whole world is sustained,” those who endure great sufferings that He might do away with the sins of His people” (Sim., v. 3).

(3) Church organisation.—Hermas is charged (Vis., ii. 4) to “read his writings to [or along with] the presbyters who preside over the church.” In Rome it is reasonable to conclude that no one in that community could then be called “bishop” in the later sense of the holder of an-office distinct from and superior to the presbyters. Episkopoi ("bishops") are mentioned (Sim., ix. 27) as “given to hospitality,” the description of the episkopos in 1 Tim 3:2, where admittedly bishop = presbyter.

VIII. Second Epistle of Clement.—This writing is doubly misclassified: it is neither an ep nor a composition of Clement. Style, thought, and standpoint differ from those of the First Ep. and HE, III, 38; suggests that the Clementine episcopate was not generally recognized. The recent recovery by Bryennios of the previously lost conclusion proves that the writing is a sermon (ch xvi).

Antiquity is indicated by (1) the use, as an authority, of the lost heretical Gospel of the Egyptians, which by the time of the Canon Muratori (175 AD) had ceased to be regarded as Scripture by Catholics; (2) the adoption, without gnostic intuition, of phrases which become notably asso-
ciated, after 150 AD with Gnosticism: "God made male and female: the male is Christ, the female, the church" (ch xiv). The date usually
2. Date and assigned is 120–50 AD (Lightfoot, Part Authorship 1, vol 11, 201). The author is a general
preacher; he had "worshipped stocks and stones." The sermon was probably preached at Corinth, for the preacher describes
many arriving by sea for the race-course, without mentioning a port, which would be appropriate in a town next to Corinthians.
No text is given, but the sermon starts from Isa 64 1, without express quotation; this chap-
ter had probably been read at the
3. Contents service. The discourse, without great
literary merit, is earnest and prac-
tical. There are exhortations to repentance
and good works, to purity, charity, prayer and fast-
ing, with special reference to coming judgment.
The standpoint is that of St. James. "Be not<br>troubled [so the sermon concludes] because we see the unrighteous with abundance, and God's servants
in straits. Let us have faith, brethren and sisters. Had God recompensed the righteous speedily, we should have had training not in piety
but in bargaining; and our uprightness would be a mere semblance, since our pursuit would be not of godliness but of gain."[13]
(1) The sermon is the oldest extant in post-NT times, and appears to have been read (ch xiv) to a congregation.
(2) Sayings of Christ not in our Gospels are quoted: (a) "The Lord, being asked when His kingdom would come, answered: 'The</p>
young woman, (4) foreshadings of Christian truth by philosophy, referring esp. to Plato's teaching about the Divine Logos and judgment to come. The epistles would describe Sunday school and administration of sacraments in his time. On the Lord's Day Christians assembled for worship; prophetic Scriptures and "memories" by apostles and their followers were read; prayers and thanksgivings were offered and an address delivered by the "president"; bread and wine were distributed and sent by deacons to those absent; and an offering for charitable purposes was made. "As many as believe what is taught, and undertake to live accordingly, are, after prayer and fast, baptized" (ch. lxv, lvii).

There are probably no descript to the first; Eusebius quotes from both as from one work. After a protest against a recent summary of a prior trial, Justin deals with two popular taunts: (1) "If at death they went to heaven, why did they not commit suicide?" (2) "We do not shrink from death but from opposing God's will." (2) "If God is really on the Christians' side, why do they allow them to be persecuted?" (3) "The divine Logos is not a small and heretical minority" (Dial. 48). He writes elsewhere (1 Ap., 13) of the Son as the object of worship: "In the second place": but the student before the Arian Controversy must be reminded that this statement by Justin, as elsewhere, he appears to subordinate Him to the Father, as the Son to the Father. He is to be "worshipped in the third order" (1 Ap., 13).

(5) Millenarianism: "I and others are assured that there will be a resurrection at the dead and 1,000 years in Jerus which will be built, adorned and enlarged" (Dial., 80). He adds, however, that many pure and pious Christians think otherwise.

(6) Future punishment: On this subject Justin speaks with two voices. In 1 Ap., 8, he writes of "condemned souls suffering eternal punishment, not for a millennial period only." But in Dial., 5, he teaches the specific term for an old man who was the immediate degree of his conversion is saying that "the wicked shall be punished as long as God shall will them to remain." (7) Angel-worship: In 1 Ap., 6, Justin, when refuting the charge of theologian, worship: the Father and the Son, and the host of other good messengers (or angels), and the Prophetic Spirit." (8) The context, however, shows that by "worship" he means the veneration which is necessarily amount to what is usually meant by worship, but simply to veneration and homage. The Gr words here, kzewos and phereioun, are often used in this latter sense; and the train of thought seems to be this: "You call us heretics; the charge is not true for we not believe in one God and Father of all, but in one who is preeminently the Son of God, who was sent by God. We believe further in other beings, who are angels, and are leader of angelic spirits; yes we believe in one who is preeminently God's Spirit, who have inspired." Justin of course is inspired. All these are the object in different degrees of their veneration and homage. Undoubtedly, however, the statement is not without courage and misunderstanding.

(10) Doctrine of the sacraments: Justin uses "regenerate" as the synonym of "baptized" (1 Ap., 61), but he identifies the two, not as essentially inseparable, but as uniformly associated. As regards the Lord's Supper, while emphasizing the ideas of commemoration, communion, and thanksgiving, he is in one place speaks of the bread and wine being the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus, "from which, by a transmutation, our flesh and blood are nourished" (1 Ap., 66). These words tend to transubstantiation; but, in the absence of the controversy at the time, may be no more than a strongly figural representation of a spiritual union. Justin also uses the word "disciple of the apostles." Dionysius was a very common Gr name, so that his identification with the tutor of Marcus Aurelius (130–40 AD) is a mere conjecture. Donaldson (Chr. Lit., II, 142) inclines to the belief that the work was composed by one of the many Greeks who came to Rome in the 14th cent. and that the author intended merely to write a "good declaration in the old style." The smart but superficial way in which heathenism and Judaism are dealt with is more befitting a medieval theological exercise than a genuine statement, by a cultured writer, of prevalent religions.

5. Notabilia

(1) Bearing of Justin's quotations from "memoirs" on the Age of Our Gospels (see Gospel)

(2) "The Manny of apostolic doctrine. Justin is a disciple of St. Paul, and a strong anti-Judæan; yet he recognizes thoroughly the Twelve as the true source of Christian teaching, "sent by Christ to teach all nations" (1 Ap., 30, 49; Dial., 42, 10)."

(3) "From personal knowledge as a traveler, Justin testifies to the wide diffusion of Christianity: "No race of men exists among whom prayers are not offered up to the Father through the name of the crucified Jesus (Dial., 117)."

(4) Authorship of Resurrection: "John, one of the apostles, prophesied, by a revelation made to him, that beloved disciple who was the earliest direct witness to Johnanthous, by one who had resided at Ephesus.

(5) Belief of the primitive church in Our Lord's true Divinity: Writing in the name of Christians as a body, declares, "Both Him [the Father] and Him who came forth from Him we adore" (1 Ap., 6). He speaks also of some "we worship and adore" (1 Ar., 110)."

(6) As to the Holy Spirit, Justin refers to baptism as administered in the name of Father, Son, and Spirit" (1 Ap., 61), implying the Divinity of the Third Person; although elsewhere he appears to subordinate Him to the Son, as the Son to the Father. He is to be "worshipped in the third order" (1 Ap., 13).

(7) Millenarianism: "I and others are assured that there will be a resurrection at the dead and 1,000 years in Jerus which will be built, adorned and enlarged" (Dial., 80). He adds, however, that many pure and pious Christians think otherwise.

(8) Future punishment: On this subject Justin speaks with two voices. In 1 Ap., 8, he writes of "condemned souls suffering eternal punishment, not for a millennial period only." But in Dial., 5, he teaches the specific term for an old man who was the immediate degree of his conversion is saying that "the wicked shall be punished as long as God shall will them to remain." (9) Angel-worship: In 1 Ap., 6, Justin, when refuting the charge of theologian, worship the Father and the Son, and the host of other good messengers (or angels), and the Prophetic Spirit." (10) Doctrine of the sacraments: Justin uses "regenerate" as the synonym of "baptized" (1 Ap., 61), but he identifies the two, not as essentially inseparable, but as uniformly associated. As regards the Lord's Supper, while emphasizing the ideas of commemoration, communion, and thanksgiving, he is in one place speaks of the bread and wine being the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus, "from which, by a transmutation, our flesh and blood are nourished" (1 Ap., 66). These words tend to transubstantiation; but, in the absence of the controversy at the time, may be no more than a strongly figural representation of a spiritual union. Justin also uses the word "disciple of the apostles." Dionysius was a very common Gr name, so that his identification with the tutor of Marcus Aurelius (130–40 AD) is a mere conjecture. Donaldson (Chr. Lit., II, 142) inclines to the belief that the work was composed by one of the many Greeks who came to Rome in the 14th cent. and that the author intended merely to write a "good declaration in the old style." The smart but superficial way in which heathenism and Judaism are dealt with is more befitting a medieval theological exercise than a genuine statement, by a cultured writer, of prevalent religions.
THE EARLY ST, and metal, without any apparent realization that for cultured heathens of that time such images were not objects, but only symbolic media of worship; and he ridicules Mosaic observances without any recognition of their significance as a Divine educative discipline. But when he proceeds (chs vii-xii) to describe Christianity, the work merits Hefele’s designation, praestantissima Epitola. Into a world, yes, into human hearts, which had become degenerate and wicked, “God sent not mere servant or angel, but His own Son,” and Him, not as a condemning Judge, or fear-inspiring Tyrant, but as a gracious Saviour. To the inquiry, “If Christianity is so precious, why was Christ sent so late?” the author replies: “In order first to bring home to mankind their unworthiness to attain eternal life through their own works” and their incapacity for salvation apart from Him “who is able to save even what it was impossible (formerly) to save.” But faith in the Son of God now revealed, would lead to “knowledge of the Father”; knowledge of God to “love of Him who hath first so loved us”; and love of God to “imitation of Him and of His loving-kindness.” And wherein consists such imitation? Not in “seeking lordship over those weaker,” or in “showing violence toward those below us”; but in “taking on oneself the burden of one’s neighbor,” even as “God took on Himself the burden of our iniquities, and gave His own Son as a ransom for us.” “He who in whatsoever he may be superior is ready to benefit another who is deficient; he who, by distributing to the needy what he has received from God, becomes a god to those who receive his benefits: he is an imitator of God.”


HENRY COWAN

LITTER, lit’er (ט, גוחב): (1) Used upon backs of camels for easy riding, made of a wooden frame with light mattress and pillows, also a covering above, supported by upright pieces, sometimes having also side awnings for protection from the sun’s rays. Mule litters were made with pairs of shafts projecting before and behind, between which the animals were yoked (Isa 60:16). Littered as (בְּבַלְגָּד, ‘qphlāh qābh), are mentioned in Nu 7 3; the horse litter (חפוא, ‘phōrion) is mentioned in 2 Macc 9 8; cf 3 27. (2) בְּבַלְגָּד, milāt, “palanquin” or “litter of Solomon” (Cant 3 7; cf ver 9). See Palanquin.

LITTLE GENESIS. See Book of Jubilees.

LIVELY, liv’ly, LIVING, living (‘7, hāy; פָּז, sø): “Living,” sometimes “lively,” is the tr of hāy (often also tr “life”); it denotes all beings possessed of life (Gen 1 21 24; 2 19; Ex 21 35, “live”); we have frequently the phrase, “the land of the living” (as contrasted with shābāl, the abode of the dead), e.g. Job 28 13; Ps 27 13; 62 5; Isa 38 11; the characteristically Bib. expression, “the living God,” also frequently occurs (Josh 3 10; 1 8 17 26 8; 82 K 19 4; 84 K v 14 15; and also frequently in the NT as the tr of sø (Mt 16 16; 26 63; Jn 6 57, “the living Father”; Acts 14 15). “Lively” in Ex 1 19 (hāyēh) and Ps 38 19 denotes fulness of life, vigor; hāyēh, “a living being,” is mostly confined to Ezek. (ch 37) (1.5.13.14, etc), also Gen 1 28; 8 17, “living thing”; “living” is sometimes applied fig. to that which is not actually alive; thus we have the phrase “living waters” (Jer 2 13; 17 13; Zec 14 8, “living waters shall go out from Jerusalem” in contrast with stagnant waters—waters that can give life; so Jn 4 10 11 (bubbling up from the spring at bottom of the well); 7 38; Rev 7 17 AV; “living bread” (Jn 6 51); “a new and living way” (He 10 20), perhaps equivalent to “ever-living” (Rev 11 15); “living waters” (1 Pet 2 4 5) are those made alive in Christ; a “living hope” (a hope full of life), 1 Pet 1 3; “living” (sō) is sometimes also “manner of life” (Lk 15 13; Col 2 20); δίκαιος, “to lead or go through,” is also so tr (Tit 3 5); bios is “means of life,” tr “living” (Mk 12 44; Lk 8 43); “living,” in this sense, occurs in Apoc as the tr of sō, “Defraud not the poor of his living” (Eccles 4 1).

RV has “living” for “alive” (Lev 14 4), for “the lively” (Acts 7 70; Rom 16 21); “living stones” (1 Pet 2 5; 2 Pet 3 11); “living creatures” for “beasts” (Rev 4 6; 6 6, etc); “living” for “beasts” (Dt 11 6); “living things” for “beasts” (Lev 11 24 47); “living” for “Ps 68 9); “a fountain of waters” (Rev 7 17); “fountains of waters of life” for “trade” (Rev 18 17), “gain their living” for “work the sea” for “Son of the living God” (Jn 6 69), “the Holy One of God” (amended text).

W. L. WALKER

LIVER, liv’er (לֹא, kabhōd), derived from a root meaning “to be heavy,” being the heaviest of the viscera; LXX ἱππόρ, ἱππάρχη: The word is usually joined with the Hb yāḇērēth (see Capt.) (Ex 29 13 22; Lev 9 10 19) as a special portion set aside for the burnt offering.

This represents the large lobe or flap of the liver, ἄκονα τοῦ ἀκονοῦ, ἱππάρχη ἢ ἱππάρχων (thus LXX and Jos, Acts III, ix, 2, 286). Others, however, interpret it as the membrane which covers the upper part of the liver, sometimes called the “lesser omentum.” Thus the Vulg: reculcium testis. It extends from the fissures of the liver to the curve of the stomach. Still others consider it to be the “fatty mass” or “tissue” of the liver, which reaches to the kidneys and becomes visible upon the removal of the lesser omentum or membrane” (Driver and Whet, Leviticus, 60).

As in the scholastic psychology of the Middle Ages, the liver played an important part in the science of Sem peoples. It was the seat of feeling, and thus became synonymous with temper, dis-
position, character (cf Assyra kabidu, "liver," "temper," "character," and Arab. کبید, kabid, vulgar kibdi). Thus Jeremiah expresses his profound grief with the words: "My liver is pored upon the earth, because of the destruction of the daughter of my people" (Lam 2 11). The liver is also considered one of the most important and vital parts of the body (cf Virgil, cercum, òcur domicilia vitæ). A hurt in it is equivalent to death. So we find the fate of a man enticed by the flattering of a loose woman compared to that of the ox that "goeth to the slaughter . . . till an arrow strike through his liver as a breedeth 5 to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life" (Prov 7 22 23; the rest of the verse is obscure as to its meaning).

In a few passages of the OT, kâbhâd ("liver") and kâbhdâh ("glory") have been confounded, and we are in uncertainty as to the right tr. Several authors, to give but one example, would read kâbhdâ in Ps 16 9, for reasons of Heb poetical parallelism: Therefore my heart is glad and my liver (AV "glory") rejoiceth. While this is quite possible, it is not easy to decide, as according to Jewish interpretation "my glory" is synonymous with "my soul," which would present as proper a parallelism.

The liver has always played an important rôle in heathen divination, of which we have many examples in old and modern times among the Greeks, Etrurians, Romans and now among African tribes. The prophet Ezekiel gives us a Bib. instance. The king of Babylon, who had been seeking to find out whether he should attack Jerusalem, inquired by shaking "arrows to and fro, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver." (Ezk 21 21 [Heb ver 26; cf Tob 6 4 R; 8 2]. See Astrology, 3; Divination.

H. L. E. LEUBING

LIVING CREATURE, living krâ'tar: (1) (ם), nephesh ha'hayâh, or nefesh ha'hayâh [nephesh, "breath" or "living things"; hayâh, "living"; cf Arab. نفاس, nefs, "breath," نفاس, haiy, "living"]: In the account of the creation this term is used of aquatic animals (Gen 1 21), of mammals (Gen 1 24) and of any animals whatever (Gen 2 19).

(2) (י), hayâth, pl. of (י), hayâh): The name of the "living creatures" of Ezek 1 5-25, which had wings and the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle; cf Ezek 10 4. (ג), (ג), "living thing," "animal": The four "living creatures" (AV "beasts") of Rev 4 6, etc, the first like a lion, the second like a calf, the third having a face as of a man, and the fourth like an eagle, having each six wings. See Creatures.

ALFRED ELY DAY

LIZARD, lizard: The list of unclean "creeping things" in Lev 11 29.30 contains eight names, as follows:

(1) (ם), holédh, EV "weasel" (q.v.); (2) (ם), abbâr, EV "mouse" (q.v.); (3) (ם), gâbdh, AV "tor- toise," RV "great lizard" (q.v.); (4) (ם), (ם), anâkh, AV "tertum," RV "gecko" (q.v.); (5) (ם), ksâb, AV "chameleon," RV "land-crocodile" (q.v.); (6) (ם), kmâš, EV "lizard"; cf Arab. كَبْد (kibdi). (7) (ם), bômêl, AV "snail"; RV "sand-lizard" (q.v.); (8) (ם), (ם), tinâhâth, AV "mole," RV "chameleon" (q.v.). In Pro 30 28, we find (9) (ם), s'mâmîth, AV "spider," RV "lizard." Since (1), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) occur as names of animals only in this passage, and as the philo- logical evidence available is in most cases not very convincing, their determination is difficult and uncertain. RVm to "gecko" (Lev 11 30) has "Words of uncertain meaning, but probably denoting four kinds of lizards."

Among the many lizards of Palestine, the monitor and thorny-tailed lizard are remarkable for their size, and the chameleon for its striking appearance and habits. On etymological grounds, kôph, AV "chameleon," RV "land-crocodile" (Ger. Crocuta crocuta) chervatos, to be the thorny-tailed lizard; and tinâhâth, AV "mole," RV "chameleon" LXX aspilos, to be the chameleon. On the same grounds, bômêl, LXX pàl, might be the mole-rat. See Chameleon; Tortoise; Weasel.

The commonest lizard of Palestine is the rough-tailed agama, Agama stellio, Arab. بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ بَذَذْ BIBLICAL AND SCHOOL DICTIONARIES.

The commonest lizard is the "great lizard," (9) (ם), s'mâmîth (Ptyodactylus lobatus). The gecko, Ptyodactylus lobatus, is common in houses. By means of adhesive disks on the under sides of its toes, it clings with ease to smooth walls which other lizards cannot scale. Although perfectly harmless, it is believed to be poisonous, and is much feared. It is called סְאָבִי, (S'abai, "father of hardy"), either on account of its supposed poisonous qualities or because it has a semi-transparent and sickly appearance, being of a whist- yellow color with darker spots. It utters a little cry, which may be the reason why RV has "gecko" for סְאָבִי, AV "tertum." Various species of the genus Lacerta and its allies, the true lizards, may always be found searching for insects on trees and walls. They are scaly, like all lizards, but are relatively smooth and are prettily colored, and are the most attractive members of the group which are found in the country. They are called by the Arabs סְאָבִי (S'abai) or chameleon.

The skins include ribes uncinatissimus, and allied species, Arab. سُكْرِبَة, or عَنَقِي (škuée, škîbûs, shackos). They are smooth, light-colored lizards, and are found in sandy places. They cannot climb, but they run and burrow in the sand with remarkable rapidity. The dried body of the ribes uncinatissimus is an important feature of the primitive oriental materia medica, and may be found in the shops (officines) of the old-style apothecaries.

S'mâmîth (Prov 30 28, AV "spider," RV "lizard") is one of the "four things which are little . . . but . . . exceeding wise," RV reads: "The lizard taketh hold with his hands, Yet is she in kings' palaces."

LXX has καλάβης, kalabalès, which according to Liddell and Scott, is καλαβή, kalabôthi, a spotted lizard. There is no other 1.

2. Identif- lizard which fits this passage as does cations the gecko. If Gesenius is correct in deriving s'mâmâth from the y'samâm (cf Arab. samma, "to poison"), we have another reason for making this identification, in which case we must rule out the rendering of RVm, "Thou canst seize with thy hands."
For none of the names in Lev 11:20–30 have we as many data for identification as for swanem. For letf'ah, EV "lizard," LXX has ἄγαλα (ἄγαλα, halálát, which is the second variant of ἀγάλα). If we follow the LXX, therefore, we should render letf'ah "gecko." Tristram quotes Bochart as drawing an argument that letf'ah is a "gecko" from the Arab. γέκκο, to cling to the ground. This view is in accordance with the LXX.

It is of course untenable if 'dnakdh is "gecko," but it is certainly safe to do so in the absence of a clear indication to the contrary. This view seems to be little evidence available for deciding the identity of ḥōmēt, AV "small," RV "sand-lizard."

LXX has aGápa, aWára, and Vüg lacerta, both words for lizard. Gesenius refers the word to an obsolete form, ḥōmēt, "to bow down," to Ilp upon the ground. Tristram, NAB, cites Bochart as referring to a word meaning "to cling" to the ground. If by this means is the dink, there is no inherent improbability in the identification.

We have thus more or less tentatively assigned various words of the list to the monitor, the thorny-tailed agama, the gecko and its skink, but we have done nothing with the rough-tailed agama and the Lacertae, or true lizards, which are the commonest lizards of Pal, and this fact must be reckoned against the correctness of the assignement. The writers of RV have this to commend it, that it gives two small mammals followed by six lizards, and is therefore to that extent systematic. It is, however, neither guided in all cases by etymological considerations, nor does it follow LXX.

As none of the etymological arguments is very cogent, the writer can see no harm in consistently following LXX, understanding for (1) gál, weasel or pole-cat; for (2) wá, mouse; for (3), kroddalá, small lizards, either the monitor or the thorny-tailed lizard; for (4), magál, shrew or field-mouse; for (5), chámålín, chameleon; for (6), chálábát, gecko; for (7), sáw, Lacerta, or true lizard; for (8), anákal, mole-rat. On the other hand, the etymological considerations are to be taken into account and LXX abandoned when it conflicts with them we might have (1) kálál, mole-rat; (2) akÁbr, mouse; (3) GÁb, thorny-tailed lizard; (4), 'dnakdh, field-mouse; (5) kósh, monitor; (6) Idf'ah, gecko; (7) ḥōmēt, skink; (8) inánakálá, chameleon.

Neither of these lists has the systematic arrangement of that of RV, but we must remember that these writers were not zoologists, as is seen in the inclusion of the bat among birds (Lev 11:19; Dt 14:18), and of the hare and coney among ruminants (Lev 11:56; Dt 14:7).

ALFRED ELY DAY

LOAF, lôf. See Bread.

LO-AMMI, lo-âmî ("âGáD sâf, lo-âmî, "not my people"): The 2d son and 3d child of Gomer b. Diblaim, wife of the prophet Hosea (Hos 19). An earlier child, a daughter, had been named Lo-yahmah ("âGáD sâf, bîru-yâhmâh, "uncompasionated"). The names, like those given by Isaiah to his children, are symbolic, and set forth Hosea's conviction that Israel has, through sin, forfeited Jeho's compassion, and can no longer claim His protection. Of the branches of these names nothing further is known; but their symbolism is alluded to in Hos 2:13. This latter passage is quoted by Paul (Rom 9:25 f.). See Hosea; JEZEREEL.

JOHN A. LEES

LOCKS, lôks [2GáZ, tâát, [2GáZ, pêrâ, [3GáZ, tâát, mábîlâh, [4GáZ, tâát, ãbîlâh, (Gen. 39:25); See in general the article on HAIR. (1) The first word, tâát, appears not only as a personal name, such as is borne by the Jews on the four corners of the prayer-shawl or tallith and on the 'arba' kampóth (Dt 22:12), but in the NT by kpdôlós, krepidón (Mt 9:20; 14:36; 23:5; Mk 6:50; Lk 8:44). Once it is applied to a forehead of hair. The prophet Ezekiel, describing the sensations which accompanied his vision of Jesus, says: "He put forth the form of a hand, and took me by a loek of my head; and the Spirit lifted me up between earth and heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem" (Ezk 8 3). (2) The word pêrâ signifies the unshorn and disheveled locks of the Nazirite (Nu 6:5) or of the priests, the sons of Zadok (Ezk 44:20). (3) The Book of Jgs employs the word mábîlâh when speaking of the "seven locks" of Samson (Jgs 15:13,19), which really represent the plaited (etymologically, "interwoven") strands of hair still worn in our days by youthful Bedouin warriors. (4) R'vâqî (Cant 5:21) means the luxuriant hair of the Hebrew youth, which was the care of his exterior. It is called bushy (RV "curling") and black as a raven. AV trâî also the word kâmmâh with "locks" (Cant 4:1; 6:7; Isa 47:2), but RV has corrected this into "veil," leaving the word "locks" in Cant 4:1 m. H. L. E. LEUBING

LOCUST, lôk'ust: The tr of a large number of Heb and Gr words:

(1) ãbîrâh, "arbech, from ãbîrâh, râkhâh, "to increase" (cf Arab. 'abáh, râ'â'áh; "to increase"). (2) óôô, sâlâm, from obsolete ãbîrâh, râkhâh, "to swallow down." (3) ãbîrâh, hâr-gol (cf Arab. hâr-gol, "to run to the right or left," hâr-galat, "a company of horses" or "a swarm of lizards," hâr-jawâd, a kind of locust). (4) ãbîrâh, hâgâhâh (cf Arab. hâgâhâh, "to hide," "to cover"). (5) ãbîrâh, gâdám (cf Arab. gâdám, "to cut off"). (6) ãbîrâh, yâlekh; from ãbîrâh, "to line") (cf Arab. yâlêkkâ, "to dart out the tongue" [(used of a serpent). (7) ãbîrâh, hâjâl, from ãbîrâh, hâjâl, "to devour" (cf Arab. hâjâl, "crop" [(of a bird)]. (8) ãbîh, gâbâh, from obsolete ãbîrâh, râkhâh (cf Arab. gâbâh, "locust," "grasshopper," from ãbîrâh, râkhâh, "grasshopper," "to come out of a hole"). (9) ãbîh, gâbâh, from same ãbîh. (10) ãbîh, yâlêkkâ, from ãbîrâh, gâdám (omnepetotic), "to tinkle." "to ring" (cf Arab. gâdâm, "chink, to give a ringing sound" [(used of a horse's bit]; cf also Arab. gâdâm, fann, used of the sound of a drum or piece of metal, also of the humming of flies). (11) oôô, akâris (Gol. apâbôs, akâriston; dim. apâbôs, akâriston, a genus of locusts).

(1), (2), (3), (4) constitute the list of clean insects in Lev 11:21 f., characterized as "winged creeping things that go upon all fours, "which have legs above their feet, wherewith to leap upon the earth.

This manifestly refers to jumping insects of the order Orthoptera, such as locusts, grasshoppers and crickets, and is in contrast to the unclean "winged creeping things that go upon all fours," which may be taken to denote running Orthoptera, such as cockroaches, mole-crickets and ear-wigs, as well as insects of other orders.

"Arbech (1) is uniformly trâî "locust" in RV. AV has usually "locust," but "grasshopper" in Jgs 6:5; 7:12; Job 39:20; Jgs 16:23. LXX has usually ãpêk, akâris, "locust"; but has bôpôyôs, bôpôyôs, "wingless locust," in Lev 11:22; 1 Kâ 37 (ãkri's in the | passage, 2 Ch 6:28); Nâh 3:15; and ãnôôôêôs, ãnôôôêôs, "wingless locust," in Nah
Locust
Lo-debar
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3 17. 'Arbeh occurs (Ex 10 4-19) in the account of the plague of locusts; in the phrase "as locusts for multitude" (Jgs 6 5; 7 12); "more than the locusts ... innumerable" (Jer 46 23); "the locusts have no king. Yet so they forth all of them by bands." (Prov 30 27). 'Arbeh is referred to as a plague in Dt 28 38; 1 K 8 37; 2 Ch 6 28; Ps 78 46; in Joel and in Nah. These references, together with the fact that it is

the most used word, occurring 24 t, warrant us in assuming it to be one of the swarming species, i.e. Pachytylus migratorius or Schistocerca gregaria, which from time to time devastate large regions in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean.

Sa'lem (2), EV "bald locust," occurs only in Lev 11 22. According to Tristram, "bald" locust was given because it is said in the Talm to have a smooth head. It has been thought to be one of the genus Trzyzalis (T. unguliculata or T. nasuta), in which the head is greatly elongated. Hagal (5), AV "beetle," RV "cricket," being one of the leaping insects, cannot be a beetle. It might be a cricket, but comparison with the Arab. (see supra) favors a locust of some sort. The word occurs only in Lev 11 22. See Beetle.

Hagahah (4) is one of the clean leaping insects of Lev 11 22 (EV "grasshopper"). The word occurs in four other places, nowhere coupled with the name of another insect. In the report of the spies (Nu 13 33), we have the expression, "We were in our own sight as grasshoppers"; in Ex 12 5, "the grasshopper shall be a burden"; in Isa 40 22, "it is he that sitteth above the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers." These three passages distinctly favor the rendering "grasshopper" of EV. In the remaining passage (2 Ch 7 13), "... if I command the locust [EV] to devour the land," the migratory locust seems to be referred to. Doubtless this as well as other words was loosely used. In Eng. there is no sharp distinction between the words "grasshopper" and "locust."

The migratory locusts belong to the family Acridiidae, distinguished by short, thick antennae, and by having the organs of hearing at the base of the abdomen. The insects of the family Locustidae are commonly called "grasshoppers," but the same name is applied to these Acridiidae which are not found in swarms. The Locustidae have long, thin antenna, organs of hearing on

the tibiae of the front legs, and the females have long ovipositors. It may be noted that the insect known in America as the seventeen-year locust, which occasionally does extensive damage to trees by laying its eggs in the twigs, is a totally different insect, being a species of the order Rhynocheta. Species of Cicadae are found in Pal, but are not considered harmful.

The Book of Joel is largely occupied with the description of a plague of locusts. Commentators differ as to whether it should be interpreted literally or allegorically (see Joel). Four names 'arbeh (1), gádím (5), yelek (6) and hást (7), are found in Joel 1 4 and again in 2 25.

For the etymology of these names, see 1 above. Gadím (Am 4 9; Joel 1 4; 2 25) is uniformly rendered "palmer-worm" (LXX "psamō-" κηρύκας, "caterpillar"). Hást in RV (1 K 8 37; 2 Ch 6 28; Ps 78 46; Isa 40 24; Joel 1 4; 2 25) is uniformly rendered "caterpillar." LXX has indifferently brouchous, "wingless locust," and gevand, erustē, "rust" (in the sense of "weevil"). Yelek (Ps 105 34; Jer 51 14 27; Joel 1 4b; 2 25; Nah 3 16b 16) is everywhere "canker-worm" in RV, except in Ps 103 54, where ARV has "grasshopper.") AV has "caterpillar" in Ps and Jer and "canker-worm" in Joel and Nah. LXX has indifferently akris "caterpillar." "Palmer-worm" and "canker-worm" are both Old Eng. terms for caterpillars, which are strictly the larvae of lepidopterous insects, i.e. butterflies and moths.

While these four words occur in Joel 1 4 and 2 25, a consideration of the book as a whole does not show that the ravages of four different insect pests are referred to, but rather a single one, and that the locust. These words may therefore be regarded as different names of the locust, referring to different stages of development of the insect. It is true that the words do not occur in quite the same order in 1 4 and 2 25, but while the former verse indicates a definite succession, the latter does not. If, therefore, all four words refer to the locust, "palmer-worm," "canker-worm," "caterpillar" and the LXX erustē, "rust," are obviously inappropriate.

Gôbb (8) is found in the difficult passage (Am 7 1). "... he formed locusts [AV "grasshoppers"] AVm "green worms," LXX akris" in the beginning of the shooting up of the latter growth:" and (Nah 3 17) in "... thy marshals are as the swarms of grasshoppers [Heb gôbb gôbhah yevāk]. LXX "great grasshoppers," which encamp in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth they flee away, and their place is not known where they are." The related gôbh (9) occurs but once, in Isa 33 4, also a disputed passage, "And your spoil shall be gathered as the caterpillar [hôl] gathereth: as locusts [gebēth] leap shall men leap upon it." It is impossible to determine what species is meant, but some kind of locust or grasshopper fits any of these passages.

In Dt 28 42, "All thy trees and the fruit of thy land shall be as the locust [EV] possess," we have (10) cālôs (LXX erustē). The same word is τέρας in 2 8 6 5 and Ps 150 5 "cymbals," in Job 41 7 "fish-spears," and in Isa 13 18 "great." As stated in 1, above, it is an onomatopoetic word, and in Dt 28 42 may well refer to the noise of the wings of a flight of locusts.

In the NT we have (11) akris, "locust." the food of John the Baptist (Mt 3 4; Mk 1 6); the same word is used fig. in Rev 9 5 7; and also in Apc (Jth 2 20; Wsd 16 9; and see 2 Esd 4 24).

The swarms of locusts are composed of countless individuals. The statements sometimes read that they darken the sky must not be taken too literally.
They do not produce darkness; but their effect may be like that of a thick cloud. Their movements are largely determined by the wind.

3. Habits and while fields that are in their path may be laid waste, others at one side may not be affected. It is possible by vigorous waving to keep a given track clear of them, but usually enough men cannot be found to protect the fields from their ravages.

Large birds have been known to pass through a flight of locusts with open wings, filling their crops with the insects which they eat. 

W. J. saw the descent in the Jordan enjoying a similar feast, as the locusts fell into the meal locust, by means of ovipositor at the end of her abdomen, digs a hole in the ground, and deposits in it a mass of eggs, which are cemented together with a glandular secretion. An effective way of dealing with the locusts is to gather and destroy these eggs-masses, and it is customary for the local governments to offer a reward for the destruction of such 

measure of eggs. The young before they can fly are frequently swept into pits or ditches for the purpose and are burned.

The young are of the same general shape as the adult insects, differing only in being wingless. The three distinct stages in the metamorphosis of butterflies and other insects are not to be distinguished in locusts. They molt about six times, emerging from each molt larger than before. At first there are only two wings. After the third molt, small and 

less wings are found, but it is only after the last molt that they are able to fly. In the early molts, the tiny black nymphs are found in patches on the ground, hopping out of the way when disturbed. Later they run faster than a dog.

In all stages they are destructive to vegetation. Some remarkable pictures of their ravages are found in Joel 1 6, 7, “For a nation is come upon my land, strong, and without number; his teeth are as the teeth of a lion, and he hath the jaw-teeth of a lioness. He hath laid my vine waste, and my fig-tree, on my 

stem tree: he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away; the branches thereof are made white” (see also 2 9-20).

Locusts are instruments of the wrath of God (Ex 10 4-19; Dt 28 38-42; 2 Ch 7 13; Ps 78 46; 105 34; Nah 3 15-17; Wis 4 9; Rev 9 3). They typify an 

invading army (Jer 51 14-27). They are compared with horses (Joyo 2 4; Rev 9 7); in Job 59 20, Jehovah says of the horses “Hast thou appointed me for horses? AV ‘Canst thou make him afraid as a grasshopper?’ Locusts are among the ‘four things which are little upon the earth, but . . . are exceeding wise’ (Prov 30 27). Like the stars and sands of the sea, locusts are also of that which is, and cannot be numbered (Jgs 6 5 7; 7 12; Jer 46 23; Jth 2 20). Grasshoppers are a symbol of insignificance (Nu 13 33; Ecc 13 5; Isa 40 22; 2 Esd 4 24).

The Arabs prepare for food the thorax of the locust, which contains the great wing muscles. They pull off the head, which as it comes away brings with it a mass of the viscera, and they remove the abdomen (or “tail”), the legs and the wings. The thoraces, if not at once eaten, are dried and put away as a store of food for a lean season. The idea of feeding upon locusts when prepared in this way should not be so repugnant as eating the whole insect, for the light of this it is not incredible that the food of John the Baptist should have been ‘locusts and wild honey’ (Mt 3 4). See Locusts.

ALFRED ELY DAY

LOCUST

LODEUS; lod-w’ra (Ados, Loddeus, Loddeus; Swete reads Laodos with Dolidas as variant in A; AV Dad deus, Saddeus): The captain, who was in the place of the treasury. Ezekiel 50 25; 59 15 says that he who “might execute the priest’s office” (1 Esd 8 46); called ‘Iddo’ in Ezr 18 7.

LO-DEBAR ló-de-br; ló-de’br (לֹדוֹבָר, לֹדוֹבָר): A place in Gilead where dwelt Machir, son of Ammiel, who sheltered Mephibosheth, son of Saul, after that monarch’s death (2 S 9 4), until he was sent for by David. This same Machir met David with supplies when he fled to Gilead from Absalom (17 27). It is possible that the same place as Lidebar in Josh 13 26 (Rv.). No certain identification is possible; but Schumacher (Northern ‘Ajlun, 101) found a site with the name ‘Idbar about 6½ miles E of ‘Umm Keis, N. of the great aqueduct, which may possibly represent the

(Lect 9 32). Hence he was summoned by messengers from Joppa on the death of Dorcas.

The three governments of Aphaeraem, Lydda and Ramathaim were added to Judea from the country of Samaria by King Deme- trius II (1 Macc 11 34). Lydda pre- 

1. Scriptural (1 Ch 8 12). The children of Lod, Notices Hadid and Ono, to the number of 725, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 33; Neh 7 57 [221]). The town lay in the plain of Jopheth, perhaps the same gā-hā-ḥārēm, “the valley of craftsmen” (Neh 11 35). In the NT it appears as Lydda. Here the apostle Peter visited the saints and healed the palsied Aenesas

(Lyddar) Mac-cabean Jerus, into which Judea was divided
ancient city. Lidebir, at least, seems to be placed on the northern boundary of Gilead. The modern village stands on the southern shoulder of Wady Samur. There is a good spring to the E., a little less than a mile, while ancient remains are found in the neighborhood.

W. Ewing

LODGE, loj (Ł) [In; kata
tax
ênô, kata
tax
ênô, etc.]: To stay or dwell, temporarily, as for the night (Gen 32 13; Nu 32 51; Josh 2 1 AV; Judges 8; Lk 13 19; Mt 21 17, 18, AV; Luke 16, or permanently (Ruth 1 16). In Isa 1 8, "a lodge [wtlânâh] in a garden of cucumbers," the meaning is "hut," "cottage." "Evil thoughts" are said to "lodge" in the wicked (Jer 4 14).

LOFT: In 1 K 17 23, changed in RV to "chamber."

LOFTILY, lof'ti-li, LOFTINESS. lof'ti-nes, LOFTY: The first form is only in Ps 73 8, where it means "haughtily," as if from on high. The second is found only in Jer 48 29, where the loftiness of Moab also means his haughtiness, his grand and self-conceit.

LOFTHILY likewise means "haughty," "lifted up" (cf Ps 131 1; Isa 2 11; Prov 30 13). In Isa 26 5 it refers to a self-secure and boastful city. In Mt 15 15 it is used in a good sense of God who really is high and supreme. Isaiah uses the Hebrews, equal to about 1 pint. See Weights and Measures.

LOGIA, log'i-a, THE (Aêga, Logia): The word logia, which is a dimin. of logos, was regularly used of Divine utterances. There are examples in the classics, the LXX. The word is usually given to the Logia of Jesus in the NT. In and in four passages in the NT (Acts 7 85; 1 Co 2 1-2; Heb 5 12; 1 Pet 4 11) where it is uniformly rendered both in AV and RV "oralces." It is not, therefore, surprising that early Christian writers, who thought of Christ as Divine, applied this term to His sayings also. We find this use, according to the usual interpretation, in the title of one of the Papias fragments preserved by Eusebius, Logiôn kurtikôn ezkêptai, "Exposition of the Lord's Logia" (HE, III, 39), in that writer's obscure reference to a Heb or Aram. writing by the apostle Matthew (ib), and in Poly
carp's Ep. (§ 7), "the logia of the Lord." The modern use of the word is twofold: (a) as the name of the document referred to by Papias which may or may not be the Q of recent inquirers; (b) as the name of recently discovered sayings ascribed to Jesus. For the former of Gospels. The latter is the theme of this article.

About 93 miles from the railway station of Beni Mazur, 121 miles from Cairo, a place now called Behnasa marks the site of an ancient city called by the Greeks Oxyrhynchos, from the name of a sacred fish, the modern binni, which had long been known as a great Christian center in early times and was therefore selected by Missionary Geologists as the site of the Logia, under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund. They began work on the ruins of the town, January 11, 1897, and on the following day discovered a papyrus leaf inscribed with a number of sayings introduced by the formula Logion, "saith Jesus," some of which were at once seen to be quite new. When excavation was resumed in February, 1903, a second fragment was discovered, which must have belonged to the same or a similar collection, as the formula "saith Jesus" is employed in exactly the same way, and the sayings exhibit the same mixed character. The first of these texts (called by the discoverers logia, but the short preface to the second fragment suggests that the word used in the original title may have been logiot, which is found in Acts 20 35 as the title perhaps of a collection of sayings of Jesus used by the apostle Paul). It is convenient, however, to retain logia, at any rate for the present. Other remains of early Christian texts have been found on the same site (cf AGRAPHA) but none of precisely the same character.

The first fragment, found and published in 1897, afterward referred to as A, comes measuring in its present state 51 x 31 inches and having 42 lines on the two pages. As it is broken at the top it is impossible, in the absence of another text to ascertain how much has been lost. At the top right

hand corner of one page are the letters sina, aphia, used as numerals, that is 11, and it has been suggested that this, with other characteristics, marks the page as the first of the two. The uncial writing belongs to the 3rd cent., perhaps to the early part of it. The text is fairly complete except at the end of the third, or the beginning of the fifth, following line. The second fragment, henceforth referred to as B, found in 1903 and published in 1904, has also 42 lines, but on only one page or column. The Christian text being written on the back of a roll the recto of which contained a survey list. The uncial is somewhat uncial, and the date, like that of A, seems to be also the 3rd cent., but perhaps a little later. It is unfortunately very defective, the bit of papyrus being broken vertically throughout, so that several letters are lost at the end of each line, and also horizontally for parts of several lines at the bottom.

Seven of these sayings, or logia, inclusive of the preface of B, have or can-ontain canonical parallels, namely:

1. A1, which coincides with the usual text of Lk 6 41; (2) Alex (according to the editio princeps, 60), which comes very close to Lk 4 24; (3) A6 (or 7), a variant of Mt 5 14; (4) the saying contained in the preface of B which resembles Lk 8 52; (5) B2, II. 7 f. "The kingdom of heaven is within you," which resembles us of Lk 17 21; (6) B3, II. I 4, "Many that are first shall be last, and the last first," which corresponds to Mt 10 31; cf Mt 19 30; Lk 15 30; (7) B4, II. 2-3. "That which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee: for there is nothing hid in heaven that shall not be made manifest," which is like Mk 4 22 (cf Mt 28 26; Lk 12 2). These parallels or partial-parallel-isms are found in the following citations are-are, with one exception, of synoptic character.

The other seven or eight logia, although not without possible echoes of the canonical Gospels in thought and diction, are all non-canonical and with one exception new.

Three of these, namely B2 and 3 (apart from the canonical sayings given above) and 5, may get set aside as too uncertain of for any value. What is preserved of the first, "Who are they that draw you [MS. us] to the kingdom?" etc. is indeed very tempting, but the restoration of the lost matter is too precarious for any suggestion to be more than an ingenious conjecture. This is seen by comparing the rest of this logion by the discoverers, Dr. Swete and Dr. C. H. Taylor, with that proposed by Professor Freeman (Oxoni, 329). While the Eng. scholars take klinô in the sense of "draw," the German takes it in the sense which it has in the NT, "drag," with the result of an engendering (as to the meaning and even the subject of the logion. The logia which rest of interest, although the significance of at least one is exceedingly obscure. The number of the sayings is not certain. Dr. Taylor has brought forward two couple two distinct utterance brought together by the compiler. If this suggestion is correct, the words after A3 in the editio princeps are regarded as belonging to it and not as the remains of a separate logion, we get the following eight sayings:

(1) "Except ye fast to the world [or from the world"]; ye shall in no wise know the discovery of God" (A2a); (2) "Except ye keep the asbath
(Taylor "sabbathize the sabbath"), ye shall not see the Father" (A2b); (3) "I stood in the midst of the world, and in flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I thirst among them" (A3a); (4) "My soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart and see not their wretchedness and their poverty; yea (the last clause restored by conjecture) (A3b); (5) "Wherever there are two they are not without God, and where there is one alone I say I am with him (after Blase). Raise the stone and (there) thou shalt find me: cleave the wood (Taylor, "the tree") and there am I" (A4); (6) "A physician does not work cures on them that know him" (A5b); (7) "Thou hearest with one ear but the other thou hast closed" (large, conjectural but almost certain) (A6); (8) "(There is nothing buried which shall not be raised" (or "known") (B4, 1. 5).

Attempts have been made to trace the collection represented by these fragments (assuming that they belong to the same work) to some lost gospel—the Gospel according to the Egyptians (Harnack, Van Manen), the Gospel of the Ebionites or the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles (Zahn), or the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Mattithai), but none of these has been able to prove that there was a collection ofLogia. This is largely because of the nature of the material. It is not possible that the script in which this statement was made belongs not to the whole collection but to a part of it. The whole work may, as Swete suggests (Expos. T. VII. 444), have been entitled "Words of Jesus to the Twelve," and this may have been the portion addressed to Thomas. The other fragment, A, might belong to a section associated with the name of another apostle. In any case these sayings have formed to some considerable extent, as we know of material for 24 pages or columns of about 21 or 22 lines each. So far as can be judged the writing was not a gospel in the ordinary sense of that term, but a collection of sayings perhaps bearing considerable resemblance as to the form to the Logia of Matthew mentioned by Papias.

The remains of B5, however, show that a saying might be prefixed with introductory matter. Perhaps a short narrative was sometimes interpolated. The relation in which the canonical Gospels cannot be determined with present evidence. The sayings preserved generally exhibit the synoptic type, perhaps more specifically the Lukian type, but Johannine echoes, that is, possible traces of the thought and diction represented in the Fourth Gospel, are not absent (cf A, logia 2f, and preface to B). It seems not improbable that the compiler had our four Gospels before him, but nothing can be proved. There is no distinct sign of heretical influence. The much debated word the wood and the stone (A4d) undoubtedly lends itself to pantheistic teaching, but can be otherwise understood.

Under these circumstances the date of the collection and the present may be fixed except in a very general way. If our papyri which represent two copies were written, as the discoverers think, in the 3d cent., that fact and the indubitably archaic character of the sayings make it all but certain that the text as arranged is not later than the 2d cent. To what part of the cent. it is to be assigned is at present undiscoverable. Sanday inclines to about 120 AD, the finders suggest about 140 AD as the terminus ad quem, Zahn dates 160–70 AD, and Dr. Taylor 150–200 AD. Further research may solve these problems but, with the resources now available, all that can be said is that we have in the Logia of Oxyrhynchus a few glimpses of an early collection of sayings ascribed to Jesus which circulated in Egypt in the 3d cent. of great interest and possibly of considerable value, but of completely unknown origin.

LITERATURE.—Of the extensive literature which has gathered round the Logia—as many as fifty publications relating to A only in the first few months—only a few can be mentioned here. A was first published in 1897 as a pamphlet and after 1897 as No. 1 of Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Valuable articles by Cross and Harnack appeared in Expos. V. vol VI. 257 ff. 322 ff. 401 ff, an important lecture by Swete in Expos. T. VII. 544 ff. 568, and a very useful pamphlet by Sanday and Lock in the same year. B appeared in 1904 in pamphlet form and as No. 564 of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, with a fuller comm. Dr. C. Taylor's pamphlets on A and B issued respectively in 1899 and 1905. A useful lecture on B, Expos. T. XV. 488 ff., are of exceptional significance for the study of the subject. Cf also Grifflne, The Unwritten Sayings of Christ (A only), 1905; Zahn, Ancient Texts, No. 8. pp 11 ff. and 11, pp. 17 ff.; Kellers, Abhandlungen, II. 1905, 1906. cf. The Logia. Extra vol.; also arts. on "Unwritten Sayings" in HDB, 1909, and DCG.

WILLIAM TAYLOR SMITH


III. ALEXANDRIAN Synthesis Philo

IV. CHRISTIAN REALIZATION 1. Pauline Doctrine 2. Doctrine in the Hebrews 3. Doctrine in Fourth Gospel (1) Content of Doctrine (a) Relation of Logos to God (b) Relation of Logos to World (2) Origin of the Logos (a) Hebrew Source (b) Hellenic Source (c) Contrast between Philo and John

V. PATRIARCHAL DEVELOPMENT

LITERATURE. The doctrine of the Logos has exerted a decisive and far-reaching influence upon speculative and Christian thought. The word has a long history, and the evolution of the idea it embodies is really the unfolding of man's conception of God. To comprehend the relation of the Deity to the world has been the aim of all religious philosophy. While widely divergent views as to the Divine manifestation have been conceived, from the dawn of Western speculation, the Gr word logos has been employed with a certain degree of uniformity by a series of thinkers to express and define the nature and mode of God's revelation.

Logos signifies in classical Gr both "reason" and "word." Though in Bib. Gr the term is mostly employed in the sense of "word," we cannot properly dissociate the two significations. Every word implies a thought. It is impossible to imagine a time when God was without thought. Hence thought must be eternal as the Deity. The "thought" is probably the best for the Gr term, since it denotes, on the one hand, the faculty of reason, or the thought inwardly conceived in the mind; and, on the other hand, the thought outwardly expressed through the vehicle of language. The two ideas, thought and speech,
are indubitably blended in the term logos; and in every employment of the word, in philosophy and Scripture, both notions of thought and its outward expression are intimately connected.

In this essay we will attempt to trace the evolution of the doctrine from its earliest appearance in Gr philosophy through its Heb and Alexandrian phases till it attained its richest expression in the writings of the NT, and esp., in the Fourth Gospel.

1. Greek Speculation. — The earliest speculations of the Greeks were occupied with the world of Nature, and the first attempts at philosophy take the shape of a search for some unitary principle to explain the diversity of the universe.  

Heracleitus was practically the first who sought to account for the variability of the world in a change by a law or ruling principle. This proposition of his was all the more significant in that it was a truly revolutionary one. Heracleitus, but no one in antiquity except him, could say things are: they come into being and pass away. To account for this state of perpetual becoming, Heracleitus was led to seek out a new and primary element from which all things take their rise. This substance he conceived to be that which he had perceived all previous thinkers had conjured out, but something more subtle, mysterious and potent—fire, this eternal, self-consuming and yet all-transforming activity—now darting upward as a flame, now sinking to an ember and now vanishing as smoke—in fact, once the symbol and essence of life. But it is no arbitrary or lawless element. If there is flux everywhere, all things must have a place according to "measured" Reality — an "attainment" of opposites, a tension or harmony of conflicting elements. Heracleitus saw all the mutations of being governed by a rational and unalterable law. This law he calls sometimes "Justice," sometimes "Harmony"; more frequently "Logos" or "Reason," and in two passages at least, "God." Fire, Logos, God are fundamentally the same. It is the eternal energy of the universe pervading all its substance and preserving in unity and harmony the perpetual diversity of its phenomenal existence. Thus, Heracleitus sometimes calls this rational principle God, it is not probable that he attached to it any definite idea of the triad. The God of Heracleitus is not above the world of becoming, even prior to it. It is in it, its inner pervasive energy sustains it, and its inherent potentiality is the reason why the entire universe forms a single living connected whole and that all particulars are the determinate forms assumed by the primitive power which they conceived as never-resting, all-pervading fire.

Little was done by the immediate successors of Heraclitus to develop the doctrine of the Logos, and as the distinction between mind and matter became more defined, the term nous superseded that of Logos as the rational force of the world. Anaxagoras was the first thinker who introduced the idea of a supreme intellectual principle which, while independent of the world, governed it. His conception of the nous or "mind" is, however, vague and confused, hardly distinguishable from corporeal matter. By the artificial introduction of a power acting externally upon the world, a dualism is created, which continues its life after philosophy, was created. At the same time it is the merit of Anaxagoras that he was the first to perceive some kind of distinction between mind and matter and to suggest a teleological explanation of the universe.

2. Anaxagoras. — Anaxagoras superseded that of Logos as the rational force of the world. Anaxagoras was the first thinker who introduced the idea of a supreme intellectual principle which, while independent of the world, governed it. His conception of the nous or "mind" is, however, vague and confused, hardly distinguishable from corporeal matter. By the artificial introduction of a power acting externally upon the world, a dualism is created, which continues its life after philosophy, was created. At the same time it is the merit of Anaxagoras that he was the first to perceive some kind of distinction between mind and matter and to suggest a teleological explanation of the universe.

But though the word is frequently used, it is nous and not Logos which answers his conception of the relation of the God and the world.

3. Plato. — The special doctrine of the Logos does not appear in the dialogue, except perhaps in the Timaeus, where the word is employed as descriptive of something by which the world has arisen. But if the word does not frequently occur in the dialogues, there is not wanting a basis upon which a Logos-doctrine might be constructed. The conception of archetypal ideas affords a philosophical expression of the relation of God to the world. As the idea of a dominating principle of reason was lifted to a higher plane by the distinction which Plato made between the world of sense and the world of理念, the latter took the place of the former. According to Plato, true reality or absolute being consisted of the "Ideas" which he conceived as thoughts residing in eternity and having the creation of the world. To these abstract concepts was ascribed the power of giving substantial reality to the concrete visible things of the world were copies or images. Compared with the "Ideas," the world of things was a world of shadows; but it was not an exact copy of the Platonic doctrine of ideas, which as we shall see, Plato afterward seized upon and elaborated in connection with his general conception of the transcendency of God and His relation to the visible world. Three features of Plato's view ought to be particularly noted, one of special significance for our subject: (1) While God is regarded by Plato as the integral power of the world, this world is formed by two stages: a Hellenistic and a Heb; or, more correctly, a pre-Christian and a Christian. The theory of Philo and of the Alexandrian thinkers generally may be regarded as the connecting link between the Gr and the Heb within the framework of the pre-Christian speculation on the subject is marked by the names of Heraclitus, Plato and the Stoics. Philo paves the way for the Christian doctrine of Paul, Hebrews and the Johannine Gospels.

4. Aristotle. — Aristotle sought to solve in the fundamental problem of Gr philosophy as to how behind the changing multiplicity of appearances an abiding Being is to be thought by means of the concept of development. Plato had regarded the Ideas as the causes of phenomena — causes different from the objects themselves. Aristotle's next step was to overcome the duality of Plato by representing reality as the essence which contains all the phenomena, and unfolds into the particular manifestations of the sensible world. This conception has exerted a powerful influence not only in philosophy but particularly upon the monotheistic view of the world. At the same time Aristotle's "noumenal" view, as in the "God" of Plato. Inasmuch as God was conceived as pure thought apart from the world in eternal blessedness, Aristotle did not succeed in resolving the duality of God and the universe which exercised the Gr mind.

5. Stoics. — Both in the realms of Nature and of duty. Interested more in ethical or physical problems, they were compelled to seek a general metaphysical basis for a rational moral life. Some unitary idea must be found which will overcome the duality between God and the world and remove the opposition between the sensuous and supersensuous which Plato and Aristotle had failed to reconcile. For this end the Logos-doctrine of Heraclitus seemed to present itself as the most satisfactory solution of the problem. The fundamental idea of the Stoics is the conceptual view that the entire universe forms a single living connected whole and that all particulars are the determinate forms assumed by the primitive power which they conceived as never-resting, all-pervading fire. This eternal activity or Divine world-power which contains within itself the conditions and processes of all things, they call Logos or God. More particularly as the productive power, the Deity is named the Logos creaturelogos, logos spermatikos, the Seminal Logos or generative principle of the world. This vital energy not only pervades the universe, but unfolds itself into innumerable logos spermatikoi or formative forces which energize the manifold phenomena of Nature and life. This subordination of the Logos not only constitutes the rational order of the universe but supplies a norm of duty for the regulation of the activities of life. Hence in the moral sphere to live according to Nature is the all-determining law of conduct.

II. Hebrew Anticipation of Doctrine. — So far we have traced the development of the Logos-doctrine in Gr philosophy. We have now to note a parallel movement in Heb thought. Though strictly and definitively correct to separate the Inner Reason from the outer expression in the Heb conception of the Hellenistic usage the doctrine was sub-
st actually a doctrine of Reason, while in Jewish lit., it was more esp. the outward expression or word that was emphasized.

The sources of this conception are to be found in the OT and in the post-canonical literature. The God who is made known in Scripture is not the “Firstborn” one who actively reveals Revelation Himself. He is exhibited therefore of God (Ps 107:20); and generally as possessor of personal qualities (Isa 55:2; Ps 147:15). Revelation is frequently called “the Word of the Lord,” signifying the spoken as distinct from the written word.

In particular, we may note certain ambivalences of distinction of persons within the Being of God. It is contended that the phrase “Let us make” in Gen points to a plurality of persons in the Godhead. This indefinite language is more fully explained by the in Deity priestly ritual in Nu (6:23-26) and in the Psalter. In Jer, Ezr and the vision of Isa (6:2-8) the same idea of Divine plurality is implied, showing that the OT presented a doctrine of God far removed from the sterile monotheism of the Koran (cf. Liddon, Divinity of Our Lord, and König).

Passing from these indefinite intuitions of personal distinction in the Being of God, we may mention first that series of remarkable apparitions described as the “Angel of Jehovah” or of the “Commandant”; and secondly, the “Angel” whose appearance is sometimes identified with Jehovah (Gen 16:11-13; 32:29-31; Ex 3:2; 13:21), sometimes distinguished from Him (Gen 26:15; 24:7; 32:12); sometimes present in both aspects (Ex 3:6; Zec 1:11). Wisd. and God revealing Himself in this way to Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Hagar, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Manoah. Who was this angel? The earliest Fathers reply with general unanimity that He was the “Word” or “Son of God.” But while the earlier church teachers distinguished between the “Angel of the Lord” and the Father, the Arians sought to widen the distinction into a difference of natures, since an invisible Being must be held to be identifiable with a physical person. Augustine insists upon the Scriptural truth of the invisibility of God as God, the Son not being the Father. He was not present, however, to say which of the Divine persons manifested Himself in this or that instance; and his guidance has been followed by later teachers of the church, that is the theologians were not direct appearances of a Person of the Trinity, but through the mediation of God created being.

A further development of the conception of a personal medium of revelation is discernible in the description of Wisdom as given in some of the later books of the OT. The wisdom of Jewish wisdom is more than a human endowment or even an attribute of God, and may be said to attain almost to a personal reflex of the Deity, reminding us of the archetypal idea of Plato. In Job, wisdom is represented as existing in God and as communicated in its highest form to man. It is the eternal thought in which the Divine Architect ever beholds His future creation (Job 28:21-27). In Job 38:38 wisdom is revealed only as underlying the laws of the universe and not as wholly personal. In the Book of Prov it is coeternal with the Creation (Prov 3:22-23). It may be doubtful whether this is the language of a real person or only of a poetic personification. But sometimes the personified wisdom is inferred from the contents of the sapiential books outside the Canon. Sometimes it is existing from all eternity with the God. In Bar and still more in Wisd the Sophia is distinctly personal—"the very image of the goodness of God." In the apologetical books, supposed to the work of an Alexandrian writer before Philo, the influence of Gr thought is obvious, and only as an agent of the Word. Wisd and Manoah, the Angel in creation and judgment.

Finally in the Tgs., which were popular interpretations of the OT Scripture, there was a tendency to avoid anthropomorphic terms or such expressions in the concept of God's nature and manifestation. Here the three doctrines of the Word, the Angel, and Wisdom are introduced as mediating factors between God and the world. In particular the chiasm between the Divine and human is bridged by terms as m'shōrah ("word") and šekhelōn ("glory"). The m'shōrah proceeds from God, and is His messenger in Nature and history; but it is not the use of this expression implied the need of a Mediator, the Word does not seem to have been actually identified with the Messiah.

III. Alexandrian Synthesis. — We have seen that according to Gr thought the Logos was conceived as a rational principle or impersonal energy by means of which the world was fashioned and ordered, and while according to Heb thought the Logos was regarded as a mediating agent or personal organ of the Divine Being. The Hellenistic doctrine, in other words, was chiefly a doctrine of the Logos as Reason; the Jewish, a doctrine of the Logos as Word.

In the philosophy of Alexandria, of which Philo was an illustrious exponent, the two phases were combined, and Hellenistic speculation was united with Heb tradition for the purpose of showing that the OT taught the true philosophy and embodied all that was highest in Gr revelation. In Philo the two streams meet and flow henceforth in a common bed. The all-pervading Energy of Heraclitus, the archetypal Idea of Plato, the concept of Aristotle, the immanent Order of the Stoics are taken up and fused with the Jewish conception of Jehovah, who, while transcending all finite existences, is revealed through His intermediary Word. As the result of this Philonic synthesis, an entirely new idea of God is formulated. While Philo admits the eternity of matter, he rejects the Gr view that the world is eternal, since it denies the creative activity and providence of God. At the same time he departs from Heb thought that the Word was in the world, and is therefore compelled to connect the one with the other by the interposition of subordinate Powers. These Divine forces are the embodiment of the Ἰδέα, ἱδεία, of Plato and the Ἀγγέλος, ἄγγελος, of the OT. The double meaning of Logos—thought and speech—is made use of by Philo to explain the relation subsisting between the ideal world existing only in the mind of God and the sensible universe which is its visible embodiment. He distinguishes two Logos inherent in God (λόγος ἐνθυάτης, λόγος ἐνθυάτητος), corresponding to reason in man, and the Logos which emanates from God (λόγος προφητής, λόγος προφητικός), corresponding to the spoken Word as the Godhead in creation and revelation; and in His inner essence God is incomprehensible by any but Himself. He has created the intelligible cosmos by His self-activity. The Word is therefore in Philo the rational order manifested in the visible world.

Some special features of the Philonic Logos may be noted: (1) It is distinguished from God as the instrument from the Cause. (2) As instrument by which God makes the world, it is in its nature intermediate between God and man, and is the expression of God and the rational principle of the visible world, the Logos is "the Eldest or First-born Son of God." It is the "bond" (βιβρος, δεισις) holding together all things (De Mundi, i, 592), the law which determines the order of the universe and guides the destinies of men and nations (ib). Sometimes Philo calls it the "Man of God"; or the "Heavenly man," the immortal father of all noble men; sometimes he calls it "the Second God," "the Image of God," or "the Agent of God." From this it follows that the Logos must be the Mediator between God and man, the "Intersensor" (ἰσχευτης, hikithēs) or "High Priest," who is the ambassador from heaven and interprets God to man. Philo almost exhausts the vocabulary of Heb metaphor in describing the
Logos. It is "manna," "bread from heaven," "the living stream," the "sword" of Paradise, the guiding "cloud," the "rock" in the wilderness. It is the name by which the NT describes Christ, and the later correlative of the NT descriptions of Christ, lead us to ask: Is Philo's Logos a personal being or a pure abstraction? Philo himself seems to waver in his answer, and the Greek and the Jew in him are hopelessly at issue. That he personifies the Logos is implied in the figures he uses; but to maintain its personality would have been inconsistent with Philo's whole view of God and the world. His Jewish faith inclines him to speak of the Logos as personal, while his Hellenism dispels the impression of an impersonal interpretation. Confronted with this alternative, the Alexandrian wavers in indecision. After all has been said, his Logos really resolves itself into a group of Divine ideas, and is conceived, not as a distinct person, but as the thought of God which is expressed in the rational order of the visible universe.

In the speculations of Philo, whose thought is so frequently couched in Bib. language, we have the gropings of a sincere mind after a truth which was disclosed in its fulness only by the revelation of Pentecost. In Philo, Gr. philosophy, as has been said, "stood almost at the door of the Christian church." But if the Alexandrian thinker could not create the Christian doctrine of the Logos, he prepared the soil for its acceptance. In this sense his Logos-doctrine has a real value in the evolution of Christian thought. Philo was not, indeed, the master of the apostles, but even if he did nothing more, he added to their treasures; and he has, whether indirectly or directly, determined the doctrine of Christendom.

IV. Christian Realization.—We pass now to consider the import of the term in the NT. Here it signifies usually "utterance," "speech" or "narrative." In reference to God it is used sometimes for a special utterance, or for revelation in general, and even for the medium of revelation—Holy Scripture. In the prologue of the Fourth Gospel it is identified with the personal Christ; and it is this employment of the term in the light of its past history which creates the interest of the problem of the NT doctrine.

The author of the Fourth Gospel is not, however, the first NT writer who represents Jesus as the Logos. Though Paul is the first, he does not actually use the word in this connection, Doctrine he has anticipated the Johannine conception. Christ is represented by St. Paul as before His advent living a life with God in heaven (Col 1 14; Rom 10 6). He is conceived as one in whose image earthly beings, and esp. men, were made (1 Cor 11 7; 15 45–49); and even as participating in the creation (1 Cor 8 6). In virtue of His distinct being He is called God's "own Son" (Rom 8 32).

Whether Paul was actually conversant with the writings of Philo is disputed (of Pfeiderer, Urchristentum), but already when he wrote to the Colossians and Ephesians the influence of Alexandrian speculation was being felt in the church. Incipient Gnosticism, which was an attempt to correlate Christianity with the order of the universe as a whole, was current. Most noticeable are the pointed allusions to gnostic watchwords in Eph 3 19 ("fulness of God") and in Col 2 3 ("Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden"), where Paul shows that everything sought for in the doctrine of the Pleroma is really given in Christ. The chief object of these epistles is to assert the unique dignity and absolute power of the Person of Christ. He is the one to whom the Acorns which make up the Pleroma, as gnostic teachers affirm, but a real and personal Being in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells. He is not merely an inferior workman creating glory for a higher Master. He creates for Himself out of the fulness of His own being (Col 1 15–20). Though throughout this ep. the word "Logos" is never introduced, it is plain that the eikones, eikonon, of Paul is equivalent in rank and function to the Logos of John. Each exists prior to creation, each is equal to God, shares His life and cooperates in His work.

In the Ep. to the He we have an equally explicit, if not fuller, declaration of the eternal Deity of Christ. Whatever may be said of the Johannine author of the Ep. to the He, we are certain that he was familiar with the Phinean writings. Who this writer was we do not know; but his Philonism suggests that he may have been an Alexandrian Jew, possibly even a disciple of Philo. In language seemingly adapted from that source ("Son of God," "Firstborn," "above angels," "Image of God," "Agent in Creation," "Mediator," "Great High Priest," "Melchizedek") the author of the Ep. to the He speaks of Christ as a reflection of the majesty and immitot of the nature of God, just as in a seal the impression resembles the stamp. The dignity of His title indicates His essential rank. He is expressly addressed as God; and the expression "the effulgence of His glory" (1:14) seems to indicate that He is one with God (He 1 3). By Him the worlds have been made, and all things are upheld by the fiat of His word (ver 3). In the name He bears, in the honors ascribed to Him, in His relation to the Father, He is presented both to heaven and earth (ver 10), we recognize (in language which in the letter of it strongly reminds us of Philo, yet in its spirit so different) the description of one who though clothed with human nature is no mere subordinate being, but the possessor of all Divine prerogatives and the sharer of the very nature of God Himself.

In the Fourth Gospel the teaching of Paul and the author of the Ep. to the He finds its completest expression. The letter to the He stands in a sense half-way between Pauline and Johannean teaching" (Weizsäcker, Apos. Fourth tolic Age, V, 11). It is, however, too much to say that these three writers do not represent a single line of development. While all agree in emphasizing the fact of Christ's Divine personality and eternal being, Paul represents rather the religious interest, the Ep. to the He the philosophical. In the Johannine Christology the two elements are united.

In discussing the Johannine doctrine of the Logos we shall speak first of its content and secondly of its terminology.

1. Content of doctrine.—The evangelist uses "Logos" 6 t as a designation of the Divine preexistent person of Christ (Jn 1 14; 1 Jn 1 1; Rev 19 13), but he never puts it into the mouth of Christ. The idea which John sought to convey by this term was not essentially different from the conception of Christ as presented by Paul. But the use of the word gave a precise and emphasis to the being of Christ which the writer must have felt was esp. needed by the class of readers for whom his Gospel was intended. The Logos with whom the Fourth Gospel starts is a Person, Bishops of the Synoptics had long been familiar with the term "Word of God" as equivalent to the Gospel; but the essential purport of John's Word is Jesus Himself, His Person. We have here an essential change of meaning: one of the two is indeed connected; but the conception of the perfect revelation of God in the Gospel passes into

In the prologue (which, however, must not be regarded as independent of, or having no integral connection with, the rest of the book) there is stated: (a) the relation of the Logos to God; and (b) the relation of the Logos to the world.

(2) Relation of Logos to God: Here the author makes three distinct affirmations: (i) "In the beginning was the Word." The evangelist carries back the 'Word' to God to a point prior to all temporal things. Nothing is said of the origin of the world. As in Gen 1 1, so here there is only implied that the Logos was existent when the world began to be. When as yet nothing was, the Logos was. Though the eternal preexistence of the Word is not actually stated, it is implied. (ii) "The Word was with God." Here His personal existence is more specifically defined. He stands distinct from, yet in eternal fellowship with, God. The proposition ἦν, (βιβλίον) expresses beyond the fact of coexistence that of perpetual intercommunication. John would guard against the idea of mere self-contemplation on the one hand, and entire independence on the other. It is union, not fusion. (iii) "The Word was God." This was — not merely described but defined — God made manifest. "The Word was God" is essentially a preteristic statement of the doctrine itself and the source of the language. For it is possible that Alexandrian philosophy might have suggested the linguistic medium adopted, yet the Logos itself had another origin. Writers like Reuss, Keim, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Shedd, etc., who contended for the Alexandrian derivation of the prologue, are apt to overlook two considerations regarding the Johannine doctrine: (1) There is no essential difference between the teaching of John and that of the other apostolic writers; and even when the word "Logos" is not used, as in Paul's case, the view of Christ's person is virtually that which we find in the Fourth Gospel. (2) The Logos as a writer himself states there is himself suggested the further idea of *communion*. of this self-communion the evangelist mentions two phases—creation and revelation. The Word unites Himself through the mediation of objects of sense and also manifests Himself directly. Hence in this section of the prologue (vs 3-5) a threefold division also occurs. (i) He is the *Creator* of the visible universe. "All things were made through him"—a phrase which describes the Logos as the organ of the entire creative activity of God and expresses a chrestological idea also employed by Plato and Philo that God was only the architect who molded into cosmos previously existing matter. The term ἐγένετο, ἐγένετο (*becomes, warden*), implies the successive evolution of the world, a second-chance of the universe, it has a sense of growth or development. (ii) The Logos is also the *source* of the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of man. "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." He is the light as well as the life—the fountain of all the manifold forms of being and thought in and by whom all created things subsist, and from whom all derivate illumination (cf 1 Jn 1 1-3; also Col 1 17). But inasmuch as the higher phases of intelligent life involve freedom, the Divine Light, though perfect and undiminished in itself, was not comprehended by a world which chose darkness rather than light (vs 5.11). (iii) The climax of Divine revelation is expressed in the statement, "The Word became flesh," which implies on the one hand the reality of Christ's humanity, and, on the other, the volun-

tary Incarnation of His incarnation, but excludes the notion that in becoming man the Logos ceased to be God. Though cloathed in flesh, the Logos continues to be the self-manifesting God, and retains, even in human form, the character of God. But this third phase is embodied the highest manifestation of the Godhead. In physical creation the power of God is revealed. In the bestowal of light to mankind His wisdom is chiefly manifested. But

in the third esp. is His love unveiled. All the per-
fec-tions of the Deity are focused and made visible in Christ—the "glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (Jn 1 14).

Thus the Word reveals the Divine essence. The incarnation makes the life, the light and the love which are eternally present in God manifest to men. As they meet in God, so do they meet in Christ. This is the glory which the disciples beheld; the truth to which the Baptist bore witness (ver 7); the fulness whereof His apostles received (ver 16); the entire body of grace and truth by which the Word gives to men the power to become the sons of God.

There is implied throughout that the Word is the Son. Each of these expressions taken separately have led and may lead us which But combined they correspondise misprints. On the one hand, their union protects the personal distinctness from, yet equal with, the Father—as the eternal logos was with God and was manifested to us.

(b) Relation of Logos to the world: The Logos is seen as the fountain of all the manifold forms of being and thought in and by whom all created things subsist, and from whom all derive illumination (cf 1 Jn 1 1-3; also Col 1 17). But inasmuch as the higher phases of intelligent life involve freedom, the Divine Light, though perfect and undiminished in itself, was not comprehended by a world which chose darkness rather than light (vs 5.11). (i) The climax of Divine revelation is expressed in the statement, "The Word became flesh," which implies on the one hand the reality of Christ's humanity, and, on the other, the volun-
tary Incarnation of His incarnation, but excludes the notion that in becoming man the Logos ceased to be God. Though cloathed in flesh, the Logos continues to be the self-manifesting God, and retains, even in human form, the character of God. But this third phase is embodied the highest manifestation of the Godhead. In physical creation the power of God is revealed. In the bestowal of light to mankind His wisdom is chiefly manifested. But

in the third esp. is His love unveiled. All the per-
fec-tions of the Deity are focused and made visible in Christ—the "glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (Jn 1 14).

Thus the Word reveals the Divine essence. The incarnation makes the life, the light and the love which are eternally present in God manifest to men. As they meet in God, so do they meet in Christ. This is the glory which the disciples beheld; the truth to which the Baptist bore witness (ver 7); the fulness whereof His apostles received (ver 16); the entire body of grace and truth by which the Word gives to men the power to become the sons of God.

There is implied throughout that the Word is the Son. Each of these expressions taken separately have led and may lead us which But combined they correspondise misprints. On the one hand, their union protects the personal distinctness from, yet equal with, the Father—as the eternal logos was with God and was manifested to us.
with God Himself. In Rev 19:13, we have obviously an adoption of this Heb use of the phrase. Throughout the Gospel there is evinced a decided fondness to abstract thought, sympathy with Palestinian religion, and some expressions would seem to indicate the evangelist's desire to show that Jesus is the fulfillment of Jewish expectation (e.g. 1:14; 2:9; 3:31; 8:19; 3:14; 6:52-48; 50), and the living embodiment of Israel's truth (1:16; 8:12; 11:26; 14:6). But as against this it has been pointed out by Weizsäcker (Apostolischc Zeitartik) that the Word of God is not conceived in the OT as an independent Being, still less as equivalent for the Messiah, and that the true medium which identifies the memory with God is of much later date.

At the same time the Heb cast of thought of the Johannine Gospel and its affinities with Jewish rather than Hellenic modes of expression can hardly be gainsaid. Though John's knowledge of and sympathy with Palestinian religion may not actually account for his use of the term "Logos," it may have largely colored and directed his special application of it. For, as Neander observes, that name may have been put forward at Ephesus in order to lead those Jews who were busying themselves with speculations on the Logos as the center of all theo-phanies, to recognize in Christ the Supreme Revelation of God and the fulfillment of their Messianic hopes.

But, while the flesh imers trace the Johannine ideas and terms to Hellenic philosophy and particularly to Alexandrian influence as represented in Philo. No one can compare the Fourth Gospel with the writings of Philo without noting a remarkable similarity in diction, which may lead some to call it "Logos." It would be hazardous, however, on this ground alone to impute conscious borrowing to the evangelist. It is more probable that both the Alexandrian thinker and the NT writer were subjects of common influences of thought and expression. Hellenism largely colors the views and diction of the early church. St. Paul takes over many words from Gr philosophy. "There is not a single NT writing," says Harnack (Dogmen-Geschichte, I, 47, n.), "which does not betray the influence of the mode of thought and general culture which resulted from the Hellenizing of the East." But, while that is true, it must not be forgotten, as Harnack himself points out, "that while the writers of the NT breathe and are created by Gr culture, the religious ideas in which they live and move come to them from the OT."

It is hardly probable that St. John was directly acquainted with the writings of Philo. But it is more likely that he was acquainted with the general tenor of his teaching and may have discovered in the language which had floated over from Alexandria to Ephesus a suitable vehicle for the utterance of his own beliefs, esp. welcome and intelligible to those who were familiar with Alexandrian modes of thought. But whatever superficial resemblances there may be between Philo and St. John (and they are not few or vague), it must be at once evident that the whole spirit and view of life is fundamentally different. So far from the apostle being a disciple of the Alexandrian or a borrower of his ideas, it would be more correct to say that there is clearly a conscious rejection of the Philonic conception, and that the Logos of John is a deliberate protest against what he must have regarded as the inadequate and misleading philosophy of Greece.

(c) Contrast between Philo and John: The contrast between the two writers is much more striking than the resemblance. The distinction is not due merely to the acceptance of the Logos as the Word, but extends to the whole conception of God and His relation to the world which has made Christianity a new power among men. The Logos of Philo is metaphysical, that of John, religious. Philo moves entirely in the region of the abstract, the speculative; John's thought is concrete and active, moving in a region of life and history. Philo's Logos is intermediate, the instrument which God employs in fashioning the world; John's Logos is not subsidiary but is Himself God, and as such is not a more instrument, but the prime Agent in creation. According to Philo the Deity is conceived as an architect who forms the world out of already existing matter. According to John the Logos is absolute Creator of all that is, theProvider of all being, the Ground of all existence. In Philo the Logos moves between personality and impersonality, and if it is sometimes personified it can hardly be said to have the value of an actual person; in John the personality of the Logos is affirmed from the first and it is of the very essence of his doctrine, the ground of His entire creative energy. The idea of an incarnation is alien to the thought of Philo and impossible in his scheme of the universe; the "Word that has become flesh" is the pivot and center of Johannine teaching. Philo affirms the absolute transcendent immanence of God; but it is the prime object of the evangelist to declare that God is revealed in Christ and that the Logos is the unveiling through the Jewish Incarnation of the divine nature. Not withstanding the personal epithet employed by Philo, his Logos remains a pure abstraction or attribute of God, and it is never brought into relation with human history. John's Logos, on the other hand, is in touch with life and the world from the beginning, and it is the very heart of his Gospel to declare as the very center of life and history the great historical event of the incarnation which is to recreate the world and reunite God and man.

From whatever point of view we compare them, we find that Philo and St. John, while using the same language, give an entirely different value to it. The essential purport of the Johannine Logos is Jesus Christ. The adoption of the term involves its complete transformation. It is baptized with a new spirit and henceforth stands for a new conception. From whatsoever source it was originally derived—from Heb tradition or Hellenic speculation—on Christian soil it is a new product. It is neither Gr nor Jewish, it is Christian. The philosophical abstraction has become a religious conception. Hellenism and Hebrewism have been taken up and fused into a higher unity, and Christ as the embodiment of the Logos has become the creative power and the world-wide possession of mankind.

The most probable view is that Philo and John found the same term current in Jewish and gentile circles and used it to set forth their respective ideas; Philo, following his predilections for Gr philosophy, to give a Hellenic complexion to his theory of the relation of Divine Reason to the universe; John, true to his Heb instincts, seeing in the Logos the climax of that revelation of God to man of which the earlier Jewish theophanies were but partial expressions.

There is nothing improbable in the surmise that the teaching of Philo gave a fresh impulse to the study of the Logos as Divine Reason which was already shadowed forth in the Bib. We therefore need not take offense that such a important idea should have come to the Bib, author from an extra-Bib, writer like Philo. It is no different from the possibility that the author of the Johannine Gospel was no mechanical borrower, but an entirely independent and original thinker who gave to the Logos and the ideas associated with it a wholly new worth and interpretation. Thus, as has been said, the terms of Greece were made contributory to the full unfolding of the Gospel.
circles and among the early Fathers regarding the nature of the Christ. The positive truth presented by the Fourth Gospel was once more broken up, and the various elements were given a number of a partial and one-sided theories respecting the relation of the Father and the Son. The influence of Gnosticism, already begun in the Apostolic Age, became more pronounced and largely shaped the current of ante-Nicene theology (see Hatch, Hibbert Lectures). In this conflict, the battle was a failure to reconcile Christianity with philosophy; but in gnostic systems the teaching was by no means unimportantly employed: according to Basilides the ‘Logos’ was an emanation from the nous as personified Wisdom, which again was directly derived from the Father, into whose substance it united. Gnostic philosophy was taught. In the Logos of the Wise, the spirit of the Father was supposed to unite the Scriptural idea of the Logos as Word with the Heilige Idea of Reason. According to him God produced in His own nature a rational power which was His agent in creation and took the form in history of the Divine Christ. Christ is the rational Word, as the λόγος σωματικὸς, λόγος σαματικός; He sows the seeds of virtue and truth among the human race, and that is true and beautiful in the pagan world, is to be traced to the activity of the Logos before His incarnation. Tatian and Theophilus taught essentially the same doctrine; though Tatian there is a marked leaning toward man. Consequently, a tendency to separate the ideal from the historical Christ. Athenagoras, who ascribes to the Logos the creation of all things, reads of the double sense of the reason of God. Logos, the creative energy of the world, has a firm grasp of the Bible, he says, this truth was more clearly expressed by Irenaeus, who held that the Son was the essential Word, eternally begotten of the Father and at once the Interpreter of the Word, the Divine Logos. The Alexandrian school was shaped by the threefold impact of Pauline and the Johannine Gospel. Clement of Alexandria views the Son as the Logos of the Father, the Fountain of all intelligence, the Revealer of the Divine Being and the Instructor of mankind. He repudiates the idea of the inferiority of the Logos as an emanation of the Father, and as the creative Word. Origens reconciles the two ideas of the eternity and the subordination of the Logos, and here he means as a mediator between the Father and Son. The idea of Innocence practically gathered up the divergent views of the past and established the teaching of the Logos of the Church. The Logos distinguishes the Father, and the Logos is: the God theos (θεός): God Himself; λόγος: the Logos is a second God (λόγος Θεός, δύον Θεός: the Logos and the Father). In the Nicean Age, under the shaping influence of the powerful mind of Athanasius, and, to a lesser degree, of Basil and the two Gregories, the Logos-doctrine attained its final form in the Nicene Creed. The Nicene Creed was the declaration of the unity, but, at the same time, the separation of God and the Son. The Father and Son. Council of Nicea practically gathered up the divergent views of the past and established the teaching of the Logos of the Church.

LITERATURE.—(1) On Gr Logos: Schleiermacher, History of Philosophy, 3:671-681; Ueberweg, Ritter: Die Lehre vom Logos in der Gr. Philos. (1873); Aull, Gesch. d. Logosidee in d. Gr. Philos. (1874); Oehler,Chr. (1875); Schröder, Lehrbuch d. NT Zeitgesch. (1876); Schultz, OT Theol. (1878); Oehler, OT. (1879); The Logos as a systematic doctrine: Gezer, Philo, u. der ellen. Theosophie (1881); Dähne, Gesch. der Jud.-Athenagoras Philos. (1845); Referat, Deutscher Gesch. der Jud.-Philos. (1845); Watson, Philos. Basis d. Religion (1897). (4) On Johannine Gospel: Relative comm's of Meyer, Godet, Westcott, Luthard, E. Schülemann (1876); Litzmann, Die Logoslehre der Juden (1866); Watkins, Modern Criticism on the Fourth Gospel (1890); Oehler, OT Theol. (1891); Stevens, Johannine Theol. (1894); Drummond, Gospel of St. John, 2:581-582 (1897); Schubring, Die Logoslehre (1897); Neale, The Jesus of Logos. (1898); Wiseman, Apostolic Age (1898); Ehrlich, Modern Criticism on the Fourth Gospel (1890); Stevens, Johannine Theol. (1894); Drummond, Gospel of St. John; Ehrlich, Greek Writings (1866); Weisweiler, Apostolic Age (1898); B. B. Alexander, LOINS, loins (חֵלֶב, ἣλας, Aram. ḫlēḇ, ḫās; לְחֵב, לְחָם, בּקֶשֶׁל, בּשֶׁל, יְרָדֶבֶל; or ṣsath, ṣepḥat, ṣachenoph): this variety of Heb synonyms seems to be used rather promiscuously for the loins, though there is no little difference in the secondary meanings of these words. In these various modes of expressing the loins as the seat of strength and vigor (Job 40 16, Heb mōthān, here used of Behemoth), the center of procreative power, the portion of the body which is girded about, and is considered as specially needful of covering, even under primitive conditions of life (Job 31 20), and where painful disease most effectually unites a man for work and warfare. Jacob receives the Divine promise that "kings shall come out of the loins of David" (Gen 49 10), and we read of 66 souls "that came out of his loins" (yārubâk) which went into Egypt (46 26). The Ep. to the Hebrews speaks the Levites as having come out of the loins of Abraham (He 7 5).

As the seat of strength of (Lois; Tisōn), the loins are girded with belts of leather (2 K 1 8; Mt 3 4), or cloth, often beautifully embroidered (Ex 28 39), or of costly material (39 39; Jer 13 11). Girded loins are a sign of readiness for service or endeavor (Ex 12 11; 1 K 18 46; 2 K 4 29; Job 38 3); Prov 31 17; Lk 12 35; 1 Pet 1 13). Of God it is said that "he loosed the bond of kings, and bade his loins with a girdle," i.e. strengthens them (Job 12 18). On the loins the sword is fixed (1 K 18 23; S 20 24). The loins are girded with a sash (1 K 20 32; Isa 36 11; Jer 48 37; Am 8 10; see also the First Papyrus of Elephantine, I. 20). A man whose strength is in his attachment to truth, in other words is faithful, is spoken of as having his girdle about with truth (Eph 6 14). To the Messiah is described: "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins" (Isa 11 5). One of the most primitive modes of clothing consisted of a skin or a leather girdle round the loins (Job 31 20).

The condition of unfitness for service is described in that the loins (κοῖλος) are filled with a burning (Ps 38 7, AV "loathsome disease"), or that "a sore burden" is laid upon the "loins" (mōthēn, 66 11). Thus the loins are made "continually to shake" (69 23). "The joints of [the] loins" (hōrak) are loosed (Dn 5 6), the "loins are filled with anguish" (Isa 21 3). It is very likely that originally a disabling lumbago or the painful affections of the gall or the bladder (ėnlōs, etc.) are meant, but the expression becomes merely metaphorical, as expressing personal helplessness, esp. that which can but rely upon assistance and help from God.

H. L. E. LEBRING

LOIS, λόις (Ἀλάτης, Lātēs [2 Timothy 2 3]): the grand-mother of Timothy, and evidently the mother of Eunice, Timothy's mother. The family lived at Lystra (Acts 16 1). It was on the occasion of Paul's first missionary journey (Acts 14) that Eunice and Timothy were converted to Christ, and it was, in all likelihood, on the same occasion that Lois also became a Christian. Paul speaks of the unfeigned faith that there was in Timothy, and he adds that this faith dwelt at the first in "thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice," and he declared it as the only passage where Lois is mentioned; but by comparing 2 Tim 1 5 with 2 Tim 3 15 (AV), where Paul refers to Timothy's having from a child known the holy scriptures, it would appear that Lois was associated with Eunice, both in a reverent faith in God and in the careful instruction in the word which the OT was given to Timothy. See EUNICE; TIMOTHY.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

LONGEVITY, lon-jer'-vi: In the part of Gen ascribed to P, the names and genealogies of the patriarchs are given (Gen 5 11). In the three VSS which are our chief sources, MT, LXX and Sam, the age-numbers given for these patriarchs are hope-
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Longsuffering, long-suffering (ἡ σ διακαταρχή, 'erekh 'appyqim; πατριάσεως, makrothumia). The word is a compound of 'erekh, 'erakh (nose, nostrils, "long of nose" or "breathing"), and, as anger was indicated by rapid, violent breathing through the nostrils, "long of anger," or "slow to wrath.

The adj. is applied to God (Ex 34 6 AV, in the name of Jeh as proclaimed to Moses: Nu 14 18 AV; Ps 86 15 AV; RV "slow to anger," which is also the tr. in other places; AV and RV Neh 9 17; Ps 103 8; 145 8; Prov 15 18; 16 32; Joel 2 13; Jon 4 2; Nah 1 9): it is associated with "great kindness" and "plenteous in mercy.

The subst. occurs in Jer 15 15: "Take me not away in thy longsuffering." In Eccl 7 8, we have 'erekh rēqāh, AV and RV "patient in spirit.

The word in the NT rendered "longsuffering," makrothumia (once makrothumētēs, "to be long-suffering"), which is the rendering of 'erekh 'appyqim in the LXX, is lit. "long of mind or soul" (regarded as the seat of the emotions), opposed to shortness of mind or soul, irascibility, impatience, intolerance. It is "looking after" to God (Rom 2 21; 2 Pet 3 9), of His bearing long with sinners andslowness to execute judgment on them. It is, therefore, one of "the fruits of the Spirit" in man (Gal 5 22) which Christians are frequently exhorted to cherish and show one toward the other (Eph 4 2; Col 1 11; 3 12, etc); it belongs, Paul says, to the love, without which all else is nothing: "Love suffereth long [makrothumētēs], and is kind" (1 Cor 13 4).

The vb. makrothumētētai is sometimes tr. by "patience" (Mt 18 26,27; "Have patience with me"); Lk 18 7 has been variously rendered: AV has "And shall not God avenge his own elect . . . though he bear long with them?" RV "yet and he is longsuffering over them," ARV "and is slow to punish on their behalf?"

According to Trench (Synonyms of the NT, 189), the difference between hupomōnētēs ("patience") and makrothumia is that the latter word expresses patience in respect to persons, and the former in respect to things: hence hupomōnētēs is never ascribed to God: where He is called "the God of patience," it is as He gives it to His servants and saints. But in Jas 5 7 it is used with reference to things, and in Col 1 11 it is associated with patience (cf He 12 1,2); suffering endurance is ascribed to God: in Col 1 11 it is also associated with "joy," indicating that it is not a mere submission, but a joyful acceptance of the will of God, whatever it may be. In Wisd 15 1; Ecclus 5 4, we have "longsuffering (makrothumētēs) ascribed to God; also in Ecclus 5 11, RV "mercy."
LOOKING-GLASS, lōōk'ing-glas (Ex 33 8 AV, m "brazen glasses"). See GLASS; MIRROR.

LOOM, lōōm. See WEAVING.

LOOP, lōōp (in pl. ἱλικόοι, līlēkō'ē; ἱλική thē līlēkē [Ex 26 4 f. 10 f.; 36 11 f.17]): A ring or fold made of blue thread to fasten into the corresponding golden clasps, or taches upon the curtains of the tabernacle, joining them in sets, or pairs. See TABERNACLE.

LORD, lord, THE LORD: This Eng. word in our Bible represents one Aram., 3 Gr and 9 Heb words, two of them in two forms. It thus expresses all grades of dignity, honor, and majesty. It is not always possible to be sure of the sense in which the term is to be taken. In Gen 18 3; 19 18, the translators waver between interpreting of the Divine Person and a finite angel (cf marginal readings). It represents the most sacred Heb name for God, as their covenant God, Yāh, Yahuwah, and the more usual designation of Deity, 'Adhānāy, 'Adhān, a term which they adopted to avoid announcing the most holy designation. They had placed on Lev 24 16 an interpretation that aroused such a dread that they seldom dared use the name at all. When two of the usual words usually rendered "Lord," both referring to God, occur together, AV renders "Lord God," and ARV "Lord Jehovah." AV has adopted the rule of using the covenant name transliterated, instead of the term "Lord," in which AV adopts the rule of the Hebrews to avoid the holy name. The Aram. designation, Mārē', occurs only in Dúl (e.g. 2 47; 5 23), and the same word refers to a man (4 24). Of the Gr words, Kuriós is freely used of both the Deity and men. Despótes, of men in classical usage, occurs only of God, including the ascended Jesus, and is employed only 5 t. Megístēnés (pl.) is found once, of men (Mk 8 21). Rabboni (Heb in Gr letters) is applied only to the Christ, and is simply transliterated in RV, but rendered "Lord" in AV (cf Mk 10 51).

Our Eng. VSS distinguish the 3 main uses of the term thus: (1) "Lord" represents the Heb Yahweh, LX X Kuriós, except where 'Adhānāy or 'Adhān is connected with Yāhweh (= "Lord God"); AV has in these examples employed the name as it is found in the Heb, simply transliterated. (2) "Lord" corresponds to 'Adhānāy, 'Adhān, Mārē', also Gr Kuriós (see [1]), and Despótes, for which AV has always "Master" in either the text or the margin. (3) "Lord" ("Lord") translates all the remaining 8 Heb words and the Gr words except Despótes. It is thus seen that Kuriós corresponds to all 3 forms of writing the Eng. term. See JEHOWAH.

LORD OF HOSTS: A title or name of God frequently used in the OT, always tr "Jeh of Hosts" (יְהוָה מִלְוָיָא Yhōvāh milōyāh), Yhōvāh gbdâ'ōth in ARV, since Yhōvāh, never 'Adhānāy, is used in this phrase. Evidently the meaning of the title is that all created agencies and forces are under the leadership or dominion of Jeh, who made and maintains them (Gen 2 2; Isa 46 12). It is used to express Jeh's great power. See GOD, NAMES OF, III, 8.

LORD'S DAY (ἡ κυριακή ημέρα, hé kuriakē hēmērā): Formerly it was supposed that the adj. kuriakos (tr "the Lord's") was purely Christian word, but recent dictionary covers have proved that it was fairly common use in the Rom Empire before Christian influence had been felt. In secular use it signified "imperial," "belonging to the lord"—the emperor—and so its adoption by Christianity in the sense "belonging to the Lord!"—to Christ—was perfectly easy. Indeed, there is reason to suppose that in the days of Domitian, when the issue had been sharply defined between "Jeh or Caesar or Christ?" the use of the adj. by the church was a part of the protest against Caesar-worship (see LXX). And it is even possible that the full phrase, "the Lord's day," was coined as a contrast to the phrase, "the Augustean day," a term that seems to have been used in some parts of the Empire to denote days esp. dedicated in honor of Caesar-worship.

"Lord's day" in the NT occurs only in Rev 1 10, but in the post-apostolic literature we have the following references: Ignatius, Ad Mag., ix, 1, "No longer keeping the Apostolic Sabbath but living according to the Lord's day, on which also our Light arose"; Ep. Pet., ver 35, "The Lord's day began to dawn" (cf Mt 28 1); ver 50, "early on the Lord's day" (cf Lk 24 1); Barn 15 9, "We keep the eighth day with gladness," on which Jesus arose from the dead." I.e. Sunday, as the day of Christ's resurrection, was kept as a Christian feast and called "the Lord's day," a title first adopted by the author of Ep. Pet., introduced by phrases from the canonical Gospels. Its appropriateness in Rev 1 10 is obvious, as St. John received his vision of the exalted Lord when all Christians had their minds directed toward His entrance into glory through the resurrection. This "first day of the week" appears again in Acts 20 7 as the day on which the worship of the "breaking of bread" took place, and the impression given is that in the context it is that St. Paul and his companions prolonged their visit to Troas so as to join in the service. Again, 1 Cor 16 2 contains the command, "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store," where the force of the form of the imperative used (the present for repeated action) would be better represented in Eng. by "day by on the successive Sundays." Worship is here not explicitly mentioned as an act, but the context of "by him" is the usual phrase for "at home!", but that the appropriateness of the day for Christian acts involves an appropriateness for Christian worship is not to be doubted. Indeed, since the seven-day week was unknown to Gr thought, the regular observance of a hebdomadal cycle must have been settled at Corinth before St. Paul could write his command. Finally, the phrase, "first day in the week" is found elsewhere in the NT only in Mt 28 1; Mk 16 2; Lk 24 1; Jn 20 19. The word in all passages for "first" is poor Gr (μέ, mia, "one") for πρώτος, protōs, a Hebraism), and the coincidence of the form of the phrase in Acts 20 7 and 1 Cor 16 2 with the form used by all four evangelists for the Resurrection Day is certainly not accidental; it was the fixed Christian base, just as "Lord's day" was to the writer of Ep. Pet.

The hebdomadal observance of Sunday points back to Corinth to Jewish-Christian soil, but it is impossible to say when the custom began. Not, apparently, in the earliest days, for Acts 2 46 represents the special worship as daily. But this could not have continued very long, for waning of the first enthusiasm, necessity of pursuing ordinary avocations, and increment in number of those who have made general daily gatherings impracticable. A choice of a special day must have become necessary, and this day would, of course, have been Sunday. Doubtless, however, certain individuals and communities continued the daily gatherings to a much later date, and the appearance of Sunday
as the one distinctive day for worship was almost certainly gradual.

Sunday, however, was sharply distinguished from the Sabbath, and by the second day on which was Sabbath

5. Sabbath form, the other was a day of ritual and the Sabbath subject to the Law of Moses through circumcision (Gal 5 3; Acts 21 20). Uncircumcised Gentiles, however, were free from any obligation of Sabbath observance, and it is quite certain that in apostolic times no renewal of any Sabbath rules or transfer of them to Sunday was made for gentle converts. No observance of a particular "day of rest" is contained among the "necessary things" of Acts 15 28,29; nor is any such precept found among all the varied moral directions given in the whole epistolary literature. Quite on the contrary, the observance of a given day as a matter of law or obligation is denounced by St. Paul as a forsaking of Christ (Gal 4 10), and Sabbath-keeping is condemned explicitly in Col 2 16. As a matter of individual devotion, to be sure, a man might do as he pleased (Rom 14 5-6), but no such rule necessary for salvation could be compatible with the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Evidently, then, the fact that the Christian worship was held on Sunday did not sanctify Sunday any more than (say) a regular Wednesday service among us sanctifies Wednesday day, noting esp. that the apostolic service was held in the evening. For it was felt that Christian enthusiasm would raise every day to the highest religious plane the decay of that enthusiasm through the long delay of the Parousia not being contemplated.

The delay occurred, however, and for human beings in the ordinary routine of life there are necessary not only set periods of worship, but the Christian fundamental doctrine of mercy demands that Christianity, where she has the power, shall give to men relief from the drain of continuous toil.

The formulation of general rules to carry these principles into effect, however, belongs to a period outside NT times, and does not enter into the scope of this Encyclopaedia. It is enough to say that the ecclesiastical rules for Sunday were left to be quite distinct from the Jewish observance, and that Aelius (763 804) is the first to hold that the church had transferred the day from Saturday to Sunday. This principle is still maintained in Roman Catholic theology, but at the Reformation was rejected uncompromisingly by both Zwingli (Helvet. Conf. 11 7) and Calvinists (Helvet. Conf. XXIV 1-2) in favor of a literally apostolic freedom (Calvin even proposed to adopt Thursday in place of Sunday). The appearance of the opposite extreme of a genuinely "legalistic" Sabbatharianism in the thoroughly Evangelical Scotch and English Puritanism is an anomaly that is explained by reaction from the excesses of the surroundings.

Sunday was fixed as the day for Christian worship by general apostolic practice, and the academic possibility of an alteration hardly seems worth discussing. If a literal apostolicity is to be entertained, however, the "breaking of bread" must be part of the Sunday service. Rest from labor for the sake of worship, public and private, is intensely desirable, since the regimen of the general apostolic enthusiasm seems unattainable, but the NT leaves us quite free as to details. Rest from labor to secure physical and mental renewal rests on a still different basis, and the working out of details involves a knowledge of sociological and industrial conditions, as well as a knowledge of religious principles. It is the task of the pastor to combine the various principles and to apply them to the particular conditions of his people in their locality, in accordance with his own church has found habitably the right to lay down—very special attention being given, however, to the highly important matter of the peculiar service offered to children. In all cases the general principles underlying the rules should be made clear, so that they will not appear as arbitrary legislation, and it is probably better not to use the term "Sabbath" for Sunday. Under certain conditions great freedom may be desirable, and yet be inconsistent with our liberty in Christ. But experience, and not least of all the experience of the first churches of the Reformation, in Saxony particularly, shows us that general laxity in Sunday rules invariably results disastrously. See further, Entries of Jesus, 1, 3, (1).


BUTSON SCOTT EASTON

LORD'S PRAYER, THE (Mt 6 9-13; Lk 11 2-4): Prayer occupied an important place in the life and the teachings of Jesus. He was emphatically a man of prayer, praying frequently in private and in public, and frequently spending whole nights in communion with His heavenly Father. He often spoke to His disciples on the subject of prayer, cautioning them against ostentation, or urging perseverance, faith and large expectation, and He gave them a model of devotion in the Lord's prayer.

This prayer is given by the evangelists in two different forms and in two entirely different connections. In Mt's account the prayer is given as a part of the Sermon on the Mount and in connection with a criticism of the ostentation usual in the prayers of the hypocrites and the heathen. Lk introduces the prayer after the Galilean ministry and represents it as given in response to a request from one of His disciples, "Lord teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples." It gives us, however, no note of time or place, and it is quite possible that the incident which it records took place much earlier. The later form is much shorter than that of Mt and the common parts differ materially in language.

In view of the differences, the reader instinctively inquires whether the prayer was given on different occasions in these different connections, or the evangelists have presented the same incident in forms derived from different sources, or modified the common source to suit their immediate purposes.

If the prayer was given only on one occasion, there is little doubt that Lk preserved the earlier tradition. If the prayer bears every mark of historical circumstance, though not necessarily the accurate point of time or place, or the exact form of language. Such a request made at the close of the prayer of Jesus would be natural, and the incident bears every mark of historical authenticity. On the other hand, it would be reasonable to assume that the author of Mt's source, remembering the incident, incorporated the prayer in the Sermon on the Mount as an illustration of the injunctions concerning prayer.

There are many reasons for regarding the Sermon as a collection of sayings spoken on different occasions and summarized for convenience in teaching and memorizing. Thus He, however, no proof that the prayer was given but once by Jesus. We need not suppose that His disciples were always the same, and we know that He gave instruction in prayer on various occasions. He may have given the model prayer on one occasion spontaneously and at another at the request of His disciples. It is probable that the two evangelists, using the same or different sources, presented the prayer in such connection as best suited the plan of their narratives. In any case, it is rather remarkable that the prayer is not quoted or directly mentioned anywhere else in the NT.

In addition to the opening salutation, "Our Father who art in heaven," the Lord's Prayer consists of six petitions. These are arranged in three equal parts. In the first part, the thought is directed to God and His great purposes. In the second part, the attention is directed to our condition and wants. The two sets of
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are closely related, and a line of process runs through the whole prayer. The petitions of the first part are inseparable, as each includes the one which follows. As the hallowing of God's name requires the coming of His kingdom, so the kingdom comes in His will. Again, the first part calls for the second, for if His will is to be done by us, we must have sustenance, forgiveness and deliverance from evil. If we seek first the glory of God, the end requires our good. While we have His name we are not satisfied in Him. The doxology of Mt and our rituals is not found in the leading MSS and is generally regarded as an ancient liturgical addition. For this reason it is omitted by RV.

The sources of the two accounts cannot be known with certainty. It is hardly correct to say that one account is more original than the other. The original was spoken in Aram., while both of the reports are certainly based on Gr sources. The general agreement in language, esp. in the use of the unique term πρόσωπον, επιφάνεια, shows that they are not independent of the Aram. original.

Three expressions of the prayer deserve special notice. The Greek Our Father, "abba," are new in the Bible and in the world. When God is called Father in the OT, He is re-expressed as Father of the nation, not of the individual. Even in the moving prayer of Isa 63 16 (AV), " Doubly hast thou art our father," the connection makes clear that the reference is to God in the capacity of Creator. The thought of God as the Father of the individual is first reached in the Apoc: O Lord, Father and Mother of my life. Lk 2 11; Jn 3 16. Here also the notion is veiled in the thought of God as Creator. It was left for Jesus the Son to give us the privilege of calling God "Our Father."

Of the adj. ἐπιφάνεια, "daily" or "needful," neither the origin nor the exact meaning is or likely to be known. Whether it is qualitative or temporal depends on its derivation from τρικύλια, επιφανεια, or τρικύλια, επιφανεια. Our translators usually follow the latter, translating "daily." ARV gives "needful" as a marginal rendering. The phrase ἐπιτρίπτω να, and τοι πάντως, is equally ambiguous. Since the adj. may be either masc. or neut., it is impossible to decide whether "from the evil one" or "from the evil" was intended. The probability is in favor of the masc. The essential nature of thought of evil in the concrete, just as we think of it in the abstract. For this reason the Authorized rendering "from evil" is more real to us. The evil deprecated is moral, not physical.

The Lord's Prayer was given as a lesson in prayer. As such this simple model surpasses all precepts about prayer. It suggests to the child of God the proper objects of prayer. It supplies suitable forms of language and illustrates the simple and direct manner in which we may trustfully address our heavenly Father. It embraces the elements of all spiritual desire summed up in a few choice sentences. For those who are not able to bring their struggling desires to birth in articulate language it provides the true form. To the immature disciple it ever unfolds with richer depths of meaning. Though we learn these words at our mother's knee, we need a lifetime to fill them with meaning and all eternity to realize their answer.

Liturgy. The lit. of this subject is very extensive. For brief treatment the student will consult the relative sections in the comms, on the Gospels of Mt and Lk, on the Lives of Christ and the arts, on the Lord's Prayer in the several Bible diets. A collection of patristic comment is given by C. Tillmann in his Das Gebet nach der Lehre der Heiligen dargestellt, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1876. The original comments may be found in any of the standard collections of the Church Fathers.
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LITERATURE
I. Definition.—Eucharist.—The distinctive rite of Christian worship, instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ upon the eve of His atoning death, being a religious partaking of bread and wine, which, having been presented before God the Father in thankful memorial of Christ's inexpressible sacrifice, have become (through the sacramental blessing) the communion of the body and blood of Christ (cf. Acts 2 42; 1 Cor 10 16; 11 23-26).

II. The NT Sources.—The NT sources of our knowledge of the institution of the Eucharist are fourfold, a brief account thereof being found in each of the Synoptic Gospels and in St. Paul's First Ep. to the Cor. (Mt 26 26-29; Mk 14 22-25; Lk 22 14-20; 1 Cor 11 23-26; cf. 10 16).

The text of these narratives has been found to need little amendment, save the dropping of a word or two, from each account, according to the tendency of copyists, conspicuously or unconspicuously, to assimilate the details of parallel passages. The genuineness of Lk 22 19-20 is absolutely beyond question. Their omission in whole or part, and the alterations in the order of two or three verses in the whole section (vs 14-20), characteristically of a very small number of MSS, are due to confusion in the minds of a few scribes and translators, between the paschal cup (ver 17) and the eucharistic cup (ver 20),
and to their well-meaning, but mistaken, attempt to impose the text before them.

The briefest account of the institution of the Eucharist is found in Mk 14:22-24. In it the Eucharist is not shown to come from its serving, the paschal meal: "And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed it, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, This is my body, which is for you. This is the new covenant in my blood: this do in remembrance of me."

The narrative given in Lk 22:14-20 is the latest (c 80-90) of our records. St. Luke had taken pains to follow up everything to its source, and had redacted the story with the height of his historical research (1:1-4), and thus his account is of the highest value. Writing for a wider circle of readers, he carefully separates the Eucharist from the paschal meal which preceded it, and puts the statement of the new covenant in the personal command, "Drink ye all of it, in place of the mere statement, and they all drank of it." He adds also of the blood that "poured out for many." It is "unto remission of sins."

The Pauline account, 1 Cor 11:23-25 (the earliest written down, c. 65 AD), was called forth in rebuke of the scandalous profligacy of the Eucharist at Corinth. It gives us another tradition independent of, and supplementary to, that of Mk-Mt. It claims the authority of the Saviour as its source, and had been already made known to the Corinthians in the apostle's oral teaching. The time of the institution is mentioned as the night of the betrayal. We note of the bread, "This is my body, which is for you," of the cup, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do in remembrance of me."

3. Other Scripture Passages
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The institution of the Eucharist had been prepared for by Christ through the object-lesson of the feeding of the five thousand (Mt 14:13-21; Mk 6:35-44; Lk 9:12-17; Jn 6:1-15), which was followed up by the discourse about His Passion (Mt 26:26-29; Mk 14:22-26; Lk 22:15-20; Jn 13:14-30). This was the object-lesson of the sacrifice. Salvation is a sacrifice, and salvation is of the Cross. The sacrifice of the Cross was made for the remission of sins (Rom 3:25, 26). It is the sacrifice of the new covenant. It is the sacrifice of the Blood of Christ, and of the Eucharist. The sacrifice of the Blood of Christ, of the Eucharist, is to be lived out daily by the Church. The Church is the sacrifice of the Blood of Christ, the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

In the discourse at Capernaum (Jn 6:26-59), Christ warned His hearers from eating heavenly food, from food that perished to the true bread from heaven. He declared Himself to be the living bread, and further, that it is through His flesh and drinking His blood that their sins are forgiven and cleansed by Him at the last day.

2. The Discourse

The difficulties raised by this discourse do not all solve at the time. His ascension would but add to them. He asked of His disciples acceptance of His flesh in faith. Under the administration of the Spirit would these things be realized (60-69). The institution of the Eucharist, later, gave the clue to these otherwise "hard" words. Today the Eucharist remains as to explain and prove the words. A hard maintainer, e.g., who had read Jn 6 many times, could form no notion of its purport. When first privileged to be present at the eucharistic service of the Book of Common Prayer, the meaning of feeding upon Christ's flesh and blood forthwith became apparent to him (see The Spirit of Missions, July, 1911, 572-73).

IV. Historical Setting of the Eucharist.—We should note the setting in which the institution of the Eucharist was placed. Though the Fourth Gospel does not record this, it gives us many otherwise unknown data of the words of Christ spoken upon the eve of His death, in which historically the institution of the Eucharist was set.

1. Acts and the Fourth Gospel
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The symbolic washing of the disciples (Jn 13:3-10), the "new" commandment (ver 34), Christ as the means of access to the Father (14:6), love for Christ to be shown by keeping His commandments (16:23, 24), the sending of the Paraclete Spirit (ver 16:17, 26; 16:13, 14), the intimate fellowship of Christ and His disciples, shown in the metaphor of the vine and its branches (15:1-13-16)—all these throw their illumination upon the commandment. This do in remembrance of me (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24, 25). The efficacy of prayer (in Christ's name) (Jn 16:23, 24-26-28) after His final withdrawal from the midst of His disciples, and His great prayer of self-oblation and intercession for His church throughout time (Jn 17, esp. 9-26) must not be forgotten in considering, "This is my body which is given for you" (Lk 22:19), and, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28).

The sacrificial connotation of many of the words used in the narratives of the institution would be noted: e.g. "body," "blood," "covenant," "given," "poured out," "for you," "for my church." The words are "unto remission of sins." "Memorial" (Ex 24:7, 8, Lev 23:16, 17; Ex 5:16-18; Jn 11:14, 24:7; Nu 10:10; He 9:11-12; 10:4-10.19, 20). The very elements of bread and wine also suggested the idea of sacrifice to those accustomed to their use in the older system of worship (Ex 29:38-42; Nu 15:4-10; 28:29 and 39). The Bread of Life, and about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood as the nourishment of eternal life. This was again clinched by the second object-lesson of the feeding of the four thousand afterward (Mt 16:22-23; Mk 8:19-29). The Lord's yearning, and His blessing of the loaves and fishes—acts not elsewhere recorded of Him, except at the institution of the Eucharist, and at the self-revealing meal at Emmaus (Lk 24:30)—deeply impressed the disciples. Thus the presence could say of His power to satisfy the hunger of the multitude (Mt 14:19; 15:36; Mk 6:41; 8:6, 7; Lk 16:9; Jn 6:11, 23).

In the discourse at Capernaum (Jn 6:26-58) Christ also taught of His Bread coming from heaven, the heavenly food, from food that perished to the true bread from heaven. He declared Himself to be the living bread, and further, that it is through eating His flesh and drinking His blood that their sins are forgiven and cleansed by Him at the last day.

2. The Discourse

The difficulties raised by this discourse do not all solve at the time. His ascension would but add to them. He asked of His disciples acceptance of His flesh in faith. Under the administration of the Spirit would these things be realized (60-69). The institution of the Eucharist, later, gave the clue to these otherwise "hard" words. Today the Eucharist remains as to explain and prove the words. A hard maintainer, e.g., who had read Jn 6 many times, could form no notion of its purport. When first privileged to be present at the eucharistic service of the Book of Common Prayer, the meaning of feeding upon Christ's flesh and blood forthwith became apparent to him (see The Spirit of Missions, July, 1911, 572-73).
whether he died upon the day of its observance (see art. "Preparation," DCG, II, 409). The Passover was at once a covenant-recalling and a covenant-renewing sacrifice, and the Lord's Supper, as corresponding to it, was at once a remembrance of the Passover and a new covenant, of which the elements were bread and wine, or the bread and wine or the consecrated elements themselves (cf. "gave thanks" of the institution and was the most widely used term in primitive times, as applied to the whole service, to the whole observance). In this case it may be observed that bread and wine or to the consecrated elements themselves (of the bread and wine or to the consecrated elements themselves (of the Eucharist) 3. Names (Acts 2 Eucharist 42: 20. 7.11) had little vogue after NT times. "Communion" obviously is derived from 1 Cor 10. 16.

In connection with the early and frequent use of the word "oblation" (præsbyter) and its cognates, we should note St. Paul's description of his ministry in terms that suggest the rationale of the prayer of consecration, or eucharistic prayer, as we know it in the earliest liturgical tradition: that I should be a minister of Christ's death unto the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit" (Rom 15: 16).

VII. Post-apostolic Church.—The same Spirit who guided the church in the determination of the Canon of the NT Scriptures, the same Spirit who guided the church in the working out of her explicit formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Godhead, and of the Christ—that same Spirit guided the church in the formation and fashioning of her great eucharistic prayer into its present form, in the spirit of the covenant, summoning all of the East, by their faithful adherence to this norm, have been almost undisturbed by the dissensions and disputes of Western Christendom touching the Eucharist.

The glimpses given us in the earlier Fathers of the Eucharist are in entire accord with the more articulate expression of the church's corporate eucharistic worship, which we find in the liturgical documents of the Ante-Nicene period (1) The Ignatian Epp. show us the Eucharist as the focus of the church's life and order, the source of unity and fellowship. The Eucharist consecrated by the prayer of the church is the Bread of God, the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the communication of love incorruptible and life eternal (cf Ephesians, 5.13:20; Trallians, 7.8; Romans, 7; Philadelphia, 4; Smyrnæans, 7.8; Magnesians, 7). (2) Justin Martyr tells us that the Eucharist was celebrated on the Lord's Day, the day associated with creation and with Christ's resurrection. To the celebrant were brought bread and wine mixed with water, who then put up to God, over them, solemn thanksgiving for His livingkindness in the gifts of food and health through the action wrought by Christ. The oblations of bread and wine are presented to God in memorial of Christ's passion, and become Christ's body and blood through prayer. The Eucharist is a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving commemorative of Christ's death; and the consecrated elements the communion of Christ's body and blood, by reason of the sacramental character bestowed upon them by the invocation of the Divine blessing (cf I Apol., 13.65, 66, 67; Dial. with Trypho, 41.70, 117). (3) Irenæus, also, emphasizes the fact that Christ taught His disciples to offer the new oblation of the New Covenant, to present in thank offering the first-fruits of God's creatures—bread and wine—the pure sacrifice prophesied before by Malachi. The Eucharist consecrated by the prayer through the invocation of God's blessing, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, just as he pronounced the elements to be at the institution (cf Against Heresies, 1.13.2; iv.17.5; 18.1-6; 33.2; v.22.3). (4) Cyprian, too, gives evidence of the same eucharistic belief, and alludes very plainly to the "lift up your hearts," to the great thanksgiving, and to the prayer of consecration. This last included the rehearsal of what Christ did and said.

VI. The Church's Observance of the Eucharist.—We should remember the priestly character of the church of Christ, whose sacrifices are

1. Heavenly made under the dispensation of the Background Holy Spirit (1 Pet 2:5:9; Rev 5:6; 6:1:7, 10:1-25; cf 1 Jn 2:1.2). As the Lamb slain once for all but alive for evermore, the Lord Christ is the focus of all worship and of the assemblage (1 Jn 17:18; 5:6-14:7, 9:10), and the Christian disciple has the privilege of feeding upon that eternal Priest and Victim (He 13 10; 1 Cor 10:16).

The celebration of the Eucharist was characteristic of the pentecostal church (Acts 2:42), esp. upon the Lord's Day (20 7). Its celebration was preceded by the agape Celebration (1 Cor 11 20.34) on the eve (for the circumstances of the institution were closely imitated, and the day was reckoned as beginning at sunset after the Jewish fashion), and the Eucharist proper came late into the night, or toward morning (Acts 20 11).

It should be noted that the name, "Lord's Supper," belongs to the agape rather than to the Eucharist; its position as a missionary of mediaval and Reformation times.

The name "Eucharist" is derived from the eucharisteo...
VIII. Liturgical Tradition.—When we proceed to examine the early liturgical remains we find the articulate expression of the church's sacrifice following along these lines. The great eucharistic prayer goes on to pour forth sublime praises to God for all the blessings of creation, and for the fruits of the earth; aligning the praises of the church with the worship of the heavenly host around the throne of God. The love of God in bringing about the redemption of fallen man through the incarnation, and through the self-oblation of His only Son upon the cross is then recalled in deep thankfulness. The institution of the Eucharist in the night of the betrayal is now considered and the Lord's command of Christ ("Do this for my memorial") therein recited, most solemn memorial is made before God, with the antitypical elements, of the death and of the victorious resurrection and ascension of Christ. On the Eucharist closes, as still today, carrying out this act of obedience, most humble prayer is made to the Eternal Father for the hallowing of the oblations, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, to be the body and blood of Christ, and to be those who partake of them, for the imparting of all grace, and the bestowal of life eternal.

To this great act of praise and prayer the solemn "Amen" of the assembled congregation assents, and therefrom the sacramental gifts are received by the faithful present, with another "Amen" from each recipient to whom they are administered.

The great eucharistic prayer, as outlined, was the first part of the liturgy to crystallize into written form, and of its component parts the invocation of the Divine blessing upon the elements was probably the first to be written down. Around the simplicity and the depth of such a truly apostolic norm of eucharistic worship, alone, can be gathered into one the new dispersed and divided followers of the Unifying Christ, for therein subsist in perfect harmony the Godward and the manward aspects of the memorial He commanded us to make as complementary, not contradictory; and the identity of the consecrated bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ is manifested to be in the realm of their spiritual function and power.
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This name of the Lord's Supper is derived from eucharistia, the prayer of consecration, and this in turn points back to Mt 26 27, "And he took a cup, and gave thanks" (eucharistias). The most common name is "Lord's Supper" (deipnon kurtou [1 Cor 11 20]). It is also called "Lord's table" (triskesia kurtou [10 21 AV]); while the cup is called the "cup of blessing" (potevrio tis elugias [ver 16]) and "the cup of the Lord" (potevrio kurtou [ver 21]). The word koinonía points both to the bread and the cup, whence our common term "communion." In post-apostolic days it became known as leitourgia, a sacred ministration, whence our word "liturgy." It was also named thuia, a sacrifice, and missellos, from its mystic character, and perhaps from the fact that it was celebrated only in the closed circle of believers. The Roman Catholic church calls it missa or "mass," from the words congregatio missa est, whereby in post-apostolic times the first part of worship, called the missa laurethuminorum (cf. leitourgia), and whereby the second part of worship was ushered in, known as the missa fidelium, the sacramental part of worship, only destined for believers.

The origin of the Eucharist is described in Mt 28; Mk 14, and Lk 22. Paul introduces his own statements of the origin of the institution—the earwitness then proceeds to explain the origin of the institution of the Eucharist. This shows us the Saviour in the deep consciousness of the catastrophe about to overwhelm Him, surrounded by treason on the part of Judas and a strange and total lack of appreciation of the true situation on the part of the other disciples. He had greatly 'desired to eat this Passover with them before he suffered' (Lk 22 15), and yet they are wholly unresponsive, the chief question apparently in their minds being the old content of rank and preeminence. Whether or not Judas was present at the eating of the Supper is a moot point, which we will not discuss here. Neither will we touch the question whether or not this Passover-meal was the true Jewish festive meal or an anticipation of it, called passa, only, in allusion to the great feast, which had brought to the Hundred and Comprehensive recall of spirit to Torah (cf Mt 26; Mk 14 with Jn 13 1; 13 12. 29; 18 28; 19 14.31).

Both Mt and Mk leave the exact place of the institution of the Supper in the festive meal indefinite, "as they were eating" (Mt 26 26; Mk 14 22); the words of Lk, "after supper" (22 20). there be a hint in regard to this matter (see Jn 13 1; 1 Cor 11 25). But the custom of the early church of celebrating the Eucharist after the passover or "love feast" appears (2 Jn 13; J B. Milne, Considerations on Eucharistic Worship; id., The Doctrine and Practice of Eucharist, 1808). It is clear that the original institution was separate from the paschal festival and followed it. The entire subject of the Eucharist has been called in question by the radical German critics, who point to the absence of the whole matter in Ja and to the omission of the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," in Mk. Its occurrence in Lk is ascribed to Paul's influence over
him and to his familiarity with the story of the institution as described by the apostle. But this position is utterly untenable in the light of the unquestioned fact that the Lord's Supper as a fixed part of worship was firmly established from the earliest days of the Christian church. The doctrine of Christ's vicarious suffering is nowhere so clearly enunciated as in the words of the institution of the Supper, "This is my body which is given for you" (Lk 22:19); "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28). Nothing could have utterly done away with the doctrine of the vicarious atonement or of substitution should attack the historicity of the Eucharist and should seek by all means to wipe it from the record.

Jesus bids His followers to observe the new institution "in remembrance of Him". As Dr. Bavinck says, "The Lord's Supper is instituted by Christ as a permanent benefit to His church; it is a blessing added to all other blessings to signify and to seal them" (Geref. Dogm. 11, 30).

As to the elements used in the original institution of the Supper, they were bread and wine. The bread of course was the unleavened bread of the Passover, during which every trace of leaven was removed (Ex 12:19). The Eastern church, perhaps influenced by the bitter Ebonite spirit of the Judaizers, later adopted the use of common bread (koâdos ardos); the Western church used unleavened bread. Protestantism left the matter among the adiaphore.

As regards the wine, the matter has been in dispute from the beginning (see Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Bb. Lit.). The early church always used mixed wine, barley and water, following the Passover-meal. Whether the wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper was fermented or unfermented wine, must of course be determined by the Jewish Passover-currents prevailing at that time. The matter is in dispute and is not easily settled.

Modern Jews quite generally use raisin-wine, made by steeping raisins over night in water and expressing the juice the next day for use at the Passover-meal. The ancient, used for this purpose a fermented boiled wine, mixed with water (Mish. Tosefth, xi). Whether wine, the word used in the NT, was considered as the name for fermented wine or for water, or figuratively for the mixed drinks, well known to ancient and modern Jews, is a disputed matter. As late as the 16th century the Nestorians celebrated communion with raisin-wine, and the same is said of the Indian Christians. The word "new", used by Christ in Mt 28:29, is believed by some to indicate the wine used by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, viz. the juice of grapes fresh pressed out (see Clem. Alex. Paed., xi). On the other hand the third Council of Braga explicitly forbade this practice as heretical. It is evident that the whole subject is shrouded in much mystery. Some ancient sects substituted an entirely different element, water and milk, for instance, being used (Epiph. Haer., xlii; Aug. Haer., xxvii). Such customs were utterly condemned by the Council of Braga (675 AD). In general, however, the Christian church, from the beginning, seems to have used fermented red wine, either mixed or pure, in the administration of the Eucharist. In order to maintain the correspondence between the symbol and the thing symbolized.

Originally the apostolic church celebrated communion at every meeting for worship. They continued steadfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers (Acts in 2:42-46). Very soon, however, we may judge from the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, its administration was confined to the meeting on the first day of the week. The apostles always preceded communion, and at some part of the service the believers, the sexes after the plan of the synagogue being separated, would salute each other with the "holy kiss" (philéma hagión) (1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12). But the introduction of the sacrament, with all its accessories, had evidently occasioned grave abuses at Corinth (1 Cor 11:34). Paul corrects these in unmistakable language. Thus we received our first written record of the institution of the Supper in Corinth. It must have been introduced at the beginning to the first day of the week (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2). By a slow transition the dégnom was transferred from the midnight hour to the morning. At least we find that Paul kept it. It "was celebrated from the midnight hour to the morning" (1 Cor 11:11). It would appear as if the apostle had also partaken of the Lord's Supper, together with his Christian companions, on board the ship, toward the close of his fatal trip on the Adriatic (Acts 27:35).

In the post-apostolic church the Eucharist continued to be celebrated every Lord's day. But it separated itself from the preaching of the Word and the primitive prayers, by the addition of the Lord's Prayer, and was made the central act of worship. It was invested with a mystic meaning, 2. The Eucharist as a symbol of the union between the persons of the Trinity in the mystery of the Godhead. It was thus constituted as the symbol of the profession of the Christian creed, in the words of the apostle (Rom 15:5). A symbol of all communion. It thus became an act which even the heretics only, in which the Eucharist was celebrated. Breaking of bread, all the ingredients for the apóstasis, from which the elements for the Supper were selected, were furnished by the free-will offerings of the faithful. It was solemnly set apart by the officiating bishop with a concurring prayer, eucharistia, and thus obtained the name "Eucharist." The gifts themselves were called proskophi, oblations, or thusiak, sacrifices. The sacrificial character of the act was greatly intensified thus gradually created (Ignc. Phil. Iv; Smyrna, VII; Justin. Apol. I, 68; Iren. Adv. Haer. Iv, 15.5). The Eucharist once being conceived as a sacrifice, the conception of the officiating bishop as a priest became logically necessary. Fell within the sphere of the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The Council, according to a formulary of 166 (d. 865) (philema 16), was to be taught that the bread and wine, of course, have a real, substantial existence, being consecrated by the word "new," used by Christ in Mt 28:29, is believed by some to indicate the wine used by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, viz. the juice of grapes fresh pressed out (see Clem. Alex. Paed., xi). On the other hand the third Council of Braga explicitly forbade this practice as heretical. It is evident that the whole subject is shrouded in much mystery. Some ancient sects substituted an entirely different element, water and milk, for instance, being used (Epiph. Haer., xlii; Aug. Haer., xxvii). Such customs were utterly condemned by the Council of Braga (675 AD). In general, however, the Christian church, from the beginning, seems to have used fermented red wine, either mixed or pure, in the administration of the Eucharist. In order to maintain the correspondence between the symbol and the thing symbolized.

In the Catholic Church the Eucharist is celebrated at every mass; and in the Eastern church, in many regions, at the beginning of the general service. The Eastern church was the first to adopt the custom of celebrating the Eucharist at the beginning of the Divine service, which was established at the third Council of Braga (675 AD).

In the Western church, the Eucharist was not celebrated at the beginning of the Divine service, but at the end, as a rule. The Eastern church was the first to adopt the custom of celebrating the Eucharist at the beginning of the Divine service, which was established at the third Council of Braga (675 AD).

The Catholic Church teaches in its dogma of the Eucharist that the body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood of Christ, by the Divine power. This has
been the Romish doctrine of the Supper ever since. The bread and wine are changed into the veritable body and blood of Christ, by the words of the institution of the Supper, Christ made His disciples priests, wherefore the Eucharist may be administered only by an ordained priest. In the miracle of the sacrament, the "accidents" of the elements—bread and wine—remain, but they are no longer inherent in a subject, the substance in which they inhered being replaced by another. This new substance is the body and blood of Christ, which is hidden from observation under the appearance of the elements. The whole Christ is present in and as all elements, hence no need to communicate under both forms (sub utroque). In the Romish conception of the Supper communion with Christ is a secondary idea. The main idea is that of the transubstantiation itself, for the Supper is more a sacrifice than a sacrament; thus the mass becomes a sin offering. While it feeds faith, keeps us from mortal sin, wards off temporal punishment, unites believers, it also has a potency for those who are not present, and even for the dead in purgatory. Thus the mass became the very heart and center of the entire Romish cultus (Conf. Trid., XIII, 21, 22; Cat. Rom., CXII, 4; Bellarm., De Sacrat. Euch., I, iv; Moehler, Symb., § 34).

The Reformers rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist, the adoration of the "host," the withholding of the cup, the efficiency of the Eucharist in behalf of, and the entire Romish conception of the sacrament of the Supper. Thus Luther, in his original position of Luther, that the elements in the Supper were signs and seals of the remission of sins, was soon replaced by the doctrine of "consubstantiation." The bitter controversy with Carlstadt, and esp., the failure of the Marburg Conference, drove Luther forever into the camp of the realists. As early as 1524 he had outlined his doctrine against Carlstadt. He placed himself squarely on the realist conception of the word: "the body of Christ in accordance with the will and omnipotence of God and its own ubiquity is really and substantially present in, with and under the Supper, even as His Divine nature is in the host as wrath is in the iron. What bread the Supper physically partaken of by those who are unworthy, albeit to their own destruction" (Bavinck, Gerfl. Dogm., IV, 318). This doctrine has been fully developed by the Lutheran divines, and is still this day the view of the Lutheran Church.

Zwingli essentially sided with Carlstadt in his controversy with Luther, whom he thereby greatly embittered. He interpreted the words of institution, "this is the" as signifying "this stands for," "this signifies." This view was fully set forth in a letter to Matthew Alber at Reutlingen in 1524 and was given its final form in his dogmatic treat, Com. de vera et falsa rel. (1525), where he characterizes Luther's doctrine as "an opinion not only rustic but even impious and frivolous." The breach was widened by the Marburg Conference of 1529. Reduced to its last analysis, the eucharistic concept of Zwingli is that of a symbolical memorial of the suffering and death of Christ, although Zwingli does not deny that Christ is present to the eye of faith. On the contrary, he is enjoyed through the word and through faith, i.e. in a spiritual way. In the Supper we confess what we truly mean to us, and we do it in memory of Christ's death (Oper., i, i, 426; iii, 339, 326, 459; iv, 51, 68). The Zwinglian view has been consciously or unconsciously adopted by a very large portion of the Protestant church.

Calvin's position on the doctrine of the Eucharist tends rather to the Luther than to the Zwinglian view. With Zwingli the sacrament is little more than a sign, with Calvin it is both a sign and a seal. The reality of communion with Christ and the benefit of His death, received by a living faith—all this is common to the Lutheran and the Calvinistic views. The Lord's Supper is far more than a mere memorial service, it is a marvelous means of grace as well. Calvin sides with Zwingli in denying all elements, hence to communicate under both forms (sub utroque). In the Zwinglian view of the eucharistic act far more than a confession of faith, and he lays far greater stress than Zwingli on the meaning of its true participation. With Luther he holds that Christ is truly present in the Supper, and he lays stress esp. on the mystic union of the believer with Christ. In the Supper both the benefits of Christ's death and His glorious person are touched. But Calvin does not descend in the Supper to the very heart of the matter, but he leads the believer up to Him in heaven. The central thought of the Calvinistic conception of the Supper is this, that the communicant, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, comes in spiritual contact with the entire person of Christ and that he is thus fed unto life eternal. Every close student of Calvin's works will have to admit that his ideas on the subject are somewhat involved and confusing. This is due to no doubt to the mediating position he occupied between Luther and Zwingli. As a whole is quite plain. All his followers agree in holding that (1) Christ is only spiritually present in the Supper; (2) that the participation in the benefits of the Supper must therefore be spiritual, although it is real, and (3) that only true communicants, by a living faith, can communicate therein, and that this participation in the atoning death of the Saviour is sealed to us by the use of the ordained signs of the sacrament.
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1. The Term. "Eucharist" is the anglicized form of the Gr noun eucharistia, which signifies "gratitude," "thanks," or "praise." The word "offering." The noun is derived from the vb. eucharisteō, which, with the kindred meaning in Mt 26:26:7; Mk 14:22:23, is used to describe the action of the Lord in blessing the bread and wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:23). When used absolutely, as in these places, it signifies "the offering up of praise, but not only as appointed by nothing else than God Himself and His revealed glory" (Cremer). The blessing of the physical elements was part of the sacramental act at subsequent celebrations of the ordinance (1 Cor 10:16), and thus eucharistic soon (2d cent.) came to mean the blessed elements and the entire ordinance in which these were administered.

Other Scriptural terms for the same ordinance are "Communion" (from koinōnia, in the twofold sense indicated in 1 Cor 10:16, 17, and thus eucharistic soon [2d cent.]), "Lord's Table" (trapeza tōn dētpson [1 Cor 11:20]). "Lord's Table" (trapeza tōn dētpson [1 Cor 11:20]).
kurtou (1 Cor 10 21), "Breaking of Bread" (βάσσα του δριτου [Acts 2 42]). The lit. of the church developed a great many terms which emphasize one of the other features of the ordinance. Luther, in his Small Catechism, adopts the name "Sacraments of the Altar," because it is administered at the altar. The Lutheran Confessions of the Augsburg Confession, however, in the original meaning which the early church, not in which the Roman church, connects with the word (Latin missa), either from missa, "because the materials for communion were sent to the place of celebration, or from missis, "a sending; a dispatching" (see above). Indians who were not members, were dismissed from the service before the celebration of the Eucharist. (Strong, Cyclop. of Bib., Theol. and Eccles. Lit., V, 863).

II. The Ordinance.—The "seats of doctrine," i.e. the Scripture texts which must be employed for determining every essential part of the teaching of Scripture regarding the second sacrament of the Christian church, are the words of institution of the Eucharist recorded in Mt 26 26-28; Mk 14 22-24; Lk 22 19-20; 1 Cor 11 23-25. Valuable statements, chiefly concerning the proper use of the sacrament, are found in 1 Cor 10 15 ff; 11 20 ff. These texts are controverted no reason why a doctrine should not be derived from them. No doctrine of the Christian religion could be established, if every text of Scripture should be withheld from the church until so fast as it had become controverted. Jn 6 32-59 does not treat of this ordinance, because (1) the ordinance must be dated from the night of the betrayal, which was considerably after the Lord's discourse at Communion; (2) because this passage speaks of eating the flesh, not the body, of the Son of man, and of drinking his blood, in such a manner that a person's eternal salvation is made to depend upon this eating and drinking. If this passage be interpreted to mean that the body and blood of our Lord is present during the Lord's Supper, then we are to expound every passage of Scripture which speaks of a liturgical drinking and eating of the body and blood of our Lord (see above). Thus: "My body, which is given for you," "my blood, which is shed for many." The substance of the Eucharistic words has grown on the vine, has been pressed from grapes, and has the characteristics of the substance known as wine. That the wine, however, is the substance of the Eucharist, is left undefined. The expression gýmnema τας ἀμπέλου, "fruits of the vine" (Mt 26 28), simply meant a wine of ancient quality and type, of which there was a great deal of such a substance; it is not a statement that the substance of the sacrament is wine. Likewise, the color of the wine at the Lord's Supper was left undefined. The use of unfermented wine is apt to introduce an element of uncertainty into the sacrament. The argument is as follows: (1) There is no express declaration of the church as to the kind of wine to be used. "Body and Blood of our Lord...") (2) The words of institution could not present at the same time in every eucharistic act. To say "in one or other of these things..." is to be in accord with the ancient eucharistic service; but it is not to be in accord with the church, who prescribe that in one and the same stage during the eucharistic act, the Roman ordinance of transubstantiation does (against 1 Cor 11 26-28); or the real presence of the true bread and wine, as reformed teaching does, is not doing justice to Scripture.

The exposition of the genuine eucharistic texts of Scripture is governed by the common law of Bible exegesis, viz. that every word and statement of Scripture must be understood in its proper and native sense, unless a plain and urgent reason contra mandas the sense given by the writer. The writers who have recorded the institution of the sacrament have given no hint that they wish to be understood figuratively. The solemn occasion—the Eucharist being the expression of the last will and testament of the Lord—forbids the use of figurative language (Gal 3 15). The fact that a statement of Scripture transcends our natural powers of comprehension does not justify us in giving it a figurative meaning. If this rationalistic principle were to be applied in explaining Scripture, we could not retain a single revealed doctrine. Besides, those who have adopted a figurative interpretation are not agreed where to locate the figure in the words of institution. Some claim that the word το κρέας, others that κρέας, others that το σῶμα μου contain a figure, while still others would take the institutional words in their proper sense, but understand the entire ordinance figuratively.

The eucharistic passages contain: (1) a statement fixing the time of occasion of the institution. It was "in the night in which he was betrayed," immediately before the Contents of the beginning of the passio s. of the Eucharist, and the Institution of the Jewish Passover Passages (Mt 26 17 ff). The ordinance which Christ instituted was to take the place of the ancient Passover (1 Cor 5 7, which text Luther aptly renders: "We, too, have a passover, which is Christ crucified for us"). Jewish custom at the time of Christ seems to have allowed some latitude as regards the time for eating the paschal lamb. Thus the difference between John (18 28; 19 29) and the Synoptic Evangelists (Mark 14 12) is a purely eucharistic difference (see above). Our Lord was deeply stirred with thoughts of love and sacrifice in his act of institution for his disciples at the time of the institution (13 1).

(2) An authoritative declaration of Christ, the God-man, fixing the constituent parts of the sacrament, and the distinctive nature of the eucharistic act (speciem actus). This declaration names:

(a) the elements of the sacrament, which are of two kinds: bread and wine (matera terrae), and the body and blood of the Lord (matera coelestis) (see Irenaeus, Hdr., IV, 34, 463, quoted in P. C. H., Art. VII, no. 14, 449). There is no law laid down as regards the quality, form, or quantity of the bread (leavened or unleavened, round or oblong. In large loaves, cakes, or in water form ready for immediate distribution. Likewise the color of the wine; the wine is left undefined. The expression γόμμα τας αμπέλου, "fruits of the vine" (Mt 26 28), simply meant a wine of ancient quality and type, of which there was a great deal of such a substance; it is not a statement that the substance of the sacrament is wine. Likewise, the color of the wine at the Lord's Supper was left undefined.

The use of unfermented wine is apt to introduce an element of uncertainty into the sacrament. The argument is as follows: (1) There is no express declaration of the church as to the kind of wine to be used. "Body and Blood of our Lord...") (2) The words of institution could not present at the same time in every eucharistic act. To say "in one or other of these things..." is to be in accord with the ancient eucharistic service; but it is not to be in accord with the church, who prescribe that in one and the same stage during the eucharistic act, the Roman ordinance of transubstantiation does (against 1 Cor 11 26-28); or the real presence of the true bread and wine, as reformed teaching does, is not doing justice to Scripture.

(2) The relation of the elements to one another: In offering the physical elements to the disciples the Lord employs the locutio exhibiti, common to every language of men: He names that which is not seen while giving that which is seen ("Here are your spicis, says the grocer delivering the package containing them.) The locutio exhibiti, except when used by a jester or dishonest person, always states a fact. The bread in the Eucharist is the body of Christ, the wine, likewise, is the blood of Christ (1 Cor 10 16 17 by koimànna, "communion.") This term is not the same as matoché, "participation," which would refer to the communal act (Pent. 14 159; 149). Koimànna declares a communion of the body and blood of Christ by the body, of Christ, the wine. It is impossible to define the mode and manner of this communion of the earthly with the heavenly elements. Such terms as "consubstantiation," "invagination," are faulty attempts to define the undefinable. All we can assert is that by the manner in which we use the bread and wine, we are in a sacramental union with the eucharistic bread and wine.

(c) The action required, viz. "take, eat": "take, drink." These words refer to the distribution and reception of the sacramental elements. These are essential, the mode is not, unless one wishes to emphasize, e.g. by the breaking of the bread, the merely symbolic meaning of the entire ordinance. Accordingly, it is also immaterial whether the adminstrant place the elements into the hands of the communicant, or, if he should convey them to his mouth, or whether the communicant conveys the elements directly to his mouth, without the adminstrant. It is impossible to define the mode and manner of this communion of the earthly with the heavenly elements. Such terms as "consubstantiation," "invagination," are faulty attempts to define the undefinable. All we can assert is the manner in which we as communicants receive is to commend to us the body and blood of our Lord in a sacramental union with the eucharistic bread and wine.
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also the unworthy communicant receives the Lord's body, and that for his service, "not discerning" it (1 Cor 10:21) (d) The end and aim of the ordinance: The Lord says as a command to the Church, Paul says, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." These words make the Eucharist an efficient means for strengthening the spiritual union of the disciples with the Lord until His return, and to make an appeal for faith on their part of the communicants, and restrict admission to communion to the believing followers of the Lord. Worthy communicants are those who understand the meaning of Christ's sacrifice and hope for His return in glory. (Luther: "The sacrament is instituted for us Christians.")

The humility of self-examination enjoyed upon communicants further emphasizes the purpose of the Eucharist: stimulation of knowledge and acknowledgment of our sinful state, confidence in the ever-present forgiveness of God for Christ's sake, and a sincere purpose to forsake sin and grow in holiness. Accordingly, non-believers, morally irresponsible persons, and persons who lead offensive lives which they will not amend, cannot be admitted to communion (Mt 7:26).

1. “This do in remembrance of me,” Paul says: "The strengthning of the bonds of brotherly love and fellowship by means of communion. Hence, unity besides the blessing of the elements, only the giving and receiving as communion together (Mt 26:26), and “close communion," not “open, or promiscuous communion" is in accord with the teaching of Scripture. In the absence of any fixed rule as to the frequency of a Christian's communion, these above reasons suffice to induce him to commune frequently ("as often as").

2. An authoritative statement of Christ concerning the continued use of the sacrament (exercitium actus): "This do." This means (a) that the action of Christ is effective, i.e., bread and wine should be blessed, distributed and received. The blessing is called the consecration and consists in the reciting of a prayer and the words of the institution. Consecration has no magical effects, it does not produce the sacrament, but it does, on the other hand, it is not a mere meaningless ceremony, but a solemn declaration that in accordance with the will of the Lord, bread and wine are now being separated from their common use, to be devoted to the use which the Lord has decreed. Hence, the prayer to the Lord to be present in the sacrament; (b) that whenever disciples do as their Lord did, He will connect His body and blood with the earthly substances as He did at the first communion; (c) that besides the blessing of the elements, only the giving or distribution, and the taking, or reception, of the sacramental elements are proper and essential parts of a sacramental action. A true sacramental action is complete only where these three acts concur: consecration, distribution, and taking, and one of these acts nothing that may be done with the elements possesses the nature of a sacrament or a sacramental action. Offering the consecrated wafer for adoration is no part of the sacrament, but it is a form of adoration (adoratorio), because there is no sacramental union except in the act of distributing and receiving the consecrated elements. The withdrawal of the cup from the lay communicants is an unwarranted mutilation of the sacrament (Mt 14:25). But the greatest perversion of the sacrament, and a standing reproach to the completeness of the atoning sacrifice of the Lord is the offering up of the consecrated elements as an unbloody sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, which is being done in the Roman mass (He 10:14,15).

III. Difficulties.—“How can these things be?”

This question might be raised against every doctrine of Scripture. The union of the human natures in the God-man, the imputation of His merit to the believer, the quickening power of the word of Divine grace, the resurrection of the dead, etc, can be all subjected to the same questionings. "Has faith no place in this sacrament?" Faith does not create, nor help to create the sacrament, neither the administrator's nor the communicant's faith. The sacrament is fully constituted in all its parts by the institutional act of the Lord and by His command to continue the observance of it. Man's faith cannot make, man's unbelief cannot unmake, an ordinance of God. But faith is necessary in order that a communicant may receive the blessings offered in the Eucharist, and testify to his believing relation to the Lord and to his Christian fellowship with the brethren. The sacrament bestows no blessing ex opere operato, i.e., by the mere mechanical performance of the physical act.

Are the words of the institution part of the sacred text?" Up to the age of Reformation, the were universally regarded so, and the critical labors of Briggs, P. Gardner, Graf, Immer, Jülicher, etc, which can be readily explained by the theological position of these men, lack unity of result and are offset by the labors of Scrivener, Schultzen, R. A. Hoffman, Blass, Böyschlag, etc. Christianity as yet, sees no reason for discarding the words of the institution and for discontinuing the Eucharist as a part of Divine worship.

W. H. T. DAV

ACCORDING TO THE BELIEF AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN (DUNKERS)

I. THE LAST SUPPER WAS NOT THE JEWISH PASSOVER

A. Date
1. The Last Supper was not the Jewish Passover.

1. 1. The Last Supper Was Not the Jewish Passover.—John gives five distinct insinuations of the date: (1) "Now before the feast of the passover..." (John 13:1). This shows the Supper, early on the day of crucifixion, before the Passover.

2. "Buy what things we have need of for the feast" (Gyros o ὁριον ἔχων εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἀγάπην ἡν ἡ λαξίων τῆς διακονίας τῆς ἑορτῆς; 13:29). This shows that the Supper (σεβεμένη σελβίαν) was not the Passover feast (σεβεμένη, ψευδής).

3. "They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas into the Praetorium; and it was early; and they themselves entered not into the Praetorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover" (τὰς ἀναφέρεται ἄνθρωπον της ἑορτῆς... τρόφιμος ἐνα, ἐνα φάγον της ἑορτῆς; 15:28). This was the Passover, early on the day of crucifixion, before the Passover.

4. "Now it was the Preparation of the passover: it was about the sixth hour" (ἐν τῇ ἐπαρτησίᾳ της ἑορτῆς... ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῆς πραξικότητος τῆς ἑορτῆς; 19:14). This again shows conclusively that the Passover was not yet eaten. Jesus is before Pilate: it is the day of the crucifixion and after the Last Supper.

5. "The Jews therefore, because it was the Preparation, and the Passover was not yet eaten..." (τὰς ἀναφέρεται τῇ ἑορτῇ... τῆς ἑορτῆς... τρόφιμος... τρόφιμος... τῆς ἑορτῆς... 19:15). This shows that the Passover was intended to continue the observance after sunset on the 15th of Nisan at the beginning of the Jewish Sabbath. Whenever the Passover fell upon the Sabbath, that Sabbath was a "high day."

II. Place of Faith

Christ is our Passover: died at the time the Passover lamb was slain, hence after the Last Supper. (1) Christ died at the time the Passover
lamb was slain on Friday afternoon, the 14th of Nisan, and thus became Our Passover (1 Cor 5:7), the 14th of Nisan also having been sacrificed before Christ. The Passover also had been sacrificed.

2. Doctrinal Significance.—(a) Jesus, the Lamb of God (Jn 1:29) corresponds to the Passover lamb (Ex 12:5). "Without blemish, (Ex 12:5) = Jesus, "who did no sin" (1 Pet 2:22-24). The blood of a lamb sprinkled upon houses (Ex 12:7.13) corresponds to the blood of Jesus (1 Jn 1:7-9). (b) Jesus arose the third day and became "the first-fruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor 15:20.23). The resurrection was our first day of the week. The sheaf, or first-fruits, was gathered in the 16th of Nisan. Therefore Jesus must have died on Friday the 14th of Nisan, when the Passover lamb was slain; hence after the Last Supper.

All the early traditions, both Jewish and Christian, agree that Jesus was crucified on the day of Preparation of the Passover, and that they distinguished between the Passover and the Last Supper which was eaten the evening before the Jewish feast.

II. The Perpetuation of the Last Supper.—(1) Since the Last Supper was a new institution, there is no more reason for perpetuating one part than another. It is a unit, and each event of that night has its meaning and place. (2) Jesus commanded the disciples to perpetuate feet-washing (see Washing of Feet) (Jn 13:14.15.17), and likewise He commanded the Eucharist to be perpetuated as a memorial of Him (1 Cor 11:24.25). Why not the Agape? (3) The Agape was perpetuated by the apostles in their services. They certainly understood Jesus to mean that the entire service of the Last Supper should be perpetuated, else they would not have done so.

III. Practice of the Church of the Brethren (Dunkers).—The Dunkers, or German Dunkers, perpetuate the Last Supper with the disciples. These Love Feasts are held once or twice each year, always in the evening, by each local church or congregation. Preparatory services on "self-examination" (1 Cor 11:28) precede the ordinances. The church persons are divided into parties. The Supper (bêvov, dêpov) is made ready beforehand by the deacons and deaconesses. The devotional exercises aim to accomplish special consecration, confession, and reconciliation. Before the eating of the Supper, Jn 13:1-17 is read and contemplated, whereupon the brethren proceed to wash one another's feet, and the sisters likewise by themselves. All tarry one for another (1 Cor 11:33) until they are ready for the Supper. The officiating elder then calls upon some one to offer prayer for the bread, which then is broken, and another person conducts a thanksgiving at the close of the meal. After the meal, the officiating elder calls upon one to read the story of Christ's sufferings (Isa 53, or Jn 12:16). After a short explanation of the meaning of the symbol, the elder distributes the bread while the officiating elder gives thanks for the bread. He then turns to his brother at his right and breaks a piece of the unleavened bread for him with the words, "My beloved brother, the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ." (see 1 Cor 10:16). The brethren then break the bread one to the other, with these words. Likewise the sisters in the same manner. Again the congregation rises while the officiating elder gives thanks for the cup, which is then passed by one to the other with the words, "Beloved brother (or sister), the cup of the NT is the communion of Christ (1 Cor 10:16). This is followed by prayers of praise and thanksgiving, then a hymn (Mt 26:30) and a benediction.

IV. The Meaning and Significance of the Love Feast.—All these ordinances or symbols signify some fundamental virtue in the Christian life. We are commanded to follow our Master who is the Way and the Truth. But these symbols have a real significance, apart from merely "following" or "imitation" of Christ. The washing of feet symbolized humility and service, and also the partial cleansing which all Christians need. (2) The Agape signifies the bread-and-water covenant of brotherhood and peace. It is not only the symbol of true Christian love (Acts 2:45), but it is also the "Marriage Supper of the Lamb," which is supremely a symbol of joy. (3) The Eucharist: (a) The broken bread represents the "body of Christ" (1 Cor 10:16) which is broken for you" (1 Cor 11:24 AV) hence the symbol of sacrifice. It is a memorial of Christ's sufferings, and a consecration to suffer with Him. It means also feeding on Christ, whose flesh we must eat (Jn 6:51.53.54). (b) The cup represents the blood of Christ (1 Cor 10:16; Jn 6:53.54). It is the blood covenant that symbolizes the unity of man with God (Jn 17:21). Jesus is the vine, we are the branches (Jn 15). The same mind, spirit, life and love which are in God and Christ are to be in us.


DANIEL WEBSTER KURTZ

LORDS OF THE PHILISTINES (תֵּפרִיִם, sifrei, same as Heb word for "axle" probably a native designation).—These (Josh 13:3; Jgs 3:16; 15:5, etc.), elsewhere called "princes" (sar, 1 S 18:30; 29:3.4.9.), were the petty rulers or kings of the 5 Phil cities, Gaza, Askelon, Ashdod, Ekron, Gath. See Philistines.

LO-RUHAMAH, ló-roh-há'má, ló-roh-há'má. See Lo-ammi.

LOSS: נַפְּח, hâ'dâ', "to suffer as one erring, or as a sinner" (Gen 31:39, where Jacob assures Laban that he [Jacob] suffered the loss of all animals of the flock torn by beasts); שִׁבְּכָה, shibkhâ, "bereavement" (Isa 47:8 f, where the prophet foretells the humiliation of proud Babylon who shall suffer the loss of her children, and widowhood); שִׁיבְּקֵל, shibqel, "bereavement" (Isa 49:20, tré, "bereavement" in RV, where the prophet promises to the desolate Zion enlargement). In the NT the tr of three Gr words; ἀδελφός, apostē; "casting away" (Acts 27:22, where Paul assures the crew and passengers that there shall be no "loss" of life from the storm); σώλω, zômâ, "loss" (Acts 27:21, referring to the harvest of grain), or the ship's crew, or cargo, or life; where Paul counts all his natural privileges and attainments as forfeited for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ); ἀδελφός, zômâs, "to suffer loss" (1 Cor 15:15, where Paul says the man whose works are buried will himself suffer "loss"); Phil 3:8, same context as above). CHARLES B. WILLIAMS

LOT, lot

I. Personality.—The man who bore the name Lot (לט, lót; ἅλα, ἅλα; Lót, Lot) is mentioned for the first time in Gen 11:27, at the beginning of that section of Gen which is entitled the "generations of Terah." After Terah's 3 sons are named, it is added that the third of these, Haran, begat Lot.

The reason for thus singling out but one of the grandsons of Terah appears in the next verse, where we are told that "Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees." For that period in the life of this family, therefore, which begins with the migration from Ur, Lot represents his father's branch of the family (ver 31). It is hardly probable that the relation between Abraham and Lot would have been what it was, had not Haran died; but be this as it may, we read this introduction of L. into the genealogy of the race of Terah as an introduction, which furnishes an introduction, and in which L. is destined to play an important part.

The sections of that story in which L. appears are: in ch 11, the migration from Ur to Haran; in ch 12, Abraham's strife with Lot; in ch 13, the separation of Abraham and L.; in ch 14, the campaign
of the eastern kings against Sodom and Abraham's recovery of the captives; and in ch 19, the destruction of Sodom.

In 14:14-16 L. is termed the "brother" of Abraham; but that this does not represent a variant tradition is proved by reference to ver 12 of the same chapter (ascribed to "an independent source") and to 13:8 (ascribed to J; cf 11:28). 14:3-9 (of his father there; the marriage of his sister Milcah to his uncle Nahor (of another sister, Isaac, we learn only the name), and the journey to Haran in company with Terah, Abraham and Sarah. The fact that Sarah's childlessness and Haran's death are the only two circumstances related of the family history, may serve to explain why L. went with Abraham instead of staying with Nahor. A childless uncle and a fatherless nephew may well have remained together with the idea that, even if there was no formal adoption, the nephew might become his uncle's heir. Certainly, the promise of a nameless seed, so often repeated to the patriarchs, comes first to Abraham immediately after L. has separated from his family (16:1-3).

In the second period of L.'s life, we find him the companion of Abraham on his journeys to Mesopotamia to Canaan, through Canaan to Egypt, and back again to the neighborhood of Beth-el. His position is subordinate, for his uncle is head of the family, and oriental custom is uniform and rigorous in the matter of family rule. Hence the use of the singular number throughout the narrative. What Abraham did, his whole clan did. Yet L.'s position was nearly independent as these patriarchal conditions admit. When the story reaches the point where it is necessary to mention this fact, the narrator explains, first, the generosity with which Abraham treated his nephew, in permitting him to have "flocks, and herds, and tents" of his own, a quasi-independent economy, and second, that disproportion between their collective possessions and the land's resources which made separation inevitable. Up to this point the only mention of L. during this period of wanderings is contained in 13:1, in the words "And Lot with him." And even here the words are useless (because stating a fact perfectly presumably here as elsewhere), except as they prepare the reader for the story of the separation that is immediately to follow.

That story introduces the third period of Lot's career, that of his residence in the Kieakar (RV "Plain," RVa "Circle") and in Sodom. For the foundation, as above stated, the author adds the two circumstances which contributed to produce the result, namely, first, the strife that arose between Abraham's herdsmen and L.'s herdsmen, and, second, the presence in the same country of others—the Canaanites and Perizites—thus reminding his readers that it was no vacant land, through which they might spread themselves absolutely at will and so counteract the operation of the principle of cause and the contributory cause already set forth.

With a magnanimity that must have seemed even greater to minds accustomed to patriarchal authority than it seems to us, and that was in fact much more remarkable then it is now, Abraham offers to his nephew the choice of the land—from the nomad's point of view. In the

"we are brethren" (ver 8), the whole force of the scene is crystallized. L., who believes himself to have chosen the better part, is thereupon in his nomadic progress as far as Sodom, and the reader leaves him for a time face to face with a city whose men "were wicked and sinners against Jehovah exceedingly," while the narrative moves on with Abraham through that fresh scene of revelation which presented to this man of magnanimity a Divine deed to all the land, and to this man, now left without an heir from among his own kindred (cf 16:23), a Divine pledge of innumerable offspring.

L. returns for a moment to our view as the spring of Abraham's motions in the campaign of ch 14. We are expressly told that it was "when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive," that he "led forth his trained men . . . and pursued." On the one hand we hear that L. now "dwelt in Sodom," having abandoned the life in tents that he had led since Mesopotamian days, and on the other hand we find in him a foil to the energetic, decisive and successful figure of his uncle—for L. plays a sorry role, bracketed always with "the women and the goods."

This period of his life ends with the annihilation of his chosen home, his wealth, his companions, and all that was his save two daughters, who, if L. had been spared, might better have deserted him. Ch 19, coming immediately after the intercession of Abraham for Sodom that poignantly impresses on the reader's mind the wickedness of L.'s environment, exhibits to us the man himself in his surroundings, as they have been through well-nigh a score of years (cf 12:4; 17:1). What we see is a man who means well (courtesy, ver 1; hospitality, vs 2.3.6-8; natural shame, ver 7; loyalty, ver 14; and, gratitude, ver 19), but who is hopelessly bound up with the moral life of the city through his family connections—alliances that have pulled him down rather than elevated others (vs 9.14.20.31-35). The language of 2 Pet 2 7.8 reminds us that L. was, even at this time of his life, a "righteous" man. Viewed as a part of his environment (the writer has been speaking of Sodom, ver 6), L. was certainly entitled to be called a "righteous" man, and the term fits the implications of Gen 18:24-32. Moreover, Gen 18 itself shows L. "vexed"" and "sore distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked" (cf vs 3.7.8.14). Yet the contrast with Abraham is always present in the reader's mind, so that the most lasting impressions are made by L.'s selfishness, worldliness, vacillation and cowardice, not to mention the moral effect made by the closing scene of his life (vs 30-38).

The fourth period of L.'s career is of uncertain duration. Upon the destruction of Sodom he dwelt at first in Zoar, the "little" city, sparsely peopled and far removed from the "mountain" (ver 19). In this mountain-country, a land of rocks and caves (Driver in HDB, art. "Lot," cites Buckingham, Travels in Syria, 61-63, 67, as authority for the statement that people still live in caves in this region). L. and his remaining daughters dwell; and the biography of this companion of "the friend of God" ends in a scene of incest, which supplies the logical epilogue to a drama of progressive moral deterioration.

This bestial act, hitherto unknown and unthought of Abram, but he has reached this goal because his path had led down from Beth-el to Sodom.
The origin of the two neighboring and kindred nations, Moab and Ammon, is by the Heb tradition traced to Lot and his descendants. III. Place in Later Literature.—In the Bible, Lot finds mention only as the father of Moab and Ammon (Dt 2 9; Ps 83 8), and in the passage in 2 Pet already noticed; and, besides these places, in Lk 17 28-32. Here L. represents the central figure of the destruction of Sodom. As Noah in the flood in the preceding context (of the association of these two characters in 2 Pet and the Koran). His deliverance is mentioned, the haste and narrowness of that escape is implied, and his wife's fate is described. His iniquity is to be praised, including many passages in the Koran itself). L. is a personage of importance, about whom details are told which fancy has added to the sober traditions of old Israel. But particularly for Mohammed there was point of attachment in L.'s character, often in Gen 19 7.14. Like Mohammed to the men of wicked Mecc, L. becomes a preacher of righteousness and a messenger of judgment to the men of wicked Sodom. He is one of the line of apostles, sent to reveal God's will and purpose to his contemporaries.

IV. Critical Theories about the Figure of Lot.—The common view of those who deny the historical reality of the name simply stands for the other group, Moab and Ammon. Wellhausen, e.g., expressly calls "Lot" a national name (Volknamen). As to what is told of him in Gen be remarks: "Were it not for the remarkable depression in which the Dead Sea L., Sodom and its environs would not have perished; were it not for the flat and sandy land that reaches out into the swamp from the S.E., Lot would have fled at once to the mountains of his sones, Moab and Ammon, and perhaps have made the deour by Zoar, which merely serves the purpose of explicating why this corner is excepted from the overfow, to the territory of which it really belongs" (Prolegomena, 326). Meyer confesses that nothing in the story of L. because any characteristics that feature might furnish a point of attachment is entirely lacking.

Names of the families of the Horites of Seir was named Lotan (Gen 36 20,22), and this writer believes it "probable that this name is derived from Lot; but that Lot was ever a tribal name (Stammname) follows neither from this fact (rather the contrary) nor from the designation of the 'sons of L.' 'Ammon as 'sons of Lot'" (Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, 311; cf 261, 339). If "Horite" was understood in the story in Gen 19 30 might be added in support of this combination. But the most recent line of reasoning concerning these patriarchal figures makes their names "neither Divine names nor tribal names, whatever in actual use or regarded as such, but tribal names like Tom, Dick, or Harry... Typical names they became... so that... Israel's story-tellers would connect the name 'L.' with the overfow of the cities" (Grossmann, in ZATW, 1910). These names were chosen just because of the "imperial" time when these narratives were stamped into types"; later they became a vanity, but the story-tellers held fast to the old names. One sees from this at once how ancient a time the proper names Abraham and Lot must reach, and understands therefore the more easily how they could have been used into tribal ancestors." It does not require the cautions, uttered by writers of this way of thinking, against regarding their views as a return to the old historical view of the patriarchs, to remind us that, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary, the present trend of thought among the most radical critics of the Genesis-traditions is much more favorable to that classical view than with the opinions they have overthrown. So that it may justly be asserted, as Grossmann writes: "Confidence in tradition is in any case open." Lot's Wife: This woman, unknown by name, figures in the narrative of Lot that relates his escape from Sodom. She is mentioned in Gen 19 only in vs 15-17, where she is commanded to flee from the doomed city with her husband and daughers and is laid hold of by the angelic visitors in their eff, to hasten the slow departure; and in ver 26, where she alone of the four fugitives disobeys the warning, looks back, and becomes a "pillar of salt." This disobedience, with the moral state it implied, and the judgment is entailed, is held up as an example by Christ in Lk 17 32. In the Scriptures this is all that is said of a person and event that furnished the basis for a great deal of speculation. In Jos (Ant. I, xi, 4) adds to this that in Gen. "She was changed into a pillar of salt," the words, "for I visited it, and it still remains even now" (see also Wisd 10 7).

Among Christian writers contemporary with and subsequent to Jos, as well as among the Jews themselves, the same assertion is found, and to recent times travelers have reported the existence of such a "pillar of salt," either on the testimony of natives or as eyewitnesses. The question of the origin and nature of these "pillars" is a part of the larger question of Sodom and its neighborhood (see Salt; Sodom; Sâme): for that no one particular "pillar" has persisted through the centuries may be regarded as certain; nor if it had, would the identification of Lot's wife with it and with it alone be certain. This is just an early, persistent and notable case of that "identification" of Bib. sites which prevails all over the Holy Land. It is to be classed with the myth- and legend-building turn of mind in simple peoples, which has e.g. been molded upon the OT account of the destruction of Sodom such marvelous details and embellishments.

The principal thing to observe is the vagueness and the simplicity of the story in Gen. For it does not necessarily imply the "metamorphosis" popularly attributed to it, in the strict sense of that word. And it lacks, even in a narrative like this, where the temptation would be great, the versions of that "popular archaeology" or curiosity, which, according to some critics, is alleged to have furnished the original motive for the invention of the patriarchal narratives. She became a pillar of salt, and "Remember Lot's wife," this is the extent of the Bib. allusions. All the rest is comment, or legend, or guess, or "science."—J. Oscar Boyd

LOT. See Divination.

LOTAN, lvt'an (תֹּלָן, ṭōlān): Son of Seir, a chief (AV "duke") of Edom (Gen 36 20,22,29; 1 Ch 1 38 f).

LOTHASBUS, loth-a'sthobus (Λωθασσούς, Lôthasôus): One of those who stood by Ezra at the reading of the law (1 Esd 9 44); called "Hashum" in Neh 8 4.

LOTS. See Divination.

LOTS, FEAST OF. See Purim.

LOTUS, lú'tus, TREES (zô'id, ζηλοίν; AV shady trees): The trees under which bôhmâth (the hippopotamus) rests; "He lieth under the lotus-trees," "The lotus-trees cover him with their shade" (Job 40 21,22). The Arab. equivalent is the dôm tree, Zeyysh, lutos, a species of jujube tree (N.O. Khamnee); it has many spines and small globular fruit a little bigger than a pea. It is common in the Jordan valley. This plant has nothing to do with the Egyptian lotus. See Lily.

LOVE, luv (לָוֵה, 'âshêb, לָוָה, 'âshêbâh, noun; φίλος, pílos, φίλας, philâs, φίλος, phîlos, v.b.; φιλέω, φιλήμ, noun): Love to both God and man is fundamental to true religion, whether as expressed in the OT or the NT. Jesus Himself declared that all the law and the prophets hang upon love (Mt 22 40; Mk 12 28-34). Paul, in his matchless ode on love (1 Cor 13), makes it the greatest of the graces of the Christian life—greater than speaking with tongues, or the gift of prophecy, or the possession of a faith of superior excellence; for without love all these gifts and graces, desirable and useful as they are to themselves, are as nothing, certainly of no permanent value in the sight of God. Not that either Jesus or Paul underestimates the faith from which all the graces proceed, for this grace is recognized
as fundamental in all God’s dealings with man and man’s dealings with God (Jn 6:28; He 11:6); but both alike count that faith as but idle and worthless belief that does not manifest itself in love to both God and man. As love is the highest expression of God and revelation to mankind, so it must be the highest expression of man’s relation to His Maker and to his fellow-man.

I. Definition.—While the Heb and Gr words for “love” have various shades and intensities of meaning, they may be summed up in some such definition as this: Love, whether used of God or man, is an earnest and anxious desire for, and an active and beneficent interest in, the well-being of the one loved. Different degrees and manifestations of this affection are recognized in the Scriptures according to the circumstances and relations of life, e.g., the expression of love as between husband and wife, parent and child, brethren according to the flesh, and according to grace; between friend and enemy, and, finally, between God and man. It must not be overlooked, however, that the fundamental idea of love as expressed in the definition of it is never absent in any one of these relations of life, even though the manifestation thereof may differ according to the circumstances and relations. Christ’s interest in the apostle Peter is expressed by the term “phileo,” love, yet Christ in His more intense love for Peter than for Peter in return is phileo, implying a clear determination of will and judgment, and belonging particularly to the sphere of Divine revelation. In his answer Peter went no farther than the word “phileo,” the natural human affection, with its strong feeling, or sentiment, and is never used in Scripture language to designate man’s love to God. While the answer of Peter, then, claims only an inferior kind of love, as compared to the one contained in Christ’s question, he nevertheless is confident of possessing at least such love for his Lord.

II. The Love of God.—First in the consideration of love, “love” comes the love of God—He who is love, and from whom love flows. The love of God is that part of His nature—indeed His whole nature, for “God is love”—which leads Him to express Himself in terms of endearment toward His creatures, and actively to manifest that interest and affection in acts of providing care and self-sacrifice in behalf of the objects of His love. God is “love” (1 Jn 4:8,16) just as truly as He is “light” (1 J.5), “truth” (1 J.16), and “spirit” (Jn 4:24). Spirit and light are expressions of His essential nature; love is the expression of His personality corresponding to His nature. God not merely loves, but is love; it is His very nature, and He imparts this nature to be the sphere in which His creatures may dwell in their enjoyment of that love which abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in them (1 Jn 4:16). Christianity is the only religion that sets forth the Supreme Being as Love. In heaven religions He is set forth as an angry being and in constant need of appeasing.

The object of God’s love is first and foremost His own Son, Jesus Christ (Mt 3:17; 17:5; Lk 20:13; Jn 17:24). The Son shares in God’s love.

1. Objects of God’s Love—The love of the Father in a unique sense; He is “my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth” (Psa 42:1). It is Ta b’s, or the Son, the soul delighteth in God, and God abideth in Ta b (1 Jn 4:16). Christianity is the only religion that sets forth the Supreme Being as Love. In heaven religions He is set forth as an angry being and in constant need of appeasing.

The object of God’s love is first and foremost His own Son, Jesus Christ (Mt 3:17; 17:5; Lk 20:13; Jn 17:24). The Son shares in God’s love.

1. Objects of God’s Love—The love of the Father in a unique sense; He is “my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth” (Psa 42:1). It is Ta b’s, or the Son, the soul delighteth in God, and God abideth in Ta b (1 Jn 4:16). Christianity is the only religion that sets forth the Supreme Being as Love. In heaven religions He is set forth as an angry being and in constant need of appeasing.

1. Objects of God’s Love—The love of the Father in a unique sense; He is “my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth” (Psa 42:1). It is Ta b’s, or the Son, the soul delighteth in God, and God abideth in Ta b (1 Jn 4:16). Christianity is the only religion that sets forth the Supreme Being as Love. In heaven religions He is set forth as an angry being and in constant need of appeasing.

God loves the believer in His Son with a special love. Those who are united by faith and love to Jesus Christ are, in a different sense from those who are not thus united, the special objects of God’s love. Said Jesus, “Iloved them, even as thou lovedst me” (Jn 17:24). This is the fact that just as the disciples had received the same treatment from the world that He had received, so they had received of the Father the same love that He Himself had received. They were not on the outskirts of God’s love, but in the very center of it. “For the father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me’ (Jn 16:27). Here phileo is used for love, indicating the fatherly affection of God for the believer in Christ, His Son. This is love in a more intense form than that spoken of for the world (Jn 3:16).

God loves the world (Jn 3:16; cf 1 Tim 2:4; 2 Pet 3:9). This is a wonderful truth when we realize what a world this is—a world of sin and corruption. This was a startling truth for Nicodemus to learn, who conceived of God as loving only the Jewish nation. To him, in his narrow exclusiveness, the announcement of the fact that God loved the whole world of men was startling. God loves the world of sinners lost and ruined by the fall. He did not say that God the Father “loved not the world” (Jn 14:21); but He did say that He loved the world. He is the compassionateGod, taking the fall of every sinner into account. Christ was not born to save those who loved Him; the very fact be overlooked that God loves not only the whole world, but each individual in it; it is a special as well as a general love (Jn 3:16, “whosoever,” Gal 2:20, “loved me, and gave himself up for me”).

God’s love is manifested by providing for the physical, mental, moral and spiritual needs of His people (Isa 48:14; 20:21; 62:9-12; 2. Manifests—63:12). In these Scriptures God is seen manifesting His power in behalf of His love. He is demonstrated in the wilderness journeying and their captivity. He led them, fed and clothed them, guided them and protected them from all their enemies. His love was again shown in feeding with His loving care and saving them from death. His love is again shown in their affliction, their interests were His; He was not their adversary but their friend, even though they might have seemed to Him as if He either had brought on them their suffering or did not care about it. Nor did He ever forget them for a moment during all their trials. They thought He did; they said, “God hath forgotten us,” “He hath forgotten to be gracious”; but no; a mother might forget her child that she should not have compassion on it, but God would never forget His people. How could He? Had He not given them upon the palms of His hands (Isa 49:15)? Rather than His love being absent in the chastisement of His people, the chastisement itself was often a proof of their love, and we must expect more of God than of His people. How could He? Had He not given them upon the palms of His hands (Isa 49:15)? Rather than His love being absent in the chastisement of His people, the chastisement itself was often a proof of their love, and we must expect more of God than of His people. How could He? Had He not given them upon the palms of His hands (Isa 49:15)? Rather than His love being absent in the chastisement of His people, the chastisement itself was often a proof of their love, and we must expect more of God than of His people.
the mercy and love of God; "But God, being rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead through trespasses, made us alive together with Christ," etc. It is because of this that we are granted a place in the heavenly kingdom (Eph 2:8). But the supreme manifestation of the love of God, as set forth in the Scripture, is that expressed in the gift of His only-begotten Son to die for the sins of the world (Jn 3:16; Rom 5:6–8; 1 Jn 4:9f), and through whom the sinful and repentant sons of men are taken into the family of God, and receive the adoption of sons (1 Jn 3:1f; Gal 4:4–6). From this wonderful love of God in Christ Jesus nothing in heaven or earth or hell, created or uncreated or to be created, shall be able to separate us (Rom 8:37f).

### III. The Love of Man.—Whatever love there is in man, whether it be toward God or toward his fellow-man, has its source in God—"Love is God" (1 Jn 4:7f). As God sows, so will he reap. Those who are loved by God are the highest sorts of creatures. Heathen writers do not use it at all, their nearest approach to it being *philanthropia* or *philadelphia*—the love between those of the same blood. Love in the heart of man is the offspring of the love of God. Only the regenerate heart can truly love as God loves; to this higher form of love the unregenerate can lay no claim (1 Jn 4:7.19.21; 2:7–11; 3:10; 4:11f).

The regenerate man is able to see his fellow-man as God sees him, to value him, not so much because of what he is by reason of his sin and unloveliness, but because of what, through Christ, he may become; he sees man's intrinsic worth and possibility in Christ (2 Cor 5:14–17). This love is also created in the heart of man by the Holy Ghost (Rom 5:5), and is a fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22). It is also stimulated by the example of the Lord Jesus Christ, who, more than anyone else, manifested to the world the spirit and nature of true love (Mt 26:34; 18:12; Gal 2:20; Eph 5:25–27; 1 Jn 4:9f).

God must be the first and supreme object of man's love; He must be loved with all the heart, mind, soul, and strength (Mt 22:37f; Rom 12:9). To love only one's fellow-man is to make exalted the exhortation to supreme love to God is connected with the doctrine of the unity of God (Dt 6:4f)—nearly as much as the Divine Being is one and indivisible, so must our love to Him be undivided. Our love to God is shown in the keeping of His commandments (Ex 20:6; 1 Jn 5:3; 2 Jn ver.6). Love is here set forth as more than a mere affection or sentiment; it is something that manifests itself, not only in obedience to known Divine commandments, but also in a protecting and defence of them, and a seeking to know more and more of the will of God in order to express love for God in further obedience (cf Dt 10:12). Those who love God will hate evil and all forms of worldliness, as expressed in the avoidance of the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life (Ps 97:10; 1 Jn 2:15–17). Whatever there may be in his surroundings that would draw the soul away from God and righteousness, that the child of God will avoid. Christ, being God, was clothed with the flesh in our affections. He is to be chosen before father or mother, parent or child, brother or sister, or friend (Mt 10:35–38; Lk 14:26). The word "hate" in these passages does not mean to hate in the sense in which we use the word today. It is used in the sense in which Jacob is said to have "hated" Leah (Gen 29:31), that is, he loved her less than Rachel; "He loved also Rachel more than Leah" (ver 30). To love Christ supremely is the test of true discipleship (Lk 14:26), and a real unfailing of the heart is that which prove that we are really God's children by thus loving His Son (Jn 8:42). Absence of such love means, finally, eternal separation (1 Cor 16:22).

Man must love his fellow-man also. Love for the brotherhood is a natural consequence of the love of the fatherhood; for "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whatsoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (1 Jn 3:10). For a man to say "I love God" and yet hate his fellow-man is to brand himself as "a liar" (4:20): "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen" (ver 20); he that loveth God will love his brother also (ver 21).

The degree in which we are to love our fellow-man is "as thyself" (Mt 22:39), according to the strict observance of the law. Christ set before His followers a much higher example than that, however, According to the teaching of Jesus we are to supersede this standard: A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another (Jn 13:34). The exhibition of love of this character toward our fellow-man is the badge of true discipleship. It may be called the sum total of our duty toward our fellow-man, for "This is the commandment, That ye love one another" (1 Jn 4:11). Love therefore is the fulfilment of the law?; "for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law" (Rom 13:8,10). The qualities which should characterize the love which we are to manifest toward one another are "true, steadfast, having no hypocrisy" (1 Jn 3:18–19). It is patient and without envy; it is not proud or self-elated, neither does it behave discourteously; it does not cherish evil, but keeps good account of the good; it rejoices not at the downfall of an enemy or competitor, but gladly hails his success; it is hopeful, trustful and forbearing—for such there is no law, for they need none; they have fulfilled the law.

Nor should it be overlooked that Our Lord commanded His children to love their enemies, those who would provoke evil of them, and destroy them (Mt 5:43–48). They were not to render evil for evil, but, contrariwise, blessing. The love of the disciple of Christ must manifest itself in supplying the necessities, not of our friends only (1 Jn 3:16–18), but also of our enemies (Rom 12:20,21).

Our love should be "without hypocrisy" (Rom 12:9); there should be no pretense about it; it should not be a thing of mere word or tongue, but a real experience manifesting itself in deed and truth (1 Jn 3:18). True love will find its expression in service to man: "Through love be servants one to another" (Gal 5:13). What more wonderful illustration can be found of ministering love than that set forth by Our Lord in the ministry of footwashing as found in Jn 13? Love beareth the infirmities of the weak, does not please itself, but seeketh the welfare of others (Rom 15:1–3; Phil 2:21; Gal 6:2; 1 Cor 10:24); it surrenders things which may be innocent in themselves but which nevertheless may become stumbling-block to others (Rom 14:15,21); it gladly forgives injuries (Eph 4:32), and gives the place of honor to another (Rom 12:10). What, then, is more vital than to possess such love? It is the fulfilment of the royal law ( Jas 2:8), and the ultimate aim of everything else (Col 3:14). It is the binder that holds all the other graces of the Christian life in place (Col 3:14); by the possession of such love we know that we have passed from death unto life (1 Jn 3:14), and it is the supreme test of our abiding in God and God in us (1 Jn 4:12,16).

WILLIAM EVANS
LOVE, BROTHELY. See Brotherly Love.

LOVE-FEAST, lv'vfest. See AGAPE.

LOVELY, lv'li (הבל, 'ahabh, ἡμηρία, הבל; προφιλαί, prosphiles): "Lovely" occurs only 4 t. In 2 S 1 23 it is the tr of 'ahabh, "to be loved" ("Saal and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant [AV 'amiable'], and where it seems to mean "loving" or "lovable.

Two other words are so trd in the OT: mahmādh, "desire," a "desirable" thing (Cant 5 16, "He is altogether lovely," that is, "lovable," to be desired," lit, "all of him lovely, blemish," or "desirableness"); γθήθινη, "loves," or "charms" (Ex 33 32, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song," AVm "a song of loves," RVm "a love-song"); in ver 31 the same word is trd "much love," AVm They make loves or Jests"); in Phil 4 8 we have prosphiles, "very lovely," or "lovable," "whatev ser things are lovely."

W. L. WALKER

LOVER, lv'er (ἡμηρία, 'ahabh, ἡμηρία, 'ahabh): In the OT 'ahabh, from 'ahabh, "to love," is sometimes "love" in the older Eng. sense of the word (K 5 1, "Hiram was ever a lover of David"); Ps 38 11; 88 18; Lam 1 2); more frequently it has the meaning of "lover" in the special sense, sometimes in the evil sense of the word (Jer 22 20; 22 30; 34 13; Ezek 16 33 36; Hos 2 5 7 10, etc); γθήθινη, "to love" (Jer 4 30), ἄρτος, "companion" (Jer 3 1); and γθήθινος, "loves," (Hos 8 9, are also trd "lovers" in this sense.

In the NT the simple word "lover" does not occur, but we have various compound words, philōtheos, of lover of God (2 Tim 3 4); philōgathos, lover of good, and philōzenos, lover of hospitality (Tit 1 8); philōtus, lover of self (2 Tim 3 2); philōdonos, lover of pleasure (2 Tim 3 4).

In RV we have, for "a lover of hospitality" (Tit 1 8), "given to"; for "covetous" (Lk 16 14; 2 Tim 3 2), "lovers of money"; for "not covetous" (1 Tim 3 3), "no lover of money"; for "despisers of that are good" (2 Tim 3 3), "no lovers of good."

W. L. WALKER

LOVES, lv'vs (Ps 45 1, title). See Psalms.

LOVINGKINDNESS, lv'ing-kind'ness (חסד, ἡγεσθίνη): "Lovingkindness" in AV always represents this word (30 t), but of hegesthi there are many other renderings (20 t), in which the AV translates "mercifulness" (20 t), "goodness" (38), "goodness" (12). The word is derived from ḥgadh, meaning, perhaps, "to bend or bow oneself," "to incline oneself," hence "to be gracious or merciful.

ERV has not many changes, but in AV "lovingkindness" is invariably employed when hegesethi is used of God, and, as a rule, "kindness" when it is used of man, as in Gen 21 23; Jgs 1 24 (AV "mercy," RV "deal kindly"); Ruth 3 10; 2 Ch 32 32; 35 20; AV "goodness," m. Heb "kindness"; RV "good deeds"); Jer 6 14, etc. Of the uses of the word as on man's part toward God, the only occurrences are: Jer 2 2, "I remember for thee the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, etc," Hos 6 4, "Your goodness [RV 'mercy'] or for morning cloud a mercy," "I desire goodness [AV 'mercy,' RV 'loving-kindness'], and not sacrifice," which last passage may denote kindness as toward man.

When used of God hegesethi denotes, in general, "the Divine love descending to His creatures, more esp. to sinners, in answer to the merited kindness" (Delitzsch).

It is frequently associated with forgiveness, and is practically equivalent to "mercy" or "mercifulness" (Ex 20 6), "showing lovingkindness [ERV 'mercy'] unto thousands of them that love me"; 34 6, "slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness [ERV 'plenteous in mercy']"; (ver) "keeping lovingkindness [ERV 'mercy'] for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" (cf Nu 14 18; Mic 7 18, "He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in lovingkindness" [ERV 'mercy']). This quality in Jeh was one by which He sought to bind His people to Himself. It is greatly magnified in the OT, highly extolled and glorified in, in many of the psalms (Ps 136 has the constant refrain, "For his lovingkindness endureth forever"). In Dt 7 12 it is associated with the covenant, and in 2 S 7 15 with the covenant with David (cf Isa 55 3, etc.). It was something that could always be relied on.

Being such an essential and distinctive quality of God, the prophets taught that it should also characterize His people. It is part of the Divine requirement in Mic 6 8, "to love kindness" (cf Zec 7 9, "Show kindness and compassion every man to his brother"). The want of it in the nation was a cause of Jeh's controversy with them, e.g. Mic 4 1, "There is no truth, nor goodness (hēgesith) [AV and ERV 'mercy'], nor knowledge of God in the land; 12 6, "Therefore turn thou to thy God: keep kindness [AV and ERV 'mercy'] and justice, and wait for thy God continually.

Cheyne (EB) regards hegeseth as denoting of God's part, answered by filial and loyal affection and brotherly love on man's part (philadelaphia in the NT). The word "lovingkindness" does not occur in the NT, but as its equivalents we have such terms as "mercy," "goodness," "kindness," "brotherly love" (see special articles).

W. L. WALKER

LOW COUNTRY. See SHEPHELAH.

LOWLAND, lů'land (ἐπώδεια, shephelah; cf Arab. لايبخ, sa'flāt, "the low part"): The western part of Pal, including the maritime plain and the foothills. There has been an attempt to restrict the term to the foothills, but as far as the more ancient documents are concerned, but there can be little doubt that the maritime plain should be included. RV has "lowland" throughout.

In the NT the word "lovingkindness" is in various PLURAL, low lāh, while AV has "low country" (2 Ch 26 10; 28 18), "low plains" (1 Ch 27 28; 2 Ch 9 27), "plain" (Jer 17 26; Ob 18; Zec 7 7), "valley" or "valley" (Dt 1 7; Josh 9 1; 10 40). See Country; SHEPHELAH.

ALFRED ERY DAY

LOZON, lů'zon (Ἀλόζων, Lozon): Head of a family of Solomon's servants (1 Esd 5 33); called "Darkon" in Ezr 2 50; Neh 7 58.

LUBIM, lū'bin (לן, labhām): A people mentioned in the OT (2 Ch 12 3; 16 8; Dnl 11 43; Nah 3 9). In all these cases the word is trd in AV "Libyans"; in RV only in Dnl 11 43. The people so named had their seat in North Africa, W. of Egypt (cf Acts 3 10, "the parts of Libya about Cyrene"). See LIBYA. On three different occasions the Libyans invaded Egypt, and at length, in the 10th cent. BC, succeeded in founding an Epyg dynasty under Shishak (q.v.).


LUCIFER, lū'si-fer, lū'si-fer: The morning star, an epithet of the planet Venus. See Astronomy, 11.

LUCIUS, lu'shi-us, lu'shu-is (Λούκιος, Lukiōs, Λούκιος, Lukios): A Rom consul who is said (1 Mace 16 16 ff) to have written a letter to Ptolemy
Euergetes securing to Simon the high priest and to the Jews the protection of Rome. As the praenomen only of the consul is given, there has been much discussion as to the person intended. The weight of probability has been assigned to Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was one of the consuls in 139–138 BC, the fact of his praenomen being Cneius and not Lucius being explained by an error in transcription and the fragmentary character of the documents. The authority of the Romans not being as yet thoroughly established in Asia, they were naturally anxious to form alliances with the kings of Egypt and with the Jews to keep Syria in check. The imperfections that are generally ascribed to the transcriptions of the Roman letters are not such as in any serious degree to invalidate the authority of the narrative in 1 Macc.

HUTCHISON

LUCIUS (Δούκος, Lukíos): This name is mentioned twice:
1. In the church at Antioch which sent out Barnabas and Saul as its missionaries were several prophets and teachers, among whom was Lucius of Cyrene (Acts 13 1). He was probably one of the group of Cyrians and Cyrene, who, when they came to Antioch, spoke unto the Greeks also (Acts 11 20). It has been suggested that he is the same as St. Luke, but this is merely conjecture.
2. "Lucius and Jason and Sosipater, my kinsmen," were among those who joined St. Paul in saluting the Galatians (Rom 16 21). By "kinsmen" St. Paul means "Jews" (cf Rom 9 3; 16 21). This Lucius may have been the same person as (1), but, as we have no more information about either, we cannot determine this.

S. F. HUNTER

LUKE, lú'k, ló'k (Luke, Lúkés, Ὅλοκ, Lúkês, Lóthès, Lóthim, Ὅλθημ, Ὅλθησις, "Lukites"); Λοῦκας, Λοῦκος, Λοῦκανδας, Loukadias; Tg Onk: 

1. Two "Luke," lóðith: In Gen 10 13 Ludim differs appears as the firstborn of Mizraim Nation- alsities, and in 10 22 Lud is the fourth son of Sem. We have therefore to do with two different nationalities bearing the same name, and not always easy to distinguish. 1 Ch 1 17 17 simply repeat the statements of Gen 10 13 22. In Isa 66 19 Lud is mentioned with Tarshish and Put (generally regarded as a mistake for Phut), Tubal, Javan, and the Isles. Accepting this emendation, the passage agrees with Jer 46 9, where the Ludim are spoken of with Kush and Phut as the allies of Egypt; and also with Ezek 27 10, where Lud is referred to with Persia and Put as soldiers of Tyre. Lud, again, is mentioned with Ethiopia (Cush), and all the mingled peoples, Edom, and the children of the land which is in league (or, m "the land of the covenant"), which were all to fall by the sword (Ezek 30 5).

Coming to the Semitic Lud, it is to be noted that the Assyrians called Lydia Lúd(k̑), and that the ym, and the Semitic Lyd, according to Herodotus (1,7), was Ly- dos, and their first king, Agros, was descended from Ninos and Belos, i.e. Assyria and Babylonia. The apparently Assyrian colony in Cappadocia about 3000 BC, who used the Bab script, may be regarded as sup- 

3. Not Recognizable as Semitic

Later

4. Egyptian

Lud Not Recognizable as

LuhiTh, luhi'hith, 150'hith, ASCENT OF (?λυκηθης, ma'lith ha-luḥith): A place named in Isa 15 5; Jer 48 5. It is clearly identical with the way, or descent, of Horonaim. Onom places LuhiTh between Areopolis and Zoar. Some way is intended by which fugitives from the Arabs of the uplands of the Moabite plateau. Gulf thinks it may be the road which leads from the district of the ancient Zoar on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea to the uplands through Wady Ben Hammad. Along this track also ran to the time of Horo- naim were the higher of the two places, this might account for the way being called the "descent" of Horonaim as going down from that place, and the "ascend" of LuhiTh as going up thence. Neither place can as yet be identified with certainty.

W. EWING

LUKE, lók, lúk, THE EVANGELIST: The name Luke (Λουκάς, Loukás) is apparently an abbrevia- tion for Λουκανδας, Loukandas. Old

1. Name

Lat MSS frequently have the words CATA LUCANTUM as the title of the Third Gospel. (But the form Λουκας, Loukios, is also found in inscriptions synonymous with Loukas; of Ramsey, Ebesos, December, 1912.)

It was a common fashion in the koiné to abbreviate proper names, as it is today; for that matter (of Amphipolis from Amph NONAAP, Amphion from AMPHION, A polunnia, Demas from Demetrios, Zenas from ZE NODORAS, etc; and see Jannaris, Historical & Grammar, I 287).

Paul alone names Luke (Col 4 14; 2 Tim 4 11; Philem ver 24). He does not mention Luke in the Gospel or in the Acts. Of the silence of the Fourth Gospel concerning the name of the
apostle John. There was no particular occasion to mention Luke’s name in the Gospel, except as that of the author, if the late legend that Luke was one of the three
2. Mentioned.

Seventy sent out by Jesus (Epiphanius, Three

Hær., ii, 51, 11) is pure conjecture, as is the story that Luke was one of the disciples who came to Philip for an introduction to Jesus (Jn 12 20 f.), or the companion of Cleopas in the walk to Emmaus (Lk 24 13). The clear implication of Lk 1 2 is that Luke himself was not an eyewitness of the history.

In Col 4 14 Luke is distinguished by Paul from those “of the circumcision” (Aristarchus, Mark, Jesus Justus). Epaphras, Luke, Demas form the gentle group. He was believed by the early Christian writers to have come directly from heathendom to Christianity. He may or may not have been a Jewish proselyte. His first appearance with Paul at Troas (of the “we”-sections, Acts 16 10-12) is in harmony with this idea. The classic introduction to the Gospel (1 1-4) shows that he was a man of culture (of Apollos and Paul). He was a man of the schools, and his Greek has a literary flavor only approached in the NT by Paul’s writings and by the Ep, to the He.

His home is very uncertain. The text of D (Codex Bezae) and several Latin authorities have a “we”-passage in Acts 11 27. If this reading, the so-called B text of Bezae is the original, then Luke was at Antioch and may have been present at the great event recorded in Acts 13 1 f. But it is possible that the Western text is an interpolation. At any rate, it is not likely that Luke is the same person as Luke of Acts 13 1. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 389 f) that Eusebius (HE, III, iv, 6) does not mean to say that Luke was a native of Antioch, but only that he had Antiochian family connections. Jerome calls him Lucus medicus Antiochenus. He certainly shows an interest in Antioch (cf Acts 11 19-20; 13 1; 14 16; 15 22; 23.30.35, 18 22). Antioch, of course, played a great part in the early work of Paul. Other stories make Luke live in Alexandria and Achaia and narrate that he was Achaia or Bithynia. But we know that he lived in Philippi for a considerable period. He first meets Paul at Troas just before the vision of the Man from Macedonia (Acts 16 10-12), and a conversation with Paul about Macedonia may well have been the human occasion of that vision and call. Luke remains in Philippi when Paul and Silas leave (Acts 16 40, “They...departed”). He is here when Paul comes back on his 3d tour bound for Jerusalem (Acts 20 3-5). He shows also a natural pride in the claims of Philippi to the primacy in the province as against Amphipolis and Thessalonica (Acts 16 12, “the first of the district”). On the whole, then, we may consider Philip as the home of Luke, though he was probably a man who had traveled a great deal, and may have been with Paul in Galatia before coming to Troas. He may have ministered to Paul in his sickness there (Gal 4 14). His later years were spent chiefly with Paul away from Philippi (cf Acts 20 3-28, on the way to Jerusalem, Acts 27 1, on the way to Rome) and at Caesarea, the voyage to Rome (and in Rome).

Paul (Col 4 14) expressly calls him “the beloved physician.” He was Paul’s medical adviser, and he had a close bond of friendship.

5. Physician.

He was a medical missionary, and probably kept up his general practice of medicine in connection with his work in Rome (cf Zahn, Intro, III, 1). He probably practised medicine in Malta (Acts 28 9 f). He naturally shows his fondness for medical terms in his books (cf Hobart, The Medical Language of St. Luke; Harnack, NT Studies: Luke the Physician, 175-98). Harnack adds some examples to those given by Hobart, who has done over the matter in reality. See, further, Acts of the Apostles.

It is possible, even probable (see Souter’s article in DCB), that in 2 Cor 8 18 “the brother” is equivalent to “the brother” of Titus just mentioned, that is, “his brother.” If so, we should know that Paul came into contact with Luke at Philippi on his way to Corinth during his 2d tour (cf also 2 Cor 12 18). It would thus be explained why in Acts the name of Titus does not occur, since he is the brother of Luke the author of the book.

If the reading of D in Acts 11 27 f is correct, Luke met Paul at Antioch before the 1st missionary tour. Otherwise it may not have been till Troas on the 2d tour. But he is the more or less constant companion of Paul from Philippi on the return to Jerusalem on the 3d tour till the 2 years in Rome at the close of the Acts. He was apparently not with Paul when Phil (2 20) was written, though, as we have seen, he was with Paul in Rome when he wrote Col and Phil. He was Paul’s sole companion for a while during the 2d Roman imprisonment (2 Tim 4 11). His devotion to Paul in this time of peril is beautiful.


8. Author.

Our interest in him is largely due to this fact and to his relations with Paul.

Gospel and Acts.

The Christian world owes him a great debt for his literary productions in the interest of the gospel.

One legend regarding Lukeis that he was a painter. Plummer (Comm. on Luke, xxxi f) thinks that the legend is older than is sometimes supposed and that it has a strong element of truth. It is true that he has drawn vivid scenes with his pen. The early artists were esp. fond of painting scenes from the Gospel of Lk. The allegorical figure of the ox or calf in Ezk 1 and Rev 4 has been applied to Luke’s Gospel.

Literature.

Bible dicta, comm., lives of Paul, intro. See also Harnack, Lukas, der Arzt, der Verfasser (1906); NT Studies: Luke the Physician (1907); Ramsay, Luke the Physician (1908); Selwyn, St. Luke the Prophet (1903); Hobart, The Medical Language of St. Luke (1882); Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke (1898); Macleachlan, St. John, Evangelist and Historian (1912).
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Palestinian or Jerusalem). Many of the cursive (minuscule) MSS are also of considerable worth, as are some of the quotations from the Fathers.

Bliss, *Philology of the Gospels* (1898), has advanced the theory of reclassification of this Gospel (a longer and a shorter), such as he holds to be true of Acts. In the case of Luke, he says (Actus of the Apostles), but that is not true of the Gospel to any extent. The Western text of the Gospel is the shorter, and this is also the case in Acts. It is in other texts. The Western text of Acts, and in Acts it is, but instances Bliss has that the shorter text was issued after the longer and original text. His idea is that Luke himself revised and issued the shorter text. In itself this is, of course, possible, since the books are both drawn from a common source, but it is not without prejudice against the authorship of the Gospel. Either the author's name has been inserted, or the whole book has been written in this form. An example may be the case of any MSS and Acts. There is a common edition of the Gospels, but in the other MSS, it is the case of Acts. In Acts the text of the New Testament is the shorter text. It is not always true, however, for in 27 D it has the famous passage of man working on the Sabbath, which the other MSS do not give. In Luke 3:2 D has the reading of Ps 27 ("Thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee") for the usual text. Zahn (Intro, III, 38) accepts this as the true text. There is no doubt of the interest and value of the Western readings in Luke, but these are not the passages which Bliss has carried point for point here.

The peculiar mutilation of the Gospels by Marcion has an effect on the MSS.

Plummer (Comm. on Lk, lxxvi) says: "In the second half of the 2d cent., this Gospel is recognized as authentic and authoritative; and it is impossible to show that it had not been thus recognized at a very much earlier date." The same is the case with the other MSS. Schmiedel (EB) says: "This tradition," however, cannot be traced farther back than toward the end of the 2d cent. (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian Fragment); there is no sound basis for the contention of Zahn (11, 17) that the earliest tradition of the tradition can also be found as early as in Marcion, because that writer, from his aversion to the Third Gospel (which nevertheless was the only one he admitted into his collection—with alterations it is true) omitted the expression of honor applied to Luke in Col. 4:14. Hence the two views are well stated. Schmiedel shows dogmatic bias and prejudice against Lk. Jülicher, however, frankly admits (Intro, 330) that "the ancient" were universally agreed that the writer with Lk was the disciple of Paul, who is mentioned in Phil. 24; 2 Tim 4:11, and called 'the physician' in Col 4:14; presumably a native of Antioch. This statement bears more directly on the question of authorship than of canonicity, but it is not the rather cavalier tone of Schmiedel, who is reluctant to admit the facts. The recognition of the Third Gospel in the Muratorian Canon (170 AD) is a fact of much significance. It was used in Tatian's Diatessaron (c 170 AD) as one of the four recognized Gospels (cf. Ephphatha, Diatessaron of Tatian, 2 ff). The fact that Marcion (140 AD) mutilated this Gospel to suit his theology and used it thus is even more significant (cf. Sanday, *Gospels in the 2d Cent., App.). Other heretics, like the Valentinians (cf. Lightfoot, *Bib. Essays*, 5-7) made use of it, and Heracleon (cf. Clem. Alex., Strom., iv.9) wrote a comment on it. Irenaeus (end of 2d cent.) makes frequent quotations from this Gospel. He argues that there could be only "four" Gospels because of the four points of the compass—a bald argument, to be sure, but a powerful testimony to the general acceptance of this Gospel along with the other three. It is needless to appeal to the presence of the Third Gospel in the Caezareian Syr., the Afric. Syr., the Copt. Syr., that date to the 2d cent., not to mention the probability of the early date of the Memphitic (Coptic) VSS. Examples of the early use of this Gospel occur in various writings of the 2d cent., as in Justin Martyr (150 AD), the Test. XII P (c 140 AD), Celsus (c AD 160), the Gospel of Peter (2d cent.), the Ep. of the Church of Lyons and Vienne (177 AD), probably also Did. (2d cent.), Clement of Alexandria (190-202 AD), Tertullian (190-220 AD). It is doubted that in either Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp; and the Ep. of Barnabas seems to make no use of the Third Gospel. But Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Polycarp quote Acts. But surely the general use and acceptance of the Third Gospel in the 2d cent. is beyond reasonable doubt. It is not easy to decide when the actual use began, because we have so little data from the 1st cent. (cf. Plummer, Comm., lxxii).

The fact that the author was not an apostle affected the order of the book in some lists. Most MSS and VSS have the common order of Acts. The Western order (Mt, Jn, Lk, Mk) is given by D, many Old Lat MSS, the Gothic VS, the Apos. Const. The object was probably to place the books by apostles together and first. The Old Lat k has Lk second (Jn, Lk, Mk, Mt), while the Curzontian Syr has Lk last of the four. The cur- vatives 90 and 399 also have Lk second.

The first writers who definitely name Luke as the author of the Third Gospel belong to the end of the 2d cent. They are the Canon of Muratori (possibly Philo), the authorship, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Jülicher. We have already seen that Jülicher (Intro, 330) admits that the ancients universally agreed that Luke wrote the Third Gospel. In the early part of the 2d cent., they held, as a rule, give the names of the authors of the Gospels quoted by them. It is not fair, therefore, to use their silence on this point as proof either of their ignorance of the author or of denial of Luke's authorship. Jülicher, for instance, says (Intro, 330): "There is no tradition worthy of the name concerning Luke, whom Papias did not mention, or at any rate did not mention." But we owe to Eusebius all the fragments that we have preserved from the writings of Papias. Our ignorance of Papias can hardly be charged up to him. Plummer (Comm., xii) says that nothing in Bib. criticism is more certain than the fact that Luke wrote the Third Gospel. On the other hand, Jülicher (Intro, 331) is not willing to let it go as easy as that. He demands appeal to Acts, and there (ib, 447) he denies the Lukian authorship save as to the "we" sections. J. Weiss (Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments; das Lukas Evang., 1866, 778) admits that but for Acts the authorship of the Gospel would exist for denying the authorship of the Third Gospel to Luke, the disciple of Paul. A Pauline point of view in this Gospel is admitted generally. Many modern critics take it for granted that the Lukian authorship of Acts is disproved, and hence that the Gospel likewise falls by the way. So argue Baur, Clemen, De Wette, Hauricht, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Jülicher, Pflüger, Schürer, Spitta, von Boden, J. Weiss, Weizsäcker, Zeller. Men like Bliss, Credner, etc., who wrote against Luke, probably adopted the view of the Gospel itself. But it is not the case. In the 2d cent., the Gospels are cited as accepted as history, and are used in the church.
there shown that the line of argument which has convinced Harnack, the leader of the liberal criticism of Germany, ought to convince any open-minded critic. It means a good deal when Harnack (Luke the Physician, 14) says: "I subscribe to the words of Zahn (Bird, 11, 427): 'Hobart has proved for the case that it cannot be denied that the author of the Luke work was a man practised in the scientific language of Gr medicine—in short, a Gr physician.'" It is here assumed that the line of argument pursued in the art. on Acts is correct. But it remains to be done in the way of special proof for the Gospel. The author of Acts specifically refers (Acts 1:1) to a former treatise which was likewise addressed to Theophilus. This we find to be the case with the Gospel passing under the name of Luke (1:4). The critics who admit the Lukian authorship of Acts and deny the Lukian authorship of the Gospel are hardly worth considering.

It is, therefore, largely a work of supererogation to give at length the proof from internal grounds that Luke wrote the Gospel, after being convinced about Acts. Still it may be worth while to sketch in outline the line of argument, even though it is very simple. Plummer (Comm., xvii) argues three propositions: (1) The author of the Lukian Gospel is the author of the Acts. (2) The author of Acts was a companion of Paul. (3) This companion was St. Luke. Harnack (The acts of the Apostles in 1900, p. 208) takes these propositions, not as the explanation of the Acts, but as the theory that the same linguistic peculiarities connect Acts with Luke, including the "writings" of Luke. He accepts the facts set forth by Hawkins (Horae Syriacae) and adds others. He agrees, therefore, with the author of Acts being a companion of Paul. Harnack is convinced by the exhaustive labors of Hobart (Medical Language of St. Luke) that this author was a physician, as we know Luke to have been (Col 4:14). He shows this to be true of the author of Acts by the use of animal names in Acts 28:10, showing that the author of Acts received honors along with Paul, probably because he practiced medicine and thus rivaled Luke (Luke the Physician, 15). These medical terms occur in the Gospel of Luke also, and the same general linguistic style is found in both the Gospel and Acts. Hawkins has made a careful study of likenesses and variations in style in these two books of Luke (loc. cit., 15-29, 174-80). The argument is as conclusive as such a line of proof can be expected to be. For further discussion see Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 1898, 1-68; Zahn, Einleit. III, 116 ff.

There are no phenomena in the Gospel hostile to this position save the Sem character of chs 1 and 2 (harking the classical introduction 1:1-4). Luke, though Gentile, has in these chapters the most Sem narrative in the whole New Testament. He has the explanation here using Sem material (ethic or written), and has with truth the Sem character of his original. To a certain extent the same thing is true of the opening chapters of Acts.

The synoptic problem (see Gospels, Synoptici) remains the most difficult one in the realm of NT criticism. But it is not to be considered as in dispute. 4. Sources yields results that are yet true of Mt.

(1) Unity.—If the Lukian authorship of the book is accepted, there remains no serious doubt concerning the unity and integrity of the Gospel. The abridgment of Luke's Gospel used by Marcion does not discredit those portions of the Gospel omitted by him. They are omitted for doctrinal reasons (cf. the summaries in the 2 Ed. Cent., ch viii). His readings are of interest from the point of textual criticism, as are the quotations of other early writers, but his edition does not seriously challenge the value of Luke's work.

Luke's method.—Luke has announced his methods of work in a most elegant introduction (1:1-4). Here we catch a glimpse of the author's personality. That is not possible in Mk nor in Mt, and only indirectly in passing shadows in the Fourth Gospel. Here the author frankly takes the reader into his confidence and discloses his standpoint and qualifications for the great task. He writes as a contemporary about the recent past, always the most difficult history to interpret and often the most interesting. He speaks of "those matters which have been fulfilled among us," in our time. He does not himself claim to have been an eyewitness of "those matters." As we know already, Luke was a Gentile and apparently never saw Jesus in the flesh. He occupies thus a position outside of the great events which he is to record. He does not attempt to give a literal narrative, but he claims the historical spirit. He wishes to assure Theophilus of "the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed." He claims to have investigated "the course of all things accurate," but he is not the first as the historian would. He thus implies that some of the attempts made had been fragmentary at any rate, and to that extent inaccurate. He has also produced an "orderly" narrative by which Theophilus may gain a just conception of the historical progress of the events connected with the life of Jesus of Nazareth. The fact that "many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters" does not deter Luke from his task. The rather he is sturdy thereby ("it seemed good to me also") to give his interpretation of the life and work of Jesus as the result of his researches. He stands not farther away than one generation from the death of Jesus. He has the keen interest natural to a cultured follower of the Master. His work has become a great world-movement. He is able to get at the facts because he has had intercourse with eyewitnesses of Jesus and His work, "even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." Luke had abundant opportunity during the two years at Caesarea with Paul (Acts 24:26) to make careful and extended investigations. Many of the personal followers of Jesus were still living (1 Cor 15:5 ff.); it was a golden opportunity for Luke's purpose. He had also the written narratives which others ("many") had already drawn up. We are, then, to expect in Luke's Gospel a book closely akin to Acts in style and plan, with the historian's love of accuracy and order, with the author's own contribution in the assimilation and use of this oral and written material. One would not expect in such a writer slavish copying, but intelligent blending of the material into an artistic whole.

(2) The Author's Style.—The very first section of the Gospel (1:5—2:52) illustrates Luke's facility in the use of his material. Wellhausen drops these two chapters from his edition of Luke's Gospel as not worthy of consideration. What is that conjectural criticism run mad and is not to be justified by any good and right-minded one. It is time, that material did not form part of the current oral Gospel. In Mt the narrative of the birth of Jesus is given from the standpoint of Joseph, and Mary is kept in the background, according to Eastern feeling (Wright). But in Lk the story is told from Mary's point of view. Luke may, indeed, have seen Mary herself in the years 57—59 AD (58—60). He could easily have seen some of Mary's intimate friends who knew the real facts in the case. The facts were expressly said to have been kept in Mary's heart. We could understand this in light of the facts (of Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 74 f). It is not possible to discredit Luke's narrative of the Virgin Birth on a priori grounds (of Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ, 1907; Sweet, Birth
and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 1906). The curious Sem flavor of this narrative argues strongly for its genuineness, since Luke was a Greek. We do not know whether Luke knew Aram. or not. This was possible, since he spent these 2 years in Pal. We do not know whether this information came to him in written form (note esp. the hymans of Mary and of Zacharias) or oral tradition. But it is hard to credit a Greek the invention of these birth-narratives and poems which ring so true to the soil and the Heb. life. Immediately after Luke's statement about historical research comes the narrative of the birth of Jesus. It is the first illustration of his work on his sources.

(4) Luke's relation to Mark's Gospel.—Luke knew Mark in Rome (Col 4 10.14; Philem ver 24). He may have met him in Pal also. Had he seen Mark's Gospel when he wrote his own? Was it one of the "many" narratives that came under Luke's eye? Wright (of DCG) denies that Luke had our Mk. He admits that he may have had an Urmarkus or proto-Mk which he heard in oral form, but not the present (written) Gospel of Mk. He thinks that this can best be accounted for by the fact that sections in Mk have been added to Lk. But most modern critics have come to the conclusion that both Matthew and Luke had Mk before then as well as other sources. Matthew, if he used Mk, in the early chapters, followed a topical arrangement of his material, comparing Mk with other source or sources. But Luke has followed the order of Mk very closely in this part and indeed throughout. Luke has a special problem in 9 51—19 27, but the broad general outline follows that of Mk. But it cannot be said that Luke made a slavish use of Mk. If he had had this Gospel before him he gives his own touch to each incident and selects what best suits his purpose. It is not possible for us to tell always that motive, but it is idle to suppose that Luke blindly recorded every incident found in every document or every story that came to his ears. He implies in his introduction that he has made a selection out of the great mass of material and has woven it into a coherent and progressive narrative. We may admit with Harnack (New Testament Studies: Sayings of Jesus, 1911) that the Markan problem "has been treated with scientific thoroughness" and that Luke had Mk as one of his sources. The parallel between Lk and Mk in the narrative portion is easily seen in any History of the Gospels, like Brodais or Stevens and Burton.

(5) Q (Quelle) or the Logia.—It is a matter of more uncertainty when we come to the mass of material common to Mt and Lk, but absent from Mk. This is usually found in the discourses of Jesus. The more generally accepted theory today is that both Matthew and Luke made use of Mk and also this collection of Logia called Q for short (Ger. Quelle, "source"). But, while this theory may be adopted as a working hypothesis, it cannot be claimed that it is an established fact. Zahn (of Intro) stoutly stands up for the real authorship of the First Gospel of Matthew. Rev. Arthur Carr ("Further Notes on the Synoptic Problem," Expos, January, 1911, 543-553) argues strongly for the early date and Matthean authorship of the First Gospel. He says on the whole subject: "The synoptic problem which has of late engaged the speculation of some of our keenest and most laborious students is still unsolved. We do not doubt that Mark's Gospel. Wellhausen (Einleitung in die drei ertzen Evangien, 73-89) advocates the priority of Mark to Q. But Harnack balances the problem of "Q and St. Mark" (Sayings of Jesus, 193-233) and decides in favor of Q. In any case, it is to be noted that the result of critical research into the value of Q is to put it quite on a par with Mk. Harnack is quite impressed with the originality and vivid reality of the matter in Q. The material contained in Q cannot be given accurately as that in Mk, since we have the Gospel of Mk in our hands. Where both Mt and Lk give material not found in Mk, it is concluded that this is drawn from Q. But it cannot be shown that Matthew may not have used some parts of Lk and Mt at first others independently. Besides Q may have contained material not preserved either in Mt or Lk. A careful and detailed comparison of the material common to both Mt and Lk and absent from Mk may be found in Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 197—233; Harnack, Einleitung, 66; Robertson, "Matthew" in Bible for Home and School, 14-19. But, if it is true that Luke made use of Q as of Mk, he was no mere copyist. No solution of the synoptic problem can ever be obtained on the idea that the Gospels are mere reproductions of previous documents. There was freedom in the use of all the material, both oral and written, and the writer gave his own interpretation to the result. It was often a repetition of the earlier work, but it was also a new arrangement, in which the writer's own ideas are given use, and in which they used, into literary form" (ib). The point of all this is that a great deal of criticism of the Gospels is attempting the impossible, for many of the variations cannot possibly be traced to any "source."

Wright (DCG) calls this editorial element "editorial notes"; that is, of course, often true when the author makes comments on the matters presented, but "ancient authors took immense pains to make the rude matters they used, into literal form" (ib). The point of this is that a great deal of criticism of the Gospels is attempting the impossible, for many of the variations cannot possibly be traced to any "source."

(6) Other sources.—There is a large block of material in Lk (9 51-18 14) which is given by him alone. There are various sayings like some reported by Matthew (or Mark) in other connections. Some of the incidents are similar to some given elsewhere by Matthew and Mark. There are various theories concerning the literary criticism of Lk. Some critics hold that Luke has here put a mass of material which he had left over, so to speak, and which he did not know where to locate, without any notion of order. Against this theory is the express statement of Luke that he wrote an orderly narrative (1 3 f). One is disposed to credit Luke's own interpretation unless the facts oppose it. It is common for traveling preachers, as was Jesus, to have similar experiences in different parts of the country and to repeat their favorite sayings. So teachers repeat many of their sayings each year to different classes. Indeed, it is just in this section of Lk that the best parts of his Gospel are found (the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Pharisee and the Publican, etc.). "The more we consider this collection, the more we are entranced with it. It is the very cream of the Gospel, and yet (strange to say) it is peculiar to Luke" (Wright, DCG). Wright calls this a "Pauline collection," even though there is no originality of the material, but because the chapters breathe the cosmopolitan spirit of Paul. That is true, but Jesus loved the whole world. This side of the teaching of Jesus may have appealed to Luke powerfully because of its reflection in Paul. Matthew's Gospel was more narrowly Jewish in its outlook, and
Mark's had fewer of the sayings of Christ. But it is to be noted that this special material in Lk extends more or less all through the Gospel. Burton (Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem, 49) calls this special material in Lk 5:1—18 “the Perican document” and does not put any portion of the actual source of this material. Whether Luke has here followed one or more documents, he has, as elsewhere, given his own stamp to the whole, while preserving in a marvelous way the spirit of the New Testament (cf. the section of Lk and Jn see Robertson’s “Notes” to B Drews, Harmony of the Gospels, 249—52.) For the earlier material in Lk not found elsewhere (3 7–15, 17, 18; 4 28–13 [14.15], 16–30; 6 1–11, 6 21–49; 7 1—8 3) Burton suggests “the Galilean document” as the source. Wright, on the other hand, proposes “anonymous fragments” as the source of Luke's material not in the infancy narrative, nor in Mk, nor in Q. nor in the “Pauline” or Perican document. At any rate, it is certain that Luke's own words of explanation should warn us against drawing too narrow a line around the “sources” used by him. His “many” may well have included a dozen sources, or even more. But it may be said that Luke has certainly been able to learn on the subject has confirmed the statement of Luke himself concerning his method of research and his use of the material.

More fault has been found with Luke as a historian in Acts than in the Gospel. Harnack (Acts of the Apostles) is not disposed to give Luke full credit as a reliable historian. But Ramsay (Luke the Physician, 5) champions the reliability of Luke (cf also St. Paul the Traveller: The Church in the Roman Empire) against the skepticism of Harnack, which is growing less, since in Theol. Literaturzeiung (July 7, 1906, S. 4) he speaks well of Luke's ability to secure correct information. So in Luke the Physician (121–45) Harnack urges that the possible “instances of incredibility have been much exaggerated by critics.” He adds about Acts 5:36: “It is also possible that there is a mistake in Jos (cf Chase, Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, 150).”

But the Gospel is not free from fault. The chief matter in the Gospel of Lk which is challenged on historical grounds, apart from the birth-narratives, which some scholars regard as legendary, is the census in Lk 2:1. Critics, who in general have accepted Luke’s version, have sometimes admitted that here he fell into error and confused the census under Quirinius in 6–7 AD when Quirinius came, after the banishment of Archelaus, to take a census and to collect taxes, much to the indignation of the Jews (cf Acts 5:37; Jos. Ant. XIX, 3, 1). It was not known that Quirinius had been governor of Syria before this time, nor was there any other knowledge of a census under Augustus. The case against Luke seemed strong. But Ramsay (Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 227 ff.) shows that the inscription at Tiberias, as agreed by Mommaen and like authorities, since that Quirinius twice governed Syria as legatus of the divine Augustus,” he was consul in 12 BC, so that the census was after that date. Ramsay shows also from the papryi of the 14-year cycle was used in the Roman census (many census papers are known from AD 20. But the census was inserted by Augustus in 8 BC, herod, as a vassal king, was allowed to conduct census 16 in the Jewish fashion, not the Roman, and it was probably delayed several years in the provinces. Thus once more Luke is vindicated in a remarkable way (see Chronology of NT, 1, 1, 2 2).

The Acts of the Apostles has come out of the critical ordeal in a wonderful manner, so that Luke's credit as a historical writer is now very high among the critics. It has been tested and found correct on so many points that the presumption is in his favor where he cannot as yet be verified. Moffatt (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 268) finds Luke “more graphic than historical.”

He was the most versatile of the Gospel writers. He was a Greek, a Christian, a physician, a man of travel, a man of world-outlook, sympathetic, cultured, poetic, spiritual, artistic, high-minded. His Prologue is the most classic piece of Gr in the NT, but the rest of the book show an unusual and even Sem in tone. The breadth of his literary equipment is thereby shown. He not only uses many medical terms common to technical circles, but he has the physician's interest in the sick and afflicted, which is shown in the parallels between the stories of Peter and of the man sick of palsy. His interest in the poor is not due to Ebionitic prejudice against the rich, but to human compassion for the distressed. His emphasis on the human side of the work of Jesus is not due to Ebionitic denial of the Divinity of Jesus, but to his keen appreciation of the richness of the human life of the Son of God. His rich and varied vocabulary reveals a man who read and mingled with the best life of his time. He wrote his books in the vernacular, but the elevated vernacular of an educated man touched with a distinct literary flavor. His poetic temperament is shown in the preservation of the beautiful hymns of the nativity and in the wonderful parables of Jesus in chs 13, 15—18. They are reported much as he himself told them, fond of showing Christ's sympathy with women and children, and he has more to say about prayer than the authors of the other Gospels. His interest in individuals is shown by the dedication of both his books to Theophilus. His cosmopolitan sympathies are natural in view of his training and inheritance, but part of it is doubtless due to his association with the apostle Paul. He comes to the interpretation of Jesus from a world-standpoint and does not go to the Pharisees for his limitations incident to one reared in Pa. It is a matter of rejoicing that we have this book, called by Renan the most beautiful book in the world, as a cultured Greek's interpretation of the origin of Christianity. He thus stands outside of the pale of Judaism and can see more clearly the world-relations and world-destiny of the new movement. With Luke, Jesus is distinctly the world's Saviour. The accent on sin is human sin, not specifically on Jewish sin. John in his Gospel came in his old age to look back upon the events of Christianity's first Jewish standpoint. But he rose to the essentially spiritual and eternal apprehension of Christ, rather than extended his vision, as Luke did, to the cosmopolitan mission and message of Jesus, though this did not escape John. Even the Gospel of Luke has points of affinity with Paul, John and the author of He in style and general standpoint. But while Luke's own style is manifest throughout, it is not obtrusive. He hides himself behind the wonderful portrait of Jesus which he has here drawn in undying colors.

The extreme position of Baur and Zeller may be dismissed at once. There is no reason for dating the Gospel of Lk in the 2d cent. on the ground that he used Marcion's Gospel, since it is not clear that Marcion made use of Lk. The supposed use of Jos by Luke (see Acts of the Apostles for discussion and refutation) leads a good number of radical scholars (Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Holtzmann, Jülicher, Krenkel, Weisseseker, Weizsäcker, Wrede) to the end of the 1st cent. This is still extreme, as Harnack had already shown in his Chronologica der altchristl. Lit., 1, 1897, 246–50. Any use of Jos by Luke is highly improbable (see Plummer on Lk, xxx). The Gospel was certainly written before the message of Marcion (Acts 1:1) and while Paul was alive, if 1 Tim 5:18 be taken as a quotation from Lk 10:7, which is by no means certain, however. But it is true that the most
natural way to interpret the sudden close of Acts, after 2 years in Rome (Acts 28 31), is the fact that Luke finished the book before Acts 28 and 29 were written. Luke, in the literary history of the Acts, (e.g. Juel, 1890), calls this early date "reactionary" and "extravagant." But it is supported by Alford, Blass, Ehrard, Farrar, Glog, Godet, Grauf, Guerecke, Hahn, Headlam, Hitzig, Hofmann, Hug, Keil, Lange, Lumbry, Marshall, Nössen, Oscar, Reisch, Riehn, Schaaff, Schanz, Thiersch, Tholuck, Wieseler, and Harnack himself is now ready to join this goodly company. He warns critics against too hasty a closing of the chronological question (Acts of the Apostles, 291), and admits that Acts was written "perhaps so early as the beginning of the 7th decade of the 1st cent." [ib, 297] "the Acts (and therefore also the Gospel)." In the Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels (1911, 124) Harnack says: "It seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical order were written while St. Paul was still alive." There is an intermediate date about 80 AD, assigned by Adeney, Bartlett, Plummer, Sanday, Weiss, Wright, on the ground that the investigations published in Lk 1:1-13 describe the use of narratives which could have been written only after a long period of reflection. But that is not a valid objection. There is no sound critical reason why the Gospel of Mk, the infancy narratives, and all the rest should have been excluded from this period of Christian development which has not been in circulation in Pal by 55 AD. Indeed, Allen writes in Expos T (July, 1910): "I see no reason why such an original (Mark’s Gospel in Aram.) should not have appeared before the year 50 A.D. The objection to the early dates comes out of Lk 21 20, "Jesus compassed with armies" as compared with "the abomination of desolation in Lk 13 14. The change is so specific that it is held by some critics to be due to the fact that Luke was writing after the destruction of Jerusalem. But it is just as likely (Maclean) that Luke has here interpreted the Hebrews of Mk for his gentile readers. Besides, as Plummer (p. xxx) shows, Luke in 21 5-36 does not record the fact that Jesus was destroyed, nor does he change Christ’s "He to the mountains" to "Pella in North Persea," wither the Christians actually fled. Besides, the fact that Acts shows no acquaintance with Paul’s Epp. is best explained on the assumption of the early date. The question is thus practically settled in favor of the early date. The place of the writing is not known. The early date naturally falls in with Caesarea (Blass, Michaelis, Thiersch), but there is little to guide one.

(1) Prologue, 1 1-4
(2) Infancy and childhood of John and Jesus, 1 5-23
(3) Beginning of Christ’s Ministry, 3 1
(4) Gallaeus Campaign, 4 14-9 6.
(5) Retirements from Galilee, 9 7-50
(7) Close of the Public Ministry in Jerusalem, 19 29-21 27.
(8) The Dreadful End, chs 21-23.
(9) Resurrection of Christ, ch 24.

LITERATURE.—See extended list of books at close of art. on ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: the extensive list of Commentaries on Lk can also be consulted.

Apostle Plummer the best. On Luke’s Gospel are Bruce, Esopus’ or Test. Weism’s Meyer Klé-zexgel. Keil’s God’s Word. Intros to the NT, Zahn’s is the ablest and most exhaustive (conservative) and Jülicher’s is the fairest of the three. The best of the briest ones is Gregory’s Canon and Test (1907). Special treatises are and Blum: Theology of the Gospels (1896); Ew. saccumum Lukas (1897); Winholden, Das Ev. Lukase (1904); Kohn, Origin of the Third Gospel (1907); Wright, Selenidzomai, and the Gospels, the Word and the Gospel acc. to St. Luke in Gr (1900).

A. T. ROBERTSON

LUNATIC (X), Lwnt-ak: I. Epilepsy.—The Eng. word “lunatic,” which in popular speech signifies a sufferer from any mental derangement, whether periodic or chronic,

1. Incorrect other than a purely medical or non-technical translation in AV as a tr of the Gr word selenidzomai, selenidzomai, in the two passages where it occurs. In RV the word has very properly been displaced by the strictly accurate term “epileptic.” This change is justified not only by the extra-Bib. usage (see Liddell and Scott, s.v.), but clearly enough by Mt 17 15 (cf 4 24), where epilepsy is circumstantially described.

The original meaning of the term selenidzomai, “moon-strut,” is connected with the popular belief, widespread and of strange persistence, that the moon, in certain phases, is injurious to human beings, esp in the case of diseases of a periodic or remittent character. There is no way by which to determine whether, in the NT times, this particular word represented a living and active belief or had passed into the state of usage in which the original metaphor disappears, and the word simply indicates the fact without reference to the idea embodied in the etymology. We still use the word “lunatic” to signify a person mentally diseased, although we have long since ceased to believe in the moon’s influence in such cases.

II. Madness.—The Bible designates “madness” or alienation of mind, by various terms, all of which seem to be onomatopoetic. These various words seem to be derived from the strange and fierce or mournful cries uttered by the unfortunate victims of this dread malady. In Dt 28 4 the word “maddened” is *mahuqqa*, part of *mahuqqa*, shaghah (cf also 1 S 21 15). With this corresponds the word *maiwna*, maiwna, in the NT. In 1 S 21 13 (Heb 14) the word is a form of the vb. *maiwna*, halal, which is also a derivative from the sound indicated.

In certain cases, though by no means uniformly, madness is ascribed to possession (Lk 8 26 f). One is struck by the fact that mental derangement occupies a very small place in Scripture.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET

LURK, lurk. LURKING-PLACE. "Lurking" is a vb. "To lurk" means “to lie in wait,” usually with intent to do harm (see Ps 17 12; Prov 1 11). Lurking-place, a place of hiding, usually for the purpose of murder. See 1 S 23 23; Ps 10 8.


The subset, and vbs. arc: (1) Nepheth, in Ex 15 9 and Ps 75 13; "if he desire, he shall be satisfied!" "by asking food according to their desire." A strong but not sensual sense. (2) Skr'theth, meaning "obstinance," evil imagination. Jeh said (Ps 81 15), "I let them go after the stubbornness of their heart", a wilful self-satisfaction. (3) Ta'tawah, "a delight," "a longing satisfaction," and so it came to mean "sinful pleasure." Tr' in Ps 75 30, "that which they desired," intensely longed for, referring to Jeh's provision of food in the wilderness. Also in Nu 11 4 concerning "fleshly eat, it is said the multitude "lusted exceedingly," i.e. "craved eagerly." (4) Hamadeth, the vb. meaning "to delight in," "greatly below," "covet," probably for evil purposes. The young man is warned against the evil woman (Prov 6 25): "Lust not after her beauty." Here the bad sense is evident, for in the same connection are used such expressions as "harlot," "adulteress," "evil woman." (5) 'Avoth, meaning "greatly to desire," long after, with undue emphasis, with evil intent though not perhaps with impure thought. In Nu 11 34 reference is made to a place called kibhroth ha-ta'tawah, "the graves of lust," where "they buried the people that lusted." Ps 106 14 also refers to the Israelites with "lusted exceedingly," i.e. 12 15 21 "desire of thy soul"; 12 20; 14 26, "thy soul desireth." These Dt passages evidently mean lust only in the good sense.

In the OT, so in the NT we find both meanings of the word. Epithumia, and use unct.都被，and quently, and means a longing for the unlawful, hence concupiscence, desire, lust. The following references hold the idea, not only of sinful desire but also of "pleasure" as opposed to "spiritual," "heavenly," "the will of man," opposed to "the will of God," but also the sensual desire connected with adultery, fornication; vb. in Mt 5 28; Mk 4 19; Jn 8 44; Rom 1 24; 1 Cor 10 6; Gal 5 16 17 24; Tit 2 12; 1 Pet 1 14; 1 Jn 2 16 f; Jude vs 16 18; Rev 18 14. (2) H'odon, delight in sensuality, hence wicked pleasures; tr' in Jas 4 1.3 "pleasures;" "Your pleasures that war in your members," ye ask and ye are not given, but is in your pleasure; AV lust. (3) Epithumio means to crave intensely the wrong possession; tr' in Jas 4 5 "long [AV 'lusteth'] unto envying." (4) Orezia, used in Rom 1 27, from context evidently meaning 'lust' in the worst sense. (5) Pathia, the passion, inordinate affection, with the idea in it of suffering; tr' in 1 Thes 4 5 "passion of lust." 

William Edward Raffety

LUTE, lút ('lúth); neboth; thus RV; AV viol [Isa 5 12]: Nehel is rendered elsewhere by "psaltery" or "viol." The lute was originally an Arab instrument. It resembled a guitar, though with a longer and more slender neck. The name is derived from Arab al'ooed, with a of art. elided; hence Italian liuto; Fr. luth. See Music.

LUZ (lúz): The Heb word means "almond tree" or "almond wood" (OHL, s.v.). It also means "bone," particularly a bone of the spine, and might be applied to a rocky height supposed to resemble a backbone (Lagarde, 'Ubersicht', 157 f). Winckler explains it by Aram lauth, "asylum," which might be suitably applied to a sanctuary (Ge- schichte Israels). Cheyne (EB, s.v.) would derive it by corruption from lúzath, huláquth, "strong city."

(1) This was the ancient name of Bethel (Gen 28 19; Jgs 1 23; cf Gen 35 6; 48 3; Josh 16 2; 15 13). It has been thought that Josh 16 2 contradicts this, and that the two places were distinct. Referring to Gen 24 12, we see that the site of Bethel was given to "the place," ha-nákkáh, i.e. "the sanctuary," probably "the place" (ver 11, Heb) associated with the sacrifice of Abraham (12 8), which lay to the E. of Bethel. The name of the city as distinguished from "the place" was Luz. As the name of the sanctuary grew, we may suppose, its name overshadowed, and finally superseded, that of the neighboring town. The memory of the ancient nomenclature persisting among the people sufficiently explains the allusions in the passages cited.

(2) A Bethelite, the man who betrayed the city into the hands of the children of Joseph, went into the land of the Hittites, and there founded a city which he called Luz, after the ancient name of his native place (Jgs 1 26). No satisfactory identification has been suggested.

W. Ewing

LYCAONIA, lik-ô-né-a, It-ka-ô'-ni-a (Δυκαονία, Lukaonía [Acts 14 6], Λυκαονία, Lukanis, Acts 14 11), "in the speech of Lycom,'" is Lycaonia is meant, according to the South Galatian view, by the expression την Γαλατικὴν χῶραν, την Λυκαόνικην χώραν, in Acts 18 23, and the incidents in Acts 16 1-4 belong to L.: Was a country in the southern part of Asia Minor, distinguished by its boundaries and extent varied at different periods. In the time of Paul, it was bounded on the N. by Galatia proper (but lay in the Rom province Galatia), on the E. by Cappadocia, on the S. by Cilicia Tracheia, and on the W. by Phrygia. The boundary of Phrygia and L. passed between Iconium and Lystra (see Iconium). L. consists of a level plain, waterless and treeless, rising at its southern fringe for some distance into the foothills of Taurus, and broken on its eastern side by the volcanic mass of Kara-Dagh and by many smaller hills. Strabo informs us that King Amyntas of Galatia fed many flocks of sheep on the Lycaonian plain. Much of the northern portion of L. has been proved by recent discovery to have belonged to the Rom emperors, who inherited the crown lands of Amyntas.

In Acts 14 6 L. is summed up as consisting of the cities of Lystra and Derbe and the district lying between and around them. This description refers to a particular division of Asia Minor, which alone is mentioned in the Bible. In the time of Paul, L. consisted of two parts, a western and an eastern. The western part was a "region," or subdivision of the province of Galatia; the eastern was called Lycaonia Antiochiana, after Antiochus of Commagene under whom it had been placed in 37 AD. This non-Rom portion was traversed by Paul; but nothing is recorded of his journey through it (see Danna). It included the important city of Laranda, and when L. is described as consisting of the cities of Lystra and Derbe and the surrounding district, the writer is clearly thinking only of the western portion of L., which lay in, and formed a "region" of the province Galatia. This is the tract of country which is meant in Acts 18 23, where it is called the "region" of Galatia, and placed side by side with Phrygia, another region of Galatia. The province Galatia was divided into districts technically known as "regions," and Rom L. is called the "region of Galatia." In implied contrast with Antiochian L., which lay outside the Rom province. Of the language of L. (see Lystra) nothing survives except some personal and place-names, which are discussed in Kretschmar's Ein- leitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache.

Literature—Ramsay, Hist. Comm. on Galatians (Intro); Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition (inscriptions).

W. M. Calder
LYCIA, lish'ah (Λυκία, Lūkia): An ancient country forming the southeast portion of Asia Minor. The surface of Lycia is exceedingly rugged, and its lofty mountains rise almost directly from the sea. Over them several trade routes or passes lead from the coast to the interior. Down the mountain sides rush many small rivers, of which the Xanthus is the chief. The history of L., like that of the neighboring countries, forms a part of the history of Asia Minor. Successively it was in the possession of the Persians, of Alexander the Great, of the Seleucid kings and of the Parthians. In the 1st cent. BC it fell into the hands of the Romans, who gave it to the island of Rhodes; 20 years later, because of its loyalty to Rome, it became free and independent (1 Macc 16:23). In 53 AD, during the reign of the emperor Claudius, it became a Roman province, and in 74 AD it was united with Pamphylia to form a double province over which a Roman governor presided.

At different times during the history of L., there were about 100 places which issued coins of their own. Pliny speaks of 70 cities which existed there, but in his age there were but 36. Of these, Patara, Myra and Phaselis are of interest to Bible students. From the coast city of Patara, according to the Acts 11:1, Paul took ship for Phoenicia. It was a place celebrated not only as a trading center, and a port of entry to the interior, but as the seat of the oracle of Apollo, and the birthplace of St. Nicholas. Myra, though over 2 miles from the coast, possessed a harbor, and was also a trading center. Here, according to Acts 27:5-38, Paul found a corn ship from Alexandria. For some time Myra was the capital of the Roman province; to Christendom it is esp. known as the home of St. Nicholas, who was its bishop and the patron saint of the city. There is a mountain on the border of Pamphylia, was also the home of the bishop.

I. was a stopping-place, rather than the scene of the active work of Paul, and therefore it figures little in the earliest history of Christianity. For a long time the people strongly opposed the introduction of a strange religion, and in 312 AD they even petitioned the Roman emperor Maximin against it. A portion of the petition has been discovered at Arykander.

E. J. Banks

LYDDA, lid'da. See Lod.

LYDIA, lid'ah (Λυ狄α, Ludia): An important country in the western part of Asia Minor bounded on the N. by Mysia, on the E. by Phrygia, on the S. by Caria, and on the W. by the Aegean Sea. Its surface is rugged, but along the valleys between its mountain ranges ran some of the most important highways from the coast cities to the distant interior. Of its many rivers the chief are the Cayster, the Lower Hermus, the Cogamos, the Caicus and, during a part of its course, the Maeander.

Lydia was an exceedingly ancient and powerful kingdom whose history is composed chiefly of that of its individual cities. In 546 BC it fell into the hands of the Persians, and in 334 BC it became a part of Alexander's empire. After the death of Alexander its possession was claimed by the kings both of Pergamos and of Seleucia, but in 190 BC it became the undisputed possession of the former (1 Macc 8:8). With the death of Attalus III, 133 BC, it was transferred by the will of that king to Rome, and L., which then became but a name, formed, along with Caria, Mysia and Phrygia, a part of the province of Lycia and of Caria. Among its cities were Smyrna and Ephesus, two of the most important in Asia Minor, and Smyrna is still the largest and wealthiest city of that part of Turkey. At Ephesus, the seat of the goddess Diana, Paul remained longer than elsewhere in Asia, and there his most important missionary work was done (Acts 19). Hence L. figures prominently in the early history of the church; it became Christianized during the residence of the apostle at Ephesus, or soon afterward (see also Lud.).

E. J. Banks

LYDIA, lid'ah (Λυ狄α, Ludia): The fem. of Lydian, a native of Lydia, a large country on the W. of Asia Minor, and the name of St. Paul's first convert in Europe. This name was a popular one for women (cf Horace Odes 1.8; iii.9; vi.20), but Ramsay thinks she was familiarly known in the town by the ethnic that showed her origin (HDB, s.v. "Lydia"); cf St. Paul the Traveller, 214). It has always been and is still a common custom in the Orient to refer to one living in a foreign land by employing the adj. which designates the nationality. Renan thinks it means "the Lydian"; Thyatira is a city of Lydia. Lydia was (1) living in Philippi, (2) of the city of Thyatira, (3) a seller of purple-dyed garments from her native town, and (4) "one that worshiped God." Her occupation shows her to have been a woman of some capital. The phrase which describes her religion (sebomène tón Théon) is a special designation for a proselyte. She was in the habit of frequently a place of prayer by a riverside, a situation convenient for the necessary ablutions required by the Jewish worship, and there Paul and his companions met her also. After she had been brought to St. Paul (Gr. impf.), the Lord opened her heart to give heed to his teaching ("To open is the part of God, to pay attention to that of the woman," Chrysostom). Her baptism and that of her household followed. To prove her sincerity she besought the missionaries to accept the hospitality of her home. Her house probably became the center for the church in Philippi (Acts 16:14.15.40). L. is not mentioned in St. Paul's letter to the Philippians, but, if Ramsay be correct, she may have been Euodia or Syntyche (Phil 4:2). S. F. Hunter

LYDIA, lid'ah. See Lysia.

LYE, li. See Nitre.

LYING, li'ing. See Lie.

LYSANIAS, lys-an'ias (Λυσάνιας, Lūsanias): Mentioned in Lk 3:1 as tmarch of Asia in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, and thus fixing the date of the preaching of John the Baptist in the wilderness at about 26 or 28 AD. Lysanias is mentioned by Jos as having ruled over Chaleia and Abilene, and as having been slain by Mark Antony at the instigation of Cleopatra. As this happened about 36 BC, Luke has been charged with inaccuracy. Inscriptions, however, corroborate the view that the L. of Luke was probably a descendant of the L. mentioned by Jos (see Schürer, Hist, JF, iv.1, Vol ii, App. 1, p. 338). C. M. Kerr

LYSIA, lys'ah (Λυσία, Lūsia): (1) "A noble man, and one of the blood royal" whom Antiochus Epiphanes (c 168 BC) left with the government of Southern Syria and the guardianship of his son, while he went in person into Persia to collect the revenues which were not coming in satisfactorily (1 Macc 3:22; 2 Macc 10:11). According to Jos (Ant., XII, vii, 2), the instructions of Lysias were "to conquer Judæa, enslave its inhabitants, utterly destroy Jerus and abolish the whole nation." L., accordingly, armed against Judas Maccabaeus a large force under Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, Nicanor and Gorgias. Of this force
Judas defeated the two divisions under Nicor and Gorgias near Emmaus (166 BC), and in the following year L. himself at Bethsura (1 Mace 4), after which he proceeded to the purification of the temple. In the narration of these campaigns there are considerable differences between the writers of 1 Mace and 2 Mace which scholars have not found easy to explain. Antiochus died at Babylon on his Pers expedition (164 BC), and L. assumed the office of regent during the minority of his son, who was yet a child (1 Mace 6 17). He collected another army at Antioch, and after the recapture of Bethsura was besieging Jerus when he learned of the approach of Philip to whom Antiochus, on his deathbed, had intrusted the guardianship of the prince (1 Mace 6 15; 2 Mace 13). He defeated Philip in 163 BC and was supported at Rome, but in the following year he fell with his ward Antiochus into the hands of Demetrius I (Soter), who put both of them to death (1 Mace 7 1–23).

(2) See Claudius Lysias (Acts 23 26).

J. Hutchison

LYSIMACHUS, L.-sí-ma-khos (Λυσιμαχός, Lusimachos): (1) The son of Ptolemy, of Jerus, is named (Ad Est 11 1) as the interpreter (translator of the Rest of Esther into Gr). See Est. 2 Mace 11 29. (2) Brother of Menelaus, a Gr name said by Jos (Ant. XII, v 1) to have been assumed by Onias, the high priest in the hellenizing days of Antiochus Epiphanes, as the Jewish name Jesus was changed to Jason. When Menelaus was summoned to Antioch (2 Mace 4 29) on a charge of malversation, he left L. as his deputy in the priesthood at Jerus. L. robbed the temple and caused an insurrection in which he met his death beside the treasury (2 Mace 4 42). The name of L. does not appear in the narrative of these events given by Jos.

J. Hutchison

LYSTRA, lis'tra: The forms Λυστρα, Lāstran, and Λυστρος, Lāstrōs, occur. Such variation in the gender of Anatolian city-names is common (see Harnack, Apostelgeschichte, 86; Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 128). Lystra was visited by Paul 4 t (Acts 14 6 21; 16 1; 18 23—the last according to the “South Galatian” theory), and is mentioned in 2 Tim 3 5–10 as one of the places where Paul suffered persecution. Timothy resided in L. (Acts 16 1). L. owed its importance, and the attention which Paul paid to it, to the fact that it had been made a Rom colonia by Augustus (see As- trocorn), and was therefore, in the time of Paul, a center of education and enlightenement. Nothing is known of its earlier, and little of its later, history. The site of L. was placed by Leake (1820) at a hill near Khātura Sarān, 18 miles S.S.W. from Iconium; this identification was proved correct by an inscription found by Sterrett in 1885. The boundary between Phrygia and Lycaonia passed between Iconium and L. (Acts 14 6) (see Iconium).

The population of L. consisted of the local aris- tocracy of Rom soldiers who formed the garrison of the colonia, of Greeks and Jews (Acts 16 1 8), and of native Lycaonians (Acts 14 11).

After Paul had healed a life-long cripple at L., the native population (the “multitude” of Acts 14 11) regarded him and Barnabas as Zeus and Paul as Hermes. Commentators on this incident usually point out that the same pair of divinities appeared to Baucis and Philemon in Ovid’s well-known story, which he locates in the neighboring Phrygia. The accuracy in detail of this part of the narrative in Acts has been strikingly confirmed by recent epi-graphic discovery. Two inscriptions found in the neighborhood of L. in 1909 run as follows: (1) “Kakkan and Maramoon and Iman Linium priests of Zeus”; (2) “Toous Macrinus also called Abas-cantus and Batasis son of Bretasis having made in accordance with a vow at their own expense [a statue of] Hermes Most Great along with a sun-dial dedicated it to Zeus the sun-god.”

Now it is evident from the narrative in Acts that the people who were prepared to worship Paul and Barnabas as gods were not Greeks or Romans, but native Lycaonians. This is conclusively brought out by the use of the phrase “in the speech of Lycaonia” (Acts 14 11). The language in ordinary use among the educated classes in Central Anatolian cities under the Rom Empire was Gr; in some of those cities, and esp. of course, in Rom colonies, Lat also was understood, and it was used at this period in official documents. But the Anatolian element in the population of those cities continued for a long time to use the native language (e.g. Phrygian was in use at Iconium till the 3d cent. of our era; see Iconium). In the story in Acts, a fast distinction is implied, and in fact existed, between the ideas and practices of the Greeks and the Rom colonists and those of the natives. This distinction would naturally maintain itself most vigorously in so conservative an institution as religious ritual and legend. We should therefore expect to find that the association between Zeus and Hermes indicated in Acts belonged to the religious system of the native population, rather than to that of the educated society of the colony. And this is precisely the character of the cult illustrated in our two inscriptions. It is essentially a native cult, under a thin Gr disguise. The names in those inscriptions can only have been the names of natives; the Zeus and Hermes of Acts and of our inscriptions were a grecized version of the Father-god and Mother-goddess of the native Anatolian system. The college of priests which appears in inscription no. 1 (supporting the Bezan variant “priestess” for “priest” in Acts 14 13) was a regular Anatolian institution. The miracle performed by Paul, and his companionship with Barnabas would naturally suggest to the natives who used the “speech of Lycaonia” a pair of gods commonly associated by them in a local cult. The two gods whose names rose to their lips are now known to have been associated by the dedication of a statue of one in a temple, of the other in the neighborhood of L.


W. M. Calder
MAACAH, MAACHAH, mā'a-ka (מָאָכָא, ma‘akkā),

(1) B, Moṣhā, Moṣched, A, Moṣḥā, Moṣched, daughter of Nathan, born to him by Reumah (Gen 22:24).

(2) B, Moṣḥā, Moṣched, A, Moṣḥāḏ, Moṣchath, the one wife of David who was of royal rank, the daughter of Talmi, king of Gezher, who became the mother of Absalom (2 S 3 3; 1 Ch 3 2).

(3) Moṣched, father of Achish, king of Gath (1 K 2 39). He is probably referred to as “Moosh” in 1 S 27 2.

(4) Daughter of Absalom, the favored wife of Rehoboam, and mother of Abijah (1 K 15 2; 2 Ch 11 20, etc.). Evidently “daughter” must here be understood as “granddaughter,” according to a common oriental usage. Tamar was the only daughter of Absalom. If Tamar married Uriel of Gibea (2 Ch 13 2), then Maachah was her daughter. In that case the name Miciaah in this passage would be either a copyist’s error or a variant of Maachah. She must have been a woman of strong personality. Unfortunately her influence was cast upon the side of idolatry. She maintained her position in the palace, however, till the reign of her grandson Assa. Possibly she acted as regent during his minority. Ultimately she was degraded by him for an act of peculiar infamy (1 K 16 13; 2 Ch 15 16).

(5) Concubine of Caleb, son of Hezon (1 Ch 2 48).

(6) Sister of Huppim and Shuppim the Benjaminites, who became the wife of Maḥbir the Manassite, the “father” of Gilead (1 Ch 7 12 15 f).

(7) Wife of Joel, the “father” of Gibon, an ancestress of King Saul (1 Ch 8 29; 9 35).

(8) Father of Hanan, one of David’s mighty men (1 Ch 11 45).

(9) Father of Shephatiah, ruler of the Simeonites under David (1 Ch 27 16).

M A C A H, mā’a-ka (מָאָכָה, ma‘akkā; B, Moṣhā, Moṣched; A, Moṣḥā, Moṣched, Moṣḥāḏ, Moṣchath; A, Moṣḥāḏ, Moṣchath; A, Moṣḥāḏ, Moṣchath): A small Syrian kingdom, adjoining that of Geshur on the western border of Bashan, the inhabitants of which were called Maachathites (RV “Maachathites”), whose territory was taken by Jair (Dt 3 14; Josh 13 5). The border of the Geshurites and the Maachathites and all the Ammonites were given to the half-trib of Manasseh (Josh 13 11). The inhabitants of these kingdoms, however, were not driven out by Israel (ver 13), and at a later day the children of Ammon hired mercenaries from Maacah for their encounter with David. The armies met near Medeba when the “Syrians” from Maacah found themselves opposed to Joab. That famous captain completely routed them (2 S 10 6 ff; LXX “Amelek’”). In 1 Ch 19 6 it is called Aram-ma‘achah, Syria-ma‘achah (AV); and in 1 Ch 22 23 “Aram” appears instead of “Ma‘achah.”

It evidently lay between Geshur on the S. and Hermon on the N., being probably bounded by Jordan on the W., although no certain indication of boundaries has been fixed in by Israel, which accounts for “Geshur and Maacah dwell in the midst of Israel” (Josh 13 13). It is possible that Abel-beth-ma‘achah may have been a colony founded by men from Maacah.

W. EWING

M A C A C H I T E S, mā-ak’a-thiṯ (מָאָכָה-תִּתְּם, ha-ma‘akkāḥaṯīṯ; B, Ḍ ṯ ā māṣḥeṭiṯ, ho Macheṣṭel, A, Māṣḥeṭiṯ, M ochath): Mentioned in Scripture are Abisha‘i (2 S 23 34), Jaazaniah (2 K 25 23), Naham (1 Ch 4 19) and Josiah (Jer 40 8). See preceding article.

MAADAI, mā-a’dā‘iṯ, mā-a’dā‘ (מָאָדָאָה, ma‘ada‘ah): Son of Bani; one of those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10 34).

MAADIAH, mā-a’di‘ (מָאָדִי‘ה, ma‘adiyāh), “whose ornament is Jah”): A priest who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 12 5). His name also occurs in the form “Moadiah” (Neh 12 17).

MAAL, mā-‘āl, mā’ (מָאָל, ma‘ay): An Asaphite musician who took part in the ceremony of the dedication of the walls (Neh 12 36).

MAALEH-ACARABIIM, mā’ā-lah-akăr ‘îm, mā‘al-a‘rîm: See Akarabim.

MAANI, mā’a-ni (Maavi, Maanit): (1) AV “Meani” (1 Esd 5 31), corresponding to “Memoim” in Ezr 2 50; Neh 7 50; (2) RV “Bani,” head of a family, many of whom had married foreign wives (1 Esd 9 34; called “Bani” in Ezr 10 34).

MAARTH, mā-a-rah (מָאָרַת, ma‘ārāת): A city in the hill country of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anoth (Josh 15 59). The small village of Be’it Ummar upon the watershed, a little to the W. of the carriage road to Hebron and about a mile from Kh. Jedär (Gedor), is a probable site. There are some rock tombs to its E. The village mosque is dedicated to Nebi Matta, i.e. St. Matthew. See PEF, III, 305, Sh XXI.

MAAREH-GEBA, mā-a-re-gēḇā, -gēḇa (מָאָרֶה-גֶּבָּה, Ma‘ærėghēḇah’; B, Mapasayēḇe, Marougābeth, A, Māro-gābeth, i.e. Arabian camp). The place where the men of Israel lay in ambush, from which they broke forth upon the children of Benjamin (Jgs 20 33). AV renders “the meadows of Gibeah,” RV “the meadow of Gaba [or Gibeah].” LXX A affords a clue to the correct reading. It is not a place-name. The text must be emended to read mimmu-‘ārāth ‘yēghēḇa’, “to the W. of Gaba.” Pesh suggests a reading mimmu-‘ārāth ṣēghēḇa’, “from the cave of Gaba.” This, however, there is nothing to warrant. W. EWING

MAASAI, mā-a-sā‘i, mā-a’i (מָאָסְאִי, ma‘as’iy): AV Maasai: A priest, son of Abdīd (1 Ch 9 12).

MAASEAS, mā-a-se’as (Mಸಸ, Məṣsas; AV Maasias): Grandfather of Barbah (Bar 1 1); called Maasias in Jer 32 12; 51 50.

MAASEHI, mā-a-se’i, mā-a’i (מָאָסְהִי, ma‘as’eh; mā‘as’āthā, “Jehu’s work”; Məṣṣeḏ, Məṣṣa‘ud, and Məṣṣa‘al in LXX); A name common in exilic and late monarchical times (Gray, HPN). (1) A Levite musician named in connection with David’s bringing up of the ark from the house of Obed-edom (1 Ch 15 18 20). (2) A Levite captain who aided Jehoiada at the coronation of Josiah (2 Ch 23 1). (3) An officer of Uzziah (2 Ch 26 11).

(4) Ahas’ son, slain by the Ephraimites, Zichri (2 Ch 28 7).

(5) A governor of Jerus under Josiah (2 Ch 34 8).
(6) (7) (8) (9) The name of 4 men, 3 of them priests, who had married foreign wives (Exr 10 18.21.22.23).

(10) Father of Azariah, one of the builders of the wall (Neh 3 23).

(11) One of those who stood at Ezra's right hand during the reading of the Law (Neh 8 4).

(12) One of the expounders of the Law (Neh 8 7).

(13) One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Neh 10 25).

(14) A Judahite inhabitant of Jerusalem (Neh 11 5), who in 1 Ch 9 5 is called Assiah.

(15) A Benjamite (Neh 11 7).

(16) Name of two priests (Neh 12 41 f).

(17) A priest in Zedekiah's reign, father of a certain Zephaniah who interviewed the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 21 1; 29 25; 37 3).

(19) Father of the false prophet Zedekiah (Jer 29 21).

(20) A keeper of the threshold in the reign of Jehoiakim (Jer 35 4).

(21) Basseiah (q.v.), a Kohathite name (1 Ch 6 40), is probably a textual error for Masseiah.

(22) AV for Mahseiah, an ancestor of Baruch (Jer 32 12).

John A. Lees

MAASIAI, mā'-a'-šə-l. See MAASAI.

MAASMAS, mā'-a'-məs, mā'-ə-məs (Maasnás, Maasnás; Swete reads MAaasnás; AV Masman, 1 Esd 8 43): Corresponds to "Shemaiah" in Exr 8 16.

MAATH, mā'-əth (Māāḏ, Māḏāh): An ancestor of Jesus in St. Luke's genealogy in the 12th generation before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lk 3 28).

MAAZ, mā'-əz (מַאָ֣ז, ma'az): A descendant of Judah (1 Ch 2 27).

MAAZIAH, mā'-ə-zē'-ə (מַאָ֖זיה, ma'az+yēhā): (1) The priest to whom fell the lot for the 24th course (1 Ch 24 18).

(2) One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Neh 10 8).

MABDAI, mab'dā'i. See MAMDAI.

MABNABEDAI, mab-nab'-ə-dā'. See MACNABEDAI.

MACALON, mak-a'-lən (οἰ ἐκ Μακαλῶν, hoi ek Makalōn; 1 Esd 5 21): This corresponds to "the men of Michmas" in Ezr 2 27. The mistake has probably arisen through reading M in Gr uncial for AA.

MACCABAEI, mak-a'-bē'-us (ΜΑΚΑΒΑΙΟΙ, Mak'abaios), MACCABEES, mak-a'-bēz (οἱ ΜΑΚΑΒΑΙΟΙ, hoi Makabaios): I. PALESTINE UNDER THE KINGS OF SYRIA

3. Rivalry of Syria and Egypt

II. PALESTINE UNDER THE MACCABEES

1. Mattathias

2. Judas

3. Jonathan

4. Simon

5. John Hyrcanus

6. John and Eleazar

LITERATURE

The name Maccabaeus was first applied to Judas, one of the sons of Mattathias generally called in Eng. the Maccabees, a celebrated family who defended Jewish rights and customs in the 2nd cent. BC (1 Macc 1 1-3). The word has been variously derived (e.g. as the initial letters of Mt Khā-
mākhā, Bā'-elīm Yahweh? "Who is like unto thee among the mighty, O Jehovah?") but it is probably best associated with makhābāhā, "hammer," and as applied to Judas may be compared with the malleus Seclorum and malleus haeminaeus of ages (see next article). To understand the work of the Maccabees, it is necessary to take note of the relation in which the Jews and Pal stood at the time to the immediately neighboring nations.

1. Palestine under Kings of Syria.—On the division of Alexander's empire at his death in the year 323 BC, Pal became a sort of buffer state between Egypt and the Seleucid kings of Syria, and under Egypt, the house of Seleucus, the last survivor of Alexander's generals, on the N. The kings of Syria, as the Seleucid kings are generally called, though their dominion extended practically from the Mediterranean Sea to India, had not all the same name, like the Ptolemies of Egypt, though most of them were called either Seleucus or Antiochus. For a hundred years after the death of Alexander, the struggle went on as to which of the two powers was to govern Pal, until in the year 223 came the northern prince under whom Pal was destined to fall to the Seleucids for good.

This was Antiochus III, commonly known as Antiochus the Great. He waged two campaigns against Egypt for the possession of Palestine, Pal, finally gaining the upper hand in Syria under the year 198 BC, by his victory at Panium, so called from its proximity the Great, it being a sanctuary of the god Pan, a spot close to the sources of the Jordan and still called Banias. The Jews helped Antiochus to gain the victory, and, according to his rule, which was accepted by the Jews with good will. It is with him and his successors that the Jews have now to deal. Antiochus, it should be noticed, came in contact with the Romans after their conquest of Macedonia in 179, and was defeated by Scipio Asiaticus at Magnesia in 190. He came under heavy tribute which he found it difficult to pay, and met his end in 187, while plundering a Gr temple in order to secure its contents. His son and successor Seleucus IV was murdered by his prime minister Heliodorus in 175-175 BC, who reaped no benefit from his crime.

The brother of the murdered king succeeded to the throne as Antiochus IV, generally known as Antiochus Epiphanes ("the Illustrious"), a typical eastern ruler of considerable ability, whose early training while a hostage Epiphanes at Rome had made him an adept in dissimulation. Educated in the fashionable Hellenism of the day, he made it his aim during his reign (175-164 BC) to enforce it upon his empire, a policy which brought him into conflict with the Jews. Even before his reign many Jews had yielded to the attraction of Gr thought and custom, and the accession of a ruler like Antiochus Epiphanes greatly increased the drift in that direction, as will be found described in the article dealing with the period between the Old and the New Testaments (see BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS). Fious Jews meanwhile, men faithful to the Jewish tradition, Chăṣṭîlm (see ḤAS'DĀRANS), as they were called, resisted this tendency, and in the end were driven to armed resistance against the severe oppression practised by Antiochus in advancing his Hellenizing views. See ASIONEANS.

II. Palestine under the Maccabees.—Mattathias, a priest of the first of the 24 courses and therefore of the noblest who dwelt at Modin, a city of Judah, was the first to strike a blow. With his own hand he slew a Jew at Modin, who was willing to offer the idolatrous sacrifices ordered by the king, and also Apelles, the leader of the...
1. **Maccabees, mak'a-bès**, BOOKS OF:

I. 1 Maccabees
   1. Name
   2. Canonicity
   3. Contents
   4. Historical
   5. Author's Standpoint and Aim
   6. Date
   7. Sources
   8. Original Language
   9. Text and Versions

II. 2 Maccabees
   1. Name
   2. Canonicity
   3. Contents
   4. Sources
   5. Historical
   6. Teaching of the Book
   7. Authors and Date
   8. Original Language
   9. Text and Versions

III. 3 Maccabees
   1. Name
   2. Canonicity
   3. Contents
   4. Historical
   5. Aim and Teaching
   6. Authorship and Date
   7. Original Language
   8. Text and Versions

IV. 4 Maccabees
   1. Name
   2. Canonicity
   3. Contents
   4. Historical
   5. Aim and Teaching
   6. Authorship and Date
   7. Original Language
   8. Text and Versions

V. 5 Maccabees
   1. Name
   2. Canonicity
   3. Contents
   4. Historical
   5. Original Language
   6. Aim and Teaching

LITERATURE.

1. **1 Maccabees**—The title of the work is in the original Heb. text. Rabbinical writers call the Books of Mac **אַנָּאָמָא**.

2. **2 Maccabees**—The Heb title is **תַּקְדוֹשֵׁי הָוֵי-חָשַׂנְיִם**. "The Book of the Hasmoneans." (see ASMONAES).

3. **3 Maccabees**—The Heb title is **יָשָׁבָתָּא סָבוֹאָאָלָא יָשָׁבָתָּא סָבוֹאָלָא**. The title is derived from the name of the author, Judas Maccabeus, with a possible addition of the word "venture." The name is also used in the Heb. title of **I Maccabees**.

4. **4 Maccabees**—The Heb title is **יוֹסֵפָה הָא-הָשָׂמָאָנִים**. "The Book of the Hasmoneans." (see ASMONAES). The title is derived from the name of the author, Judas Maccabeus.

5. **5 Maccabees**—The Heb title is **יָשָׁבָתָּא סָבוֹאָלָא יָשָׁבָתָּא סָבוֹאָלָא**. The title is derived from the name of the author, Judas Maccabeus, with a possible addition of the word "venture." The name is also used in the Heb. title of **I Maccabees**.

LITERATURE.

1. **1 Maccabees**
2. **2 Maccabees**
3. **3 Maccabees**
4. **4 Maccabees**
5. **5 Maccabees**
Book of the House of the Hasmonaens’ (of the rabbinical name given above). In the Gr MSS N, AV (Cod. Venetus), the 4 books go under the designation Makkabaios, Makkabaios, A B Τ Δ, ββββ, ββββ, being understood. In the Vulg the 1st and 2d books are alone found, and appear under the name Maccabaeorum, Maccabaeorum. The spelling Maccabaeorum reproduces probably the pronunciation current in Jerome’s day.

The name “Maccabea” belongs strictly only to Judas, who in 2 Macc is usually called “the Maccabeus, ha Makkabaios.” But the epithet came to be applied to the whole family and their descendants. The word means probably “extinguisher” (of persecution) (“נבל, makkbi,” from קבך, ‘to be extinguished’); so Niese; Jos, Ant, X, vii, 1 f.; S. J. Curtis, The Name Maccabea. bee. The more usual explanation, “hammerer” (“נבל, makkbbhay), is untenable, as the noun from which it is derived (נבל, makkbebeth) (Igs 4 21) denotes a smith’s hammer.

Since the Vulg includes only the first 2 books of Macc, these are the only books pronounced canon, and included in recognized Protestant VSS of the Apoc (see Apocrypha). That 1 Macc was used largely in the early Christian church is proved by the numerous references made to it and the last name stated that 1 Macc is uncanonical, and it is excluded from the lists of canonical writings given by Athanasius (d. 373), Cyril of Jerus (d. 386), and Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 390). Indeed, none of the books of the Macc was recognized as canonical until the Council of Trent (1563) gave this rank to the first 2 books, and Protestants continue in their confession to exclude the whole of the Apoc from the Bible proper, though Luther maintained that 1 Macc was more worthy of a place in the Canon than many books now included in it.

1. Macc gives first of all a brief view of the reign of Alexander the Great and the partition of his kingdom among his successors. Having thus explained the origin of the Seleucid Dynasty, the author proceeds to give a history of the Jewish people from the accession of Antiochus IV, king of Syria (175 BC), to the death of Simon (155 BC). The events of these 40 years are simply but graphically related, as an exposition of the order of their occurrence. The contents of 1 Macc and 2 Macc 4–15 are in large part dealing with the same incidents; but the simple narrative character of 1 Macc, in contrast to the didactic and highly religious as well as supernatural coloring of 2 Macc, can easily be seen in these corresponding parts. The victories due to heroism in 1 Macc are commonly ascribed to miraculous intervention on the part of God in 2 Macc (see 1 Macc 1 1 f.; cf 2 Macc 8 23 f). 2 Macc is more given to exaggerations. The army of Judas at Bethsura consists of 10,000 according to 1 Macc 4 29, but of 80,000 according to 2 Macc 11 2. The following is a brief analysis of 1 Macc.

1. 1–10: An account of the rise of the Seleucid Dynasty.
2. 11–16: History of the Jews from 175 to 155 BC.

(a) 1 1–64: Introductory. Some Jews inclined to adopt Greco customs (religious, etc.); Antiochus’ aim to conquer and suppress the Jewish religion as a source of Jewish disloyalty. Desecration of the Jewish temple: martyrdom of many faithful Jews.
(b) 2 2–70: The revolt of Mattathias.
(d) 9 25–12 53: Leadership of Jonathan, 5th son of Mattathias, Mace, and successor of Judas. He becomes high priest. Political independence of Judaea secured.

3. Contents

(a) 13 31–16 24: Peaceful and prosperous rule of Simon, brother of Jonathan; accession of his son John Hyrcanus (135 BC).

That the author of 1 Macc aims at giving a correct narrative, and that on the whole his account is correct, is the opinion of practically all scholars. The simple, straightforward way in which he writes inspires confidence, and there can be no doubt that we have here a first-class authority for the period covered (175–135 BC). It is the earliest Jewish history which dates events in reference to a definite era, this era being that of the Seleucids, 312 BC, the year of the founding of that dynasty. The aid received from God is frequently recognized in the book (2 51 ff.; 3 18; 4 10 f.; 9 46; 16 3), yet it is mainly through personal valor that the Jews conquer, not, as in 2 Macc (see III, 3 below), through miraculous Divine interpositions. Ordinary, secondary causes are almost the only ones taken into account, so that the record may be relied upon as on the whole trustworthy. Yet the writer shows the defects which belong to his age and environment, or what from the standpoint of literal historicity must be counted defects, though, as in the case of 2 Macc (cf Ch), a writer may have other aims than to record bare objective facts. In 1 1–9 the author errs through ignorance of the real facts as regards Alexander’s partition of his kingdom; and other mistakes of facts due to the cause occur in 10 1 f. (Alexander [Balas], son of Antiochus Epiphanes) and in 13 31 ff. (time of assassination of Antiochus VI by Tryphon). In 6 37 it is said there were 32 men upon each elephant, perhaps a misreading of the original number. Although the Indian elephant corps of today carries more.

We know nothing of a Pers village Elymais (6 1). The number of Jewish warriors that fought and the number slain are understated, while there are evident exaggerations of the number of soldiers who fought against them and of those of whom they were left dead on the field (see 4 15; 7 46; 11 45–51, etc.).

But in this book, prayers, speeches and official records abound as they do in Ezra, Nehemiah (see Century Bible, “Ezr,” “Neh.” “Est.” 12 8), and many modern Protestant writers doubt or deny the authenticity of a part of those, though that is not necessarily to question their genuineness as part of the original narrative.

As regards the prayers (3 50–54; 4 30–33) and speeches (2 7–13; 2 50–68; 4 6–11, etc.) there is no valid reason for doubting that they give at least the substance of what was originally said or written, though ancient historians like Thucydides and Livy think it quite right to edit the speeches of their characters, abbreviating, expanding or altering. Besides, it is to be remembered that the art of stenography is a modern one; even Dr. Johnson, in default of verbatim reports, had to a large extent to make the speeches which he ostensibly reported. There is, however, in the book a large number of official documents, and it is in regard to the authenticity of these that modern criticism has expressed greatest doubt. They are the following:

1. Letter of the Jews in Gilead to Judas (5 10–13).
2. Treaty of alliance between the Romans and Jews; copy written on brass tablets sent to Judas (5 39–32).
4. Letter from King Demetrius I to Jonathan (10 20–45).
6. Letter from King Demetrius I to Jonathan, making the latter high priest (11 57).
7. Letter from Jonathan to the Spartans, asking for an alliance (12 5–18).
8. Letter from the Spartan king Artus to the high priest Onias (12 39–51).
9. Letter from King Demetrius II to Simon (13 36–40).

4. History
(10) Letter from the Spartans to Simon (14 20-24).
(11) A Jew reciting the services of Simon and his brothers (14 27-45).
(12) Letters from Antichus VII (Sidetes) to Simon (15 2-9).
(13) Message from the Rom consul Lucius to Ptolemy, king of Egypt, asking for protection for the Jews (15 16-21).
A copy was sent to Simon (15 24).

Formerly the authenticity of this state documents was accepted without doubt, as they are still by Romanist commentators (Wetzel, Schols, etc.). At most they are but translations of the originals, which in the language of the books, was written in Gr. and Lat. from which the author would translate into Heb.
The Gr. of our book is a tr from the Heb (see II, 8 below).

Ravlinson (Speaker’s Apoc, II, 329) says these documents “have a general air of authenticity.” Most modern scholars reject the letters purporting to emanate from the Romans (nos. 2 and 13 above) and from the Spartans (nos. 8, 10 above), together with Jonathan’s message to the latter (no. 7, above), on the ground that they contain some historical inaccuracies and imply others. How could one consil issue official mandates in the name of the Rom republic (see no. 13, above)? In no. 8 above, it is the king of the Spartans who writes on behalf of his people to the highest priest; but it is the emperors or rulers who write for the Spartans to Simon. Why the difference? Moreover, in 12 21 the Spartans and Jews are said to be kinsmen (lit. brothers), both alike being descendants of Abraham; so also 14 20. This is admittedly contrary to fact. For a careful examination of these official documents and their objective value, see Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen des AT, 27-30. Though, however, these documents and some others can be proved incorrect as they stand, they do seem to imply actual negotiations of the kind described; i.e. the Jews must have had communications with the Romans and Spartans, the Jews of Gilead must have sent a missive to Judas (no. 1), Alexander Balaus did not write to Jonathan, etc., though the author of 1 Macc puts the matter in his own way, coloring it by his own patriotic and religious prejudices.

Though the name of the author is unknown, the book itself supplies conclusive evidence that he belonged to the Sadducee party, the party favored by the Hasmonaean dynasty.

5. Author’s Standpoint
The aim of the writer is evidently historical and patriotic, yet his attitude toward religious questions is clearly indicated, both directly and indirectly.

(1) Name of the book is the Divine Being mentioned under any name except Heaven (3 18 f. 50.60; 4 10.55; 12 15, etc.), a designation common in rabbinical Heb (Talm, etc.). As early as 300 BC the sacred name “Yahweh” was discarded in favor of “Adonai” (Lord) for superstitious reasons. But in 1 Macc no strictly Divine name meets us at all. This would seem to indicate the idea of a certain aloofness of God, such as characterized the theology of the Sadducee party. Contrast this with the mystical closeness of God realized and expressed by the prophets and prophets of the OT.

(2) The author is a religious patriot, believing that his people have been Divinely chosen and that the cause of Israel is the cause of God.

(3) He is also a strict legalist, believing that the duty of every Jew to keep the Law of Moses is preserved in its constitutions (1 11.15.39.45.50.54.60.62; 2 20 ff. 27.42.48.50; 3 21, etc.), and deprecating attempts to compel Jews to desecrate the Sabbath and feast days (1 45), to eat unclean food (1 63) and to sacrifice to idols (1 43). Yet the comparatively lax attitude of Simon and his brothers, which was stated in the time when this book was written, words implying the lapse of say 30 years at least. This gives a terminus ante quem of 113 BC. Moreover, the parallelism on Simon (d. 135 BC) and his peaceful policies in 2 2 ff. give an impression that he had been long in his grave. We cannot be far wrong in assigning a date for the book in the early part of the last cent. BC, say 80 BC.

Sabbath” (Mk 2 27), agrees with the Sadducee position against that of the Pharisees.

(4) The book teaches that the age of inspiration is past, and that the sacred books already written are the only source of comfort in sorrow and of encouragement under difficulties (12 9).

(5) The legitimacy of the high-priesthood of Simon is not once questioned, though it is condemned by both the Deuteronomistic law (D), which restricts the priesthood to the tribe of Levi, and by the priestly law (P), which requires in addition that a priest must be of the family of Aaron. This laxity agrees well with the general tenets of the Sadducees.

(6) The book contains no trace of the Messianic hope, though it was entertained at the time in other circles (the Pharisees; see Messiah, II, 2; Prophecy); 2 57 is no exception, for it implies no more than a belief that there would be a restoration of the Davidic Dynasty. Perhaps it is implied that that expectation was realized in the Hasmonaean.
Destinon (Die Quellen des Flavius Jos. I, 1882, 80 ff.), followed by Wellhausen (JUG, 1894, 222 f.), maintained that Jos. (d. c 95), who followed 1 Macc up to the end of ch 13, could not have seen chs 14–16 (or from 14 167), or he would not have given so many and the same details of the high-priesthood of Simon (see Ant, XIII, vi, 7), which the author of 1 Macc describes so fully in these chapters. But Jos must have used these chapters or he could not have written of Simon even as fully as he does.

If, as Torrey (EB, III, 2362) holds, we have in 1 Macc "the entire apocryphal literature," the whole Maccabean struggle from its beginning, the book having been completed soon after the middle of the 2nd cent. BC, it may then be assumed that the writer depended on many sources. But even in this case one is compelled, contrary to Torrey (i.e.), to assume that written sources of his own were used, or the descriptions would not have been so full and the dating so exact. If, however, we follow the evidence of the MSS, we find that while the book to about 50 BC (see 1, 6), it must be supposed that the author had access to written sources. It may legitimately be inferred from 9 22 and 16 23 and from the habit of earlier times (see Century Bible, "Esther," 7ff) that, originally records were kept in the archives of the temple, or elsewhere. These might have contained the state documents referred to in 1, 4, some or all, and reports of speeches and prayers, etc. It must be admitted that the mere composition of the historical portion of the OT (8, K, Ch, etc.), the author of 1 Macc does not definitely name his written sources. The writer might well be supposed to have kept a kind of diary of his own in which the events of his own early life were recorded. Oral tradition, much more retentive of songs, speeches and the like in ancient than in modern times, may have been a very important source.

We have the testimony of Origen (see I, 1) and Jerome (Prolog. Galeatue) that the book existed in Heb in their day. But it is doubtful whether the words of Origen imply a Language Heb or an Aram. original, and though Jerome speaks of the book as Heb (hebraicus), it has to be remembered that in later times the Gr. adj. denoting Heb (hebraiiki, hebrastiki) and perhaps the corresponding Lat one (hebraicus) denoted often Palestinian Aram. (see Jgs 5 2; 19 13 17; and Kautzsch, Grammatik des bib. Aram., 19).

Hebraisms (or Aramaism) abound throughout the book. In the following examples Hebraisms are literally rendered in Gr, though in the latter language they are unidiomatic and often unintelligible: "two years of days"=two years old (1 29 etc.); "month and month"=every month (1 58); "a man [or each one] his neighbor"=each . . . the other (2 40; 3 43); "sons of the fortress" etc. (5 2); "those to whose face =before us (4 10); "men of power"=warriors (5 32); "of them"=some of them (6 2; cf 7 33, of the priests"=some of the priests); "the right hand wing"=the southern wing (9 1); "yesterday and the third day"=that heretofore (9 44). The above are strictly Hebraisms and not for the most part Aramaisms. The implied use of the "two parts consecutively" in 3 1.41; 8 1; 9 1, and often, points also to a Heb, not to an Aram. origin. "Heaven as a substitute for "God," so common in a Hebraism (see Tg Jerus Nu 25 19). Many of the proper names in the book are obviously but trans-
135 BC (and probably below 105 BC; see I, 5). I Macc covers a period of at least 40 years, while 2 Macc gives the history of only 18 years (176–161 BC). The history of this period is thus divided: (a) 3:1–4:6; Treason of Simón ben Judá; (b) 5:1–7:42; I Macc 10–64, with special reference to the Second Temple, its circumstances and additions. Addition of the Antiochus Epiphanes (175 BC); the Heiligenkreuz festival of some Jews (the so-called Eleazar and the seven brothers and their mother (this last not in 1 Macc)); (c) chs 8–15 (end) 1 Macc 3–7, with significant notice in the Hasmonean revolt and death of the latter; but it is strange that the history of the main hero of the book should be dropped in the middle. Perhaps this abrupt ending is due in part to the later concentration of the events, which is easier for the writer to bring together than to be related to those of the earlier period.

The record of events in 2 Macc ends with the brilliant victory of Simon (Nicanor), followed by the death of his brother, Menelaus, and the latter; but it is strange that the history of the main hero of the book should be dropped in the middle. Perhaps this abrupt ending is due in part to the later concentration of the events, which is easier for the writer to bring together than to be related to those of the earlier period.

In its present form 2 Macc is based ostensibly on two kinds of written sources.

1. In 2:19–23 the writer of 3:1 to 4: Sources there is which constitutes the book proper, says that his own work is but an epitome, clearly, artistically and attractively set out, of a larger history by one Jason of Cyrene. Modern commentators understand this statement literally, and endeavor to distinguish between the parts due to Jason and those due to the epitomizer. Some think they see endings of the 5 books reflected in the summaries at 3:40; 7:42; 10:9; 13:26; 15:37. But W. K. Kosters gives cogent reasons for concluding that the reference to Jason is but a literary device to secure for his own composition the respect accorded in ancient, as in a lesser degree in modern, times to tradition. The so-called “epitomizer” is in that case alone responsible for the history he gives. The present writer has no hesitation in accepting these conclusions. We read nowhere else of a historian called “Jason,” or of such a large history as his must have been if it extended to 5 books dealing with the events of 15 years, though it is a well-known fact that the book hardly have escaped notice. Hitzig (Gesch. des Volkes Israels, II, 415) held that Jason or his supposed epitomizer made use of 1 Macc, altering, adding and subtracting to suit his purpose. But this would mean that the author of the book was not a writer who could hardly have escaped notice. Hitzig’s supposition quite untenable. A careful examination of 2 Macc has led Grimm, Schürer, Zeuck, Windisch, Christ, Conybeare and others to the conclusion that the author depended wholly upon oral tradition. This gives the best clue to the anachronisms, inconsistencies and loose phrasing which characterize the book. According to 1 Macc 3:25–33, the first campaign of Lysias into Judaea took place in 165 BC, the year before the death of Antiochus IV; but 2 Macc 11 tells us that it occurred in 163 BC, i.e. subsequent to the death of Antiochus IV. Moreover, in the latter passage this 1st expedition of Lysias is connected with the granting of freedom to the Jews, which is really an incident of the 2nd expedition, and in 13:1–24 is rightly mentioned in the account of the 2nd expedition. The writer of 2 Macc, relying upon memory, evidently mixes up the stories of two different expeditions. Signs of the 3:3 tributes under Judas, which are represented in 1 Macc 5:1–68 as taking place in quick succession, belong, according to 2 Macc 8:30; 10:15–38; 12:2–45, to separate dates and different sets of circumstances. The statements in 2 Macc are obscure and confused, those in 1 Macc 5 clear and straightforward. Though in 2 Macc 10:37 we read of the death of Timothaeus, yet in 12:2 ff he appears as a leader in other campaigns. There again the writer's memory plays him false as he recalls various accounts of the Hasmonean Judas, who was Mattathias who gathered together the Jews and organized them for resistance against Syria, if we follow 1 Macc 2:1–70; but 2 Macc 8:1–7 ascribes this rôle to his son Judas. The purification of the temple (the “boasting”) is subsequent to the profanation, according to 1 Macc 1:54; 4:82, but only 2 years, according to 2 Macc 10:3.

(2) The two letters sent from Palestinian to Egypt Jews (1:1–2:18) form no integral part of the original 2 Macc. They are clearly forgeries, and not written in the period of the book. The second letter, much the longer, gives an account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, which is irreconcilable with that in 9:1–25 and also with that in 1 Macc 6:1–18. Nehemiah’s work was to repair the gates and walls (Neh 3:1–32; 6:1; 7:1; Sir 49:2). The writer of this letter tells us that at the time of the exile, Jeremiah concealed in a cave on Mt. Pisgah the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant and the altar of incense, a statement which no one accepts as correct or even plausible. That the author of the rest of the book is not the composer of the letters is proved by the difference of style and the contradictions in subject-matter. But that he himself prefixed them is made probable by the connecting particle in the Gr 504 (Herodotus, Polybius, Kosters) think rather plausibly that the letters were added by a later hand, the connection in the Gr being also introduced by him and not by the author of the rest of the book. It has been maintained that we have here an analogy in the case of the Sadducees, to which party the reigning dynasty (the Hasmonean) belonged. The writer of 2 Macc is evidently a Pharisee and his aim is not historical but doctrinal; i.e. the book is a historical romance with a purpose, that purpose being to make prominent the outstanding tenets of the Pharisees (see II, 6). Two extreme opinions have been defended as to the historical value of 2 Macc: (1) That 2 Macc is a strictly historical work, is more trustworthy than 1 Macc and is to be followed when the two books differ; so the bulk of Roman Catholics and also Niese and Schlatter. The supernatural-ism of the book is to Romanists a recommendation. (2) That 2 Macc has virtually no historical value, since it was written for other than historical purposes. But the bulk of Protestant critics of recent times occupy a position midway between these two opposite opinions, viz. that 1 Macc is much more accurate than 2 Macc and is to be preferred when the 2 books of Macc differ or contradict each other; so Grimm.
Reus, Schürer, Kamphausen. On the other hand, when 2 Macc contains historical matter absent from 1 Macc it is to be accepted as correct unless opposed by other evidence. 

In chapters 3-5 we have details concerning the Maccabean revolt not found in 1 Macc, and in treatment of episodes or incidents with which 1 Macc deals it is often fuller and more specific, as in 10:14-22, 15:7-9 (cf. Mace ii.1-5; 12:17-23); 10:24-38 (cf. 1 Macc 5:29-44); 15:32-45 (cf. 1 Macc 5:65,66:63f). On the other hand, the account of the celestial appearances in 3:24ff; 11:8, etc., and the description in 6:18ff of the martyrdom of the seven brethren and of their mother, carry on their face the marks of their legendary and unhistorical character. The edifying remarks scattered throughout the book, many of them pragmatic and reminding one of the Book of Dn, confirm the impression otherwise suggested, that the author's aim was didactic and not historical. The book as it stands is a real authority for the ideas prevalent in the writer's circle at the time of its composition.

In general it may be said that the doctrines taught in 2 Macc are those of the Pharisees of the day.

6. Teaching of the book

Several scholars consider 2 Macc the answer of Pharisaism to the Sadduceism of 1 Macc (see Wellhausen, Die Philister, xxiii.25; Kamphausen: "Phantasium" 7, f.; Geiger, "Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel," 219 ff). But there is evidence enough (see II, 4) that the author of 2 Macc had not seen 1 Macc. Yet it is equally clear that 2 Macc does owe much to the doctrine of Pharisaism, and it was probably written on that account.

1. The strictest observance of the law is enforced. The violation of the sanctity of the Sabbath, for instance, is regarded as a crime, whether committed under special circumstances in 1 Macc (2:30-48) is absolutely forbidden in 2 Macc (6:11, 8:26ff; 12:38); cf. the words of the Pharisees to Petronius when the latter proposed to have a statue of the emperor Caius erected in the temple: "We will die rather than transgress the law." (Jos. Ant., XVIII, viii, 3).

2. The Pharisaic party took but little interest in political affairs, and supported the Hasmoneans only because and in so far as they fought for the right to ordain their own priests, though, on the other hand, they compromised with Hellenism, the Pharisees turned against them and their allies the Sadducees. In this book we miss the unstinted praise accorded the Hasmonean leaders in 1 Macc, and it is silent as to the genealogy of the Hasmoneans, the death of Judas Maccabaeus and the family grave at Modin.

3. The book reveals thus early the antagonism between the Pharisees and the priestly party, which is so evident in the Gospels. The high-priesthood had through political circumstances become the property of the Maccabees, though they were not of the Aaronic family, or even of the tribe of Levi. The priestly circle became the aristocratic, broad-church party, willing to come to terms with Greek thought and life. Hence in 2 Macc, Jason and Menelaus are fit representatives of the priesthood. In the list of martyrs (chs 5ff) no priest appears, but on the other hand, Eleazar, one of the principal scribes—scribes and Pharisees were then as in NT times virtually one party—suffered for his loyalty to the national religion, "leaving his death for an example." (6:18-31).

4. The temple occupies a high and honorable place in 2 Macc, as in the mind of the orthodox party (see 2:19; 3:2; 5:15; 9:16; 13:23; 14:31). Great stress is laid on the importance of the feasts (6:6; 10:8, etc.), of sacrifice (10:3), of circumcision (6:10), of the laws of diet (6:18; 11:31). The author seems in particular anxious to recommend to his readers (Ez 12:14-16) the observance of the new festivals instituted to commemorate the purification of the temple by its pollution by the Syrians and also the victory over Nicanor. According to this book the Hanukkah feast was established immediately after the death of Judas (10:6ff), not before this event (1 Macc 4:56), probably to give it additional importance. The book closes with the defeat and death of Nicanor and the founding of the Nicanor Day festival, without mentioning the death of Judas, as though the writer's aim was to give prominence to the new festivals.

5. This book shows a Jewish particularism which agrees well with Pharisaism and Scribism, but is opposed to the broader sentiments of the ruling party: Israel is God's people (1:26); His portion (14:15); He often intervenes miraculously on behalf of Israel and the religion of Israel (3:24-30; 10:29f; 11:6-8); even the calamities of the nation are proofs of Divine love because designed for the nation's good (8:18); but the sufferings inflicted upon the heathen are penal and show the Divine displeasure (4:38; 5:9; 13:8; 15:32ff). The writer is deadly opposed to the introduction of Gr customs and in particular to the observance of the Jewish festivals (4:7; 11:24). The Book of Jub., also written by a zealous Pharisee, takes up the same hostile attitude toward foreign customs (see 3:31; 7:20, and the note by R. H. Charles [Book of Jub] on the former).

6. This book also testifies to the influence of the doctrine of a resurrection and of a future life about which 1 Macc, a document of the Sadducee party, is silent (cf. 1, 5 above; see 7:9.11.14.36; 12:43-45; 14:46 [cf. IV, 4, below]). The Sadducees, to which the Hasmoneans belonged, denied a resurrection, limiting their conception of religion to the present life, in this agreeing with the teaching of the Heb Scriptures down to the time of the exile (356 BC). But the Pharisees and scribes, though professing to rest their beliefs on the "Law of Moses," departed from that law in this matter (see Warburton, The Divine Legation of Moses). The resurrection is to be a bodily one (7:11.22ff; 14:46) and to a life that is unending (7:9.36). The following related beliefs are supported in this work: (a) the expectation of the resurrection of the dead; (b) the power exercised by the intercession of saints (15:12-14); (c) the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; (d) the atoning character of the martyrdom of the righteous (7:36.38; cf. 4 Macc 17:22; see IV, 4, [3], below).

7. The angeloology of 2 Macc forms a prominent feature of the book (see 3:24-30; 10:29f; 11:6-8). The Sadducees accepted the authority of the Pent., though they rejected tradition. They were therefore inconsistent in allowing no place for angelic beings in their creed, though consistent in rejecting the doctrine of a future life.

8. The comparative silence of this book on the question of the Messianic hope is strikingly in contrast with the prominence of the subject in Ps Sol (17:23ff, etc.; see Ryle and James, Psalms of Solomon, ii.11) and other contemporary writings emanating from the Pharisees. But why should the author of 2 Macc be expected to give equal prominence to all his opinions in one tract? Some such hope as that connected with the Messiah does, however, seem to be implied in 2:27; 2:18; 7:33; 14:15.

The present writer holds that one man is responsible for 2 Macc in its present form and that the
only written source was the 2 letters with which the book opens (1.1—2.18) (see II, 4, above). Even if we have to assume an original in 5 books of which the book and the letters have it, but is an epitome, it is not possible to distinguish between the sentiments of "Jason" and his epitomizer. The author — who was evidently an Egypt, probably an Alexandrian Jew, who nevertheless retained his loyalty to the Jesus temple and its constitutions and desired to prevent the alienation of his fellow-countrymen from the same supreme and its feasts, esp. the two new feasts, Hanukkah (Dedication) and Nicanor Day. The Jews of Egypt had a temple of their own, in opposition to the teaching of the Jewish law (D and P; cf. Dt 12.2—18 and Lev 17.1—9; 19.30), and it was perhaps the growing influence of this temple that prompted the author to compose this book which sets much on account upon the Jesus temple and its observances. The character of the Gr (see II, 9, below), the insertion of Psalms and also the deep interest in Egypt which this book reveals—these and other considerations give the conclusion that the author lived and wrote in Egypt. There is no evidence that Judas Macabaeus (Leon Allatus), or the author of Sir (Hasse) or Philo the Jew (Honorius d'Autun) or Jos wrote the book, that its source is not different to each of the persons named.

The book must have been written sufficiently long after 161 BC, the year with which the record closes, to allow mythical tales of the many famous heroes of Antiochus and the history of the supernatural appearances in 3.24—30, etc., to arise. If we allow 30 years, or the lifetime of a generation, we come down to say 130 BC as a terminus a quo. There is probably in 15.38 a reference to the Book of Enoch (so Conybeare and Wellhausen, JGG 4, 502 f) which would bring the terminus a quo down to about 100 BC.

That 2 Macc was written subsequently to 1 Macc (i.e. after 80 BC) is made certain by the fact that the Jews now pay tribute to Rome (3.10.36).

Since Philo, who died about 40 AD, refers to 4.8—7.42 (Quod omnis probat liber, Works, ed Mangey, II, 459), the book must have been composed before 40 AD. This is confirmed by the certainty that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (70 AD), for the city still exists and the temple services are in full operation (3.6.6f, etc.). He 11.35 is no doubt an echo of 6.18-7.42 and shows that the unknown author of He had 2 Macc before him. The teaching of the book represents the views of the Pharisees about the middle of the last cent. BC. A date about 40 BC would agree with all the evidence.

That the original language was Gr is made exceedingly likely by the easy flow of the style and the almost entire absence of Hebrewism (yet see 3.15: 9.5: 14.24). No scholar of any standing has pleaded for a Heb original of the works; Bertholdi however, argued that the two letters (1.1—2.18) were composed in Heb (or Aram [or Aramaic]). Ewald held that the 2nd letter (1.11—2.18) is from the Heb, and Schlinkens that this applies to the 1st only. But the evidence given by these scholars is such that the Heb is certainly more Hebraic in style than the 2d, the contrary of what Ewald said.

As to the texts and versions, see I, 9, above, where the statements apply here with but slight qualifications.

10. Text

The book is in Greek, with occasional remains in Heb. As to the texts and versions, see I, 9, above, and the notes following.

11. Literature.

In addition to the lit. mentioned under Apocrypha and I above, and in the course of the present art., note the following items: Comm. of Moffatt (Oxford Mapc, Books of

7. The Author

The name 3 Macc, though occurring in the oldest MSS and its MSS, is quite unsuitable, because the book refers to events which antedate the Macedonian age by about half a cent. and also to events in which the Maccabees took no part. But this book tells of sufferings and triumphs on the part of loyal Jews comparable to those of the Maccabees; perhaps the book was generalized so as to denote all who suffered for their faith. Some hold that the book was written originally as a kind of introduction to the Books of Macc, which it precedes as Book I in Cotton's Five Books of Maccabees. But other scholars do not agree with this view. Perhaps the title is due to a mistake on the part of a copyist.

The book has never been reckoned as canonical by the Western church, as is shown by the fact that it was not admitted into the Vulg.

9. Original Language

The contents of the Books of Maccabees refer to events which took place at Jerusalem and Alexandria, the Jews were persecuted in various ways delivered.

(1) 1.1—2.24: After conquering at Raphia Antiochus III, the great king of Syria, (2): 217 BC, and 2 Macc. Philopater, king of Egypt (221—204 BC), resolved to visit Jerusalem and to enter the sanctuary ("holy of holies," ἡ ἱερά, ἡ ἱερα) of the temple, and to destroy the laws, and to command that all the priestly priest, who could not be driven to Bacchus, should be defiled of all their rights as citizens.

(2) 2.25—30: Returned to Alexandria, Ptolemy is exasperated at the failure of his long-cherished project and resolves to wreak his vengeance upon the Jews of Egypt. He issues a decree that all who refused to bend the knee to Bacchus should be deprived of all their rights as citizens.

(3) 3.23—4.21: A goodly number of Alexandrian Jews refuse to obey the royal mandate, whereas Ptolemy issues an edict that all the Jews should be destroyed at once, and the women and children, shall be brought in chains to Alexandria and confined in the race-course (hippodrome), with a view to their wholesale massacre. Prior to the massacre there is to be a complete register taken of the names of the assembled Jews, and then the writing materials give way and the huge slaughter is averted.

(4) 4.32—6.31: The king, still thirsting for the blood of this people, hits upon a different method of compassing their ruin. Five hundred elephants are intoxicated with wine and incense and let loose upon the Jews in the race-course. Here we have the principal plot of the book, and we reach the climax of the present text in the present art., note the following items: Comm. of Moffatt (Oxford Mapc, Books of
execution of the king’s purpose. The lesson of it all seems to be deliver those who put their trust in Him.

21 Macc. 7:23: At length the king undergoes a change of heart. He releases the Jews and restores them to all their lost rights and honor. In response to their request, he gives them permission to stay with their brother-Jews who, in the hour of trial, had given up their faith. They put to death 500, “economizing the destruction of the wise a season of 7.”

3 Macc is made up of a number of incredible tales, the details of which are absurd and contradictory. The beginning of the book has evidently been lost, as appears from the opening words, “Now when Philopator” (σὲ ἀνὴρ καὶ κομψάτην, ὡς ἐπηλεπτα), and also from the references to an early part of the narrative now lost, e.g.: 1 1 (from those who came back); 1 2 (“the plot afore mentioned”); 2 25 (“the aforementioned companions”).

The book contains very little that is true history, notwithstanding what Israel Abrahams (see “Literature” to this section), depending largely on Mahaffy (The Empire of the Ptolemies), says to the contrary. It is much more manifest than even in the case of 2 Macc that the writer’s aim was to convey certain impressions and not to write history (see III, 5).

Thus, Philo, Raphia, the book is innumerable stories (see Bussell, The Apoc of the OT, 616 f), and it is evident that we have to do here with a combination of legends and fables worked up in feebie fashion with a view to making prominent certain ideas which the writer has in his mind and which he wishes to keep in mind. Yet behind the fiction of the book there are certain facts which prompted much of what the writer says.

(1) That Ptolemy IV bore the character of cruelty and capriciousness and effeminacy is borne out by Polybius (204-121 BC) in his History and by Plutarch in his Life of Cleomenes.

(2) The brief outline of the war between Ptolemy IV and Antiochus III, the latter being conquered at Raphia (ch 1 f), agrees in a general way with what has been written by Polybius, Livy and Justin.

(3) In this book, by the command of Ptolemy, 500 intoxicated elephants are let loose upon the Jews brought bound to the race-course of Alexandria. Jos (Cap, II, v) tells us that Ptolemy VII Physcon, king of Egypt, 145-117 BC, had the Jews of Alexandria, men, women and children, brought bound and naked to an inclosed space and that he had let loose on them a herd of elephants, which, however, turned instead upon his own men, killing a large number of them. The cause of the king’s anger was that Jewish residents of Alexandria sided with his foes. In 3 Macc the cause of the action of Ptolemy IV was the failure of his project to enter the sanctuary of the Jerus temple; this last perhaps a reflection of 2 Macc 3 9 ff, where it is related that Helleidorus was hindered from entering the temple by a ghostly apparition. Now these two incidents, in both of which Jews are attacked by intoxicated elephants, must rest upon a common tradition and have probably a nucleus of fact. Perhaps, as Israel Abrahams holds, the tradition arose from the action of the elephants of Ptolemy in the Battle of Raphia. Most writers think that the reference is to something that occurred in the reign of Ptolemy VII.

(4) The shutting up of the temple in the race-course at Alexandria was not improbable suggested by a similar incident in which Herod the Great was the principal agent.

(5) In the opinion of Grimm (Comm., 216) we have in the two festivals (6 30; 7 19) and in the existence of the synagogue at Ptolemais an indication of some great deliverance vouchsafed to the Jews.

3 Macc was probably written by an Alexandrian Jew at a time when the Jews in and around Alex-

andria were sorely persecuted on account of their religion. The purpose of the author seems to have been to comfort and encourage them out of the hands of their enemies. Note further the following points: (1) The book, unlike 2 Macc, is silent as to a bodily resurrection and a future life, though this may be due to pure accident. Hades (Ἅδης, ᾠδής) in 4 8; 5 42; 6 31, etc., appears to stand only for death, regarded as the end of all human beings. (2) Yet the belief in angelic beings is clearly implied (see 6 18 f). (3) The author has much confidence in the power of prayer (see 2 10; 21 21-24; 5 6-10.13.50 f; 6 1-15, etc). (4) The book lays stress upon the doctrine that God is on the side of His people (4 21, etc.), and even though they transgress His commandments He will forgive and save them (2 13; 4 13, etc.)

From the character of the Or, the interest shown in Alexandrian Judaism, and the acquaintance displayed with Egyptian affairs (see i. Abrah., Philo.), it is inferred with confidence that the author was a Jew residing in Alexandria.

Date. The superior limit (terminus a quo) for the date is some time in the first cent. BC. Since the existence of the Quellen (see Dn 6 6), the inferior limit (terminus ad quem) is some time before 70 AD. If the temple had been destroyed, the continuance of the temple services could not have been implied (see 1 8 ff). As the book seems written to comfort and encourage Alexandrian Jews at a time when they were persecuted, Ewald, Haurath, Reuss and others thought it was written during the reign of the emperor Caligula (37-41 AD), when such a persecution took place. But if Ptolemy did not write Caligula, it is strange, as Schürer (GGV*, III, 491) remarks, that the writer does not make Ptolemy claim Divine honors, a claim actually made by Caligula.

Though Jos (d. 95 AD) could not have known the book, since his version of the same incidents differs so much, yet it must have been written some 30 years before his death, i.e. before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 71 AD.

That 3 Macc was composed by the Gr is the opinion of all scholars and is proved by the free, idiomatic and rather bombastic character of the language in the later parts.

7. Original Language

(1) Greek.—This book occurs in the two uncials A and V (not in B or G), in most cur- susives and also in nearly all Ms. of the LXX.

(2) Syriac.—The Syr V (Pesh) reproduced in the Paris and London Polyglot and by Lagarde, Lib. Apoc. Vet. Text. It is not a good tr.

8. Text and Versions

(3) Latin.—The earliest Lat tr is that made for the Complutensian Polyglot by the author, The Apoc, Gr and Eng.

IV. Maccabees.—4 Macc is a philosophical treatise or discourse on the supremacy of pious reason (= religious prudence) and the virtuous man. The oldest title of the book, 4 Macc (Maccabæus δ, Makabæus, δ, [4]), occurs in the earliest extant MSS of the LXX
(5, A, V, etc.), in the list of the Cod. Claromontanus (3rd cent.?), the Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books (5th cent.) and the Synopsis of Athanasius (9th cent.). It obtained this name from the fact that it contains and enforces its thesis in examples from the history of the Maccabees. Some early Christian writers, believing 4 Macc to be the work of Jos (see IV, 3), gave it a corresponding title. Eusebius and Jerome, who ascribe the book to Jos, speak of it under the name of: A Discourse concerning the Supreme Power of Reason.

Though absent from the Vulg., and therefore from the Romanist Canon and from Protestant VSS of its Apoc., 4 Macc occurs in the principal MSS (N, A, V, etc.) and editions (Fritzsche, Swete, not Tischendorf) of the LXX, showing it was highly esteemed and perhaps considered canonical by at least some early Christian Fathers.

This book is a philosophical disquisition in the form of a sermon on the question: 'Is there an absolute master of the passions?' (1.1).

2. Canon- fity (Fritzsche, Swete, not Tischendorf) of the LXX, showing it was highly esteemed and perhaps considered canonical by at least some early Christian Fathers.

3. Contents (2) 13—18. He defines his terms and endeavors from general principles to show that pious reason does of ultimate. (3) 19 to end of book: He tries to prove the same proposition from the lives of the Maccabean martyrs. The books of the OT are based on 2 Macc 6:1—7 42 (cf 3 Macc 6):

Because the book is written as a discourse or sermon and is largely addressed to an apparent audience (1: 17; 2: 14; 13: 10; 15: 4). Frendialent and others think we have here an example of a Jewish sermon delivered as here written. But Jewish preachers based their discourses on Scripture texts and their sermons were more concise and arresting than this book.

The author’s philosophical standpoint is that of Stoicism, viz. that in the virtuous man reason dominates his passion. His doctrine of four cardinal virtues (σωφροσύνη, ψυχική, δικαιοσύνη, ἀρετή, andrews, αὐθεντική, προφητεία, “Providenc,” “Justice,” “Fortitude,” “Temperance” (1: 18)), is also derived from Stoicism. Though, however, he sets out as if he were a true Stoic, he proceeds to work out a doctrine in excess of Jewish fashion.

But dominating reason is that which is guided by the Divinely revealed law, that law for the faithful observing of which the martyrs died. The four cardinal virtues are but forms of that true wisdom which is to be obtained through the Maccabean literature (15: 18). Moreover, the passions are not, as Stoicism taught, to be annihilated, but regulated (1: 61; 3: 5), since God has planted them (2: 21).

The author’s view is a modification of that of the Apocalyptic. (1) He evisits the self-sacrificing devotion to the law exhibited by the Maccabean martyrs mentioned in 3: 9 to the end of the book. (2) He believes in a resurrection from the dead. The souls of the righteous will shortly hereafter ceaseless fellowship with God (9: 8—15: 5), and the wicked will endure the torment of fire forever and ever (10: 11: 15, 12: 12, 13: 14). Nothing, however, is said of the Pharisees’ doctrine of a bodily resurrection which is to be obtained through the Maccabean literature (II, 6, above). Clearly teaches. (3) The martyrdom of the faithful attone for the sins of the people (6: 24—17: 19—21; cf Rom 3: 25).

According to Eusebius (HE, III, 6), Jerome (De Viris Illust., xiii; C Peleg, ii,0), Suidas (Lat., 395 A.D.), and Photius, the author of this book is Jos, the Jos is the author of this book, and in Gr edd of his work it constitutes the last chapter with the heading: Φιλάβ. Ἰσαίας ταῦτα ἐπανάγγελε Πρωτοθάνατος Μακκαβαίων λόγος, ἐπὶ τουτέστωτα λογισμοῦ, "The Discourse of Flavius Josephus: or concerning the Supreme Power of Reason" (so Nicee, Belker, Dindorf, etc.). But this tradition is negatized by the style and thought, which differ completely from those found in the genuine writings of that Jewish historian. Besides this, the author of the book makes large use of 2 Macc, of which Jos was ignorant. Moreover, there are traditions equally ancient of a contrary kind.

The author must have been a Jew and he probably belonged to the Pharisee party (see IV, 7). He was also a Hellenist, for he reveals the influence of Gr thought more than any other apocryphal writer. He was also, it would appear, a resident of Alexandria, for the earliest notice of it occurs in literature written in an Alexandrian style, and the author makes considerable use of 2 Macc, which emanated from Alexandria.

It is impossible definitely to fix the date of the book. But it was certainly written before the destruction of the temple in 70 AD and after the composition of 2 Macc, on which it largely depends. A date in the first half of the 1st cent. of our era would suit all the requirements of the case.

The book was certainly written in Gr, as all scholars agree. It employs many of the expressions in the genuine language of the 5th cent. (Greek) of the Gr spoken and written at Alexandria in the 3d cent. It is concise and contains a very general characteristics.

6. Original Language. Greek is the language of the 5th cent. of our era. It is concise, coherent, and it bears the general characteristics of the Gr language of the 5th cent. of our era. It is written in the 5th cent. of our era.

7. Text and Versions. The text is printed in the Old Lat. VSS and it has come down to us in a number of MSS.

1. Name. The designation Macc was first given to the book now commonly so called by Cotton (The Five Books of Macc in Eng., 1852), and it has been perpetuated by Dr. Samuel Davidson (Intro to the OT, III, 465); Ginsburg (Kitto’s Cyc. of Bib. Lit.); Piggott (A History of the OT, p. 370), etc. It has been called the Arab, 2 Macc (so in the Paris and London Polyglot), and the Arab. Macc. The 5th book of the Translato Syra Peschito, edited by Ceriani, is really nothing more than a Syr Vs of the 6th book of Jos, The Wars of the Jews.

2. Canon- of the 6th century as canonical by either Jews or Christians.

This book has never been recognized as canonical by either Jews or Christians.

The book is ostensibly a history of the Jews from the time of Hellenization to 150 B.C., or about 50 B.C. It is really nothing more than a clumsy compilation, from 1 and 2 Macc, the ’Apokalupse, the Rabbis, the Targum, and other early sources. But it is the only original part, and this text with errors of various kinds, a note at the end of the book (calling it "The Second Book of Macc according to the Text of the Hebrews", 19) closes with the events narrated at the end of 1 Macc (7: 59, 62) follows Jos (1: 12, 13) closely. Perhaps the original
work ended with ch 19. Ginsburg (op. cit., III, 17). Bisset (loc. cit., and Wellhausen, Der text (Josephus) give useful tables showing the dependence of the various parts of 5 Macce on the sources used.

In so far as this book repeats the contents of 1 and 2 Macce and Jos, it has the historical value of the former, but itself has no historical worth.


The original work was almost certainly composed in Heb, though we have no trace of a Heb text (so Ginsburg, op. cit., and Bisset). This conclusion is supported by the numerous Hebraisms which show themselves even in a double tr. The Pentateuch is called the "Torah," the Heb Scriptures are spoken of as "the twenty-four books," the temple is "the house of God" or "the holy house," Judah is "the land of the holy house" and Jerus is "the city of the holy house." These and like examples make it probable that the writer was a Jew and that the language he used was Heb. Zunz (Die geistlichen Vorzeichen, 1832, 146 ff.), Graetz (Geschichte, Vol. V, 281) and Dr. S. Davidson (op. cit., 465) say the book was written in Arab. from Heb memoirs. According to Zunz (loc. cit.) and Graetz (loc. cit.) the Jewish history of Joseph ben Gorion (Josippon), the "pseudo-Josephus" (1oth cent.), is but a Heb recension of 5 Macce (the Arab. 2 Macce). On the contrary, Wellhausen (op. cit.) and Schürer (GJV, I, 159 f.) maintain that the shorter narrative in 5 Macce represents the extent of the original composition far more correctly than the Heb history of Josippon (which ranges from Adam to 70 AD), and than other recensions of the same history.

The book was compiled for the purpose of consoling the Jews in their sufferings and encouraging them to be steadfast in their devotion.

6. Aim and Teaching. The same end was contemplated in 2, 3 and 4 Macce and in a lesser degree in 1 Macce, but the author or compiler of the present treatise wished to produce a work which would appeal in the first instance and chiefly to Heb (or Arab?) readers. The author believes in a resurrection of the body, in a future life and a final judgment (6:13.43 f.). The righteous will dwell in future glory, the wicked will be hereafter punished (5:49.50 f.; 59:14).

We have no means of ascertaining who the author was, but he must have been a Jew and he lived some time after the destruction of the temple in 70 AD (see 9:5; 21:30; 22:9; 53:8), though Ginsburg regards these verses as late additions and fixes the date of the original work at about 6 BC, when the history ends. The author makes large use of Jos (d. 95 AD), which also favors the lower date.

The Arabic text of the book and a Lat. tr. by Gabriel Silosita is printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. No other ancient text has come down to us. Out (op. cit., xxv) says in saying that there is a Syr VS of the book.

LITERATURE.—The most important lit. has been mentioned in the course of the art. The Eng. and earlier Ger. ed. of Schürer, GJV, do not help. The only Eng. tr. is that by Cotton made directly from the Lat. of Griesbach, who says that a Fr. VS appears as an appendix in the Bible of de Sacy; not, however, in the writer.

T. W. TITTEN DAVIES

MACEDONIA, mas-e-don-ia (Makedonía, Make- donia, etsic Macedon, Macedon):
uniting throughout his reign of 23 years to gain that object. He welded the Macedonian tribes into a single nation, won by 1. Philip force and fraud the important position of Amphipolis, Pydna, Potidaea, and Alexandronus, Abdora and Macedonia secured a plentiful supply of gold by found Philip on the site of Creuses. Gradually extending his rule over barbarians and Greeks alike, he finally won, by order of his diademated wife Olympias (236 BC), whose son, Alexander the Great, succeeded to the throne. After securing his hold on Thrace, Illyria and Greece, Alexander turned eastward and, in a series of brilliant campaigns, overthrew the Persian empire. The battle of the Granicus (334 BC) was followed by the submission or subjugation of most of Asia Minor. By the battle of Issus (333), in which Darius himself was defeated, Alexander's way was opened to Phoenicia and Egypt; Darius' second defeat, at Arbela (331), sealed the fate of the Persian power. Babylon, Susa, Persepolis and Ecbatana were taken in turn, and Alexander then pressed eastward through Hyrcania, Aris, Arachosia, Bactria and Sogdiana to India, which he conquered as far as the Hyphasis (327); thence he returned through Gedrosia, Carmania and Persia to Babylon, to make preparations for the conquest of Arabia. A sketch of his career is given in 1 Macc 1:1-7, where he is spoken of as "Alexander the Macedonian, the son of Philip, who came out of the land of Chittim" (ver 1): his invasion of Persia is also referred to in 1 Macc 6:2, where he is described as "the Macedonian king, who reigned first among the Greeks," i.e., the first who united in a single empire all the Greek states, except those which lay to the W. of the Adriatic. It is the conception of the Macedonian power as the deadly foe of Persia which is responsible for the description of Haman in Ad Est 16:10 as a Macedonian, "an alien in truth from the Persians" (337). And for the attribution of him to a plot to transfer the Persians empire to the Macedonians (ver 14), and this same thought appears in the LXX rendering of the Heb Agagite (1 Sam 15:30, 31; 1 Macc 24:20 as Macedonian (Makedon)). Alexander died in June 323 BC, and his empire fell a prey to the rivalries of his chief generals (1 Macc 1:9); after a period of struggle 2. Roman and chaos, three powerful kingdoms Intervention were formed, taking their names from Macedonia, Syria, and Egypt. Even in Syria, however, Macedonian influence remained strong, and we find Macedonian troops in the service of the Seleucid monarchs (2 Macc 8:20). In 215 King Philip V, son of Demetrius II and successor of Antigonus Doson (229-200 BC), formed an alliance with Hannibal, who had defeated the Roman forces at Lake Trasimeine (217) and at Cannae (216), and set about trying to recover Illyria. After some years of desultory and indecisive warfare, peace was concluded in 205, Philip binding himself to a ransom from attacking the Roman possessions on the E. of the Adriatic. The Second Macedonian War, caused by a combined attack of Antiochus III of Syria and Philip of Macedon on Egypt, broke out in 200, and ended 3 years later in the crushing defeat of Philip's army by T. Quinctius Flamininus at Cynoscephalae in Thessaly (of 1 Macc 8:5). By the treaty which followed this battle, Philip surrendered his conquests in Greece, Illyria, Thrace, Asia Minor and the Aegean, gave up his fleet, reduced his army to 5,000 men, and undertook to declare no war and conclude no alliance without Roman consent.

In 179 Philip was succeeded by his son Perseus, who at once renewed the Roman alliance, but set to work to consolidate and extend it. But 172 3. Roman was war again broke out, and after several Roman Conquest reverses the consular forces under T. Quinctius Casmus decisively defeated the Macedonians at Pydna in 168 BC (Macc 3:5, where Perseus is called "king of Chittim"). The Roman Republic in the 172 was abolished and Perseus was banished to Italy. The Macedonians were democratic; their land was divided into four regions, with their capitals at Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella and Pologena respectively, and each of them had a council; commerce and cornuabium were forbidden between them and subjugation of gold. A tribute was to be paid annually to the Roman treasury, amounting to half the land tax hitherto exacted by the Macedonian kings. But this compromise between freedom and subjectship could not be of long duration, and in the end, 167, Andronicus, the pseudo-Philip, was defeated (148 BC). M. was constituted a Roman province, and enlarged by the addition of parts of Illyria, Epirus, the Ionian islands and Thessaly. Each year a governor was dispatched from Rome with supreme military and civil powers; the partition fell into abeyance and communications was improved by the construction of the Via Egnatia from Dyrrhachium to Thessalonica, whence it was afterward continued eastward to the Euphrates.

In 146 the Achaean, who had declared war on Rome, was crushed by Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius at Corinth, and Corinth was destroyed and burned, and the Achaean league was dissolved, and Greece, under the name of Achaia, was made a province and placed under the control of the governor of M. In 27 BC, when the administration of the Achaean provinces was divided between Augustus and Octavian, M. and Achaia fell to the share of the latter (Strabo, p. 340; Dio Cassius 33.12) and were governed separately by ex-consuls sent out annually with the powers of a pro-consul. In 15 AD, however, senatorial mismanagement had brought the province into a state of ruin, and they were transferred to Tiberius (Tacitus, Annals, 1.93), who united them under the government of a legatus Augusti pro praetore until, in 44 AD, he sold them to the Senate (Suetonius, Claudius 25; Dio Cassius ix.24). It is owing to this close historical and geographical connection that we find M. and Achaia frequently mentioned together in the NT. M. being always placed first (Acts 19:21; Rom 16:20; 2 Cor 10:1; 1 Thess 1:7, 8).

Dioctolion (284-305 AD detached from M. Thessaly and the Illyrian coast lands and formed into two provinces, the latter under the name of Epirus Nova. Toward the end of the 4th c. the c. 480 was taken up into two provinces, Macedonia prima and Macedonia secunda, which were independent when in 395 the Roman world was divided into the western and eastern provinces, M. was included in the latter. During the next few years it was governed by the Goths under Alaric, and later, in the latter half of the 6th c., immense numbers of Slavonic tribes settled there. In 1294 it became a Lat kingdom under Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, who, 20 years later, Theodore, the Gr. despot of Epirus, founded a Gr. empire of Thessalonica. During the 2d half of the 14th c., the greater part of it was part of the Servian dominions, but in 1439 Thessalonica fell before the Ottoman Turks, and from that time down to the year 1913 M. has formed part of the Turkish empire. Its history thus accounts for the very mixed character of its population, which consists chiefly of Turks, Albanians, Greeks and Bulgarians, but has in it a considerable element of Jews, Gypsies, Vlachs, Servians and other races.

III. Paul and Macedonia.—In the narrative of Paul's journeys as given in Acts 13-15-20 in the Pauline Epistles, M. plays a prominent part. The apostle's relations with the churches of Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea will be found discussed under these several headings; here we will merely recount in outline his visits to the province.

On his 2d missionary journey Paul journeyed from Troas, and from there sailed with Silas, Timothy and Luke to Neapolis, the nearest Macedonian seaport, in obedience to the vision of a First Visit Macedonian (whom Ramsay identifies with Luke; see sec. 16) urging him to cross to M. and predict the gospel there.
(Acts 16:9). From Neapolis he journeyed inland to Philippi, which is described as "a city of M., the first of the district" (ver 12). Thence Paul and his two companions (for Luke remained in Philippi for the next 5 years) traveled along the Egnotian road, passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia, to Thessalonica, which, though a "free city," and therefore technically exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman governor, was practically the provincial capital. Driven thence by the hostility of the Jews, the evangelists preached in Berea, where Silas and Timothy remained for a short time after a renewed outbreak of Jewish animosity and from which Paul had left M., for the neighboring province of Achaia (Acts 17:14). Although he sent a message to his companions to join him with all speed at Athens (ver 15), yet so great was his anxiety for the welfare of the newly founded Macedonian churches that he sent Timothy back to Thessalonica almost immediately (1 Thess 3:1,2), and perhaps Silas to some other part of M., nor did they again join him until after he had settled for some time in Corinth (Acts 18:5; 1 Thess 3:6). The rapid extension of the Christian faith in M. at this time may be judged from the phrases used by Paul in his 1st Ep. to the Thess., the earliest of his extant letters, written during this visit to Corinth. He there speaks of the Thessalonian converts as being an example "to all that believe in M. and in Achaia" (1:7), and he commends their love "toward all the brethren that are in all M." (4:10). Still more striking are the words, "From you hath flowed forth the word of the Lord, not only in M., but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth" (1:8).

On his 3rd missionary journey, the apostle paid two further visits to M. During the course of a long stay at Ephesus he laid plans for the future of the churches there, and dispatched two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to M. to prepare for his visit (Acts 19:21,22). Some time later, after the uproar at Ephesus raised by Demetrius and his fellow-silversmiths (vs 23-41), Paul himself set out for M. (20:1). Of this visit Luke gives us a very summary account, telling us merely that Paul, "when he had gone through those parts, and had given them much exhortation, came to M." (Acts 20:2), from 2 Cor. written from M. (probably from Philippi) during the course of this visit, we learn more of the apostle's movements and feelings. While at Ephesus, Paul had changed his plans. His intention at first had been to travel across the Aegean Sea to Corinth, and to pay a visit from there to M. and to return to Corinth, so as to sail direct to Syria (2 Cor 1:15,16). But by the time at which he wrote the 1st Ep. to the Cor, probably near the end of his stay at Ephesus, he had made up his mind to go to Corinth by way of M., as we have seen that he actually did (1 Cor 16:5,6). From 2 Cor 2:13 we learn that he traveled from Ephesus to Troas, where he expected to find Titus. Titus, however, did not yet arrive, and Paul, who "had no relief for his spirit," left Troas and sailed to M. Even here the same restlessness pursued him: "fightings without, fears within" oppressed him, till the presence of Titus brought some relief (2 Cor 7:5,6). The apostle was also chagrined by the neglect of God's word that had been given in the church of M." (8:1); in the midst of severe persecution, they bore their trials with abounding joy, and their deep poverty did not prevent them begging to be allowed to raise a contribution to send to the Christian church in Jerusalem (2 Cor 12:18). The Christian character was, indeed, from the very outset one of the characteristic virtues of the Macedonian churches. The Philippians had sent money to Paul on two occasions during his first visit to Thessalonica (Phil 4:16), and again when he had left M. and was staying at Corinth (ver 9). On the present occasion, however, the Corinthians seem to have taken the lead and to have prepared their bounty in the previous year, on account of which the apostle boasts of them to the Macedonian Christians (2 Cor 9:2). He suggests that on his approaching visit to Achaia he may be accompanied by some of these Macedonians (ver 4), but whether this was actually the case we are not told.

The 3d visit of Paul to M. took place some 3 months later and was occasioned by a plot against his life laid by the Jews of Corinth.

3. Paul's

Third Visit from Cenchreae, the eastern seaport of Corinth, to Syria (2 Cor 1:16; Acts 20:3). He returned to M. accompanied as far as Asia by 3 Macedonian Christians—Sopater, Aristarchus and Secundus—and by 4 from Asia Minor. Probably Paul took the familiar route by the Via Egnotia, and reached Philippi immediately before the days of unleavened bread; his companions preceded him to Troas (vs 4,5). Even while he himself remained at Philippi until after the Passover (Thursday, April 7, 57 AD, according to Ramsay's chronology), when he sailed from Neapolis together with Luke, and joined his friends in Troas (ver 6).

Toward the close of his 1st imprisonment at Rome Paul planned a fresh visit to M. as soon as he should be released (Phil 1:26; 2:24), and even before that he intended to send Later Visits Timothy to visit the churches and doubtless those of Beroea and Thessalonica also. Whether Timothy actually went on this mission we cannot say; that Paul himself went back to M. once more we learn from 1 Tim 1:3, and we may infer a 5th visit from the reference to the apostle's stay at Troas, which in all probability belongs to a later occasion (2 Tim 4:13).

IV. The Macedonian Church.—Of the churches of Macedonia in general, little need be said here. A striking fact is the prominence in them of women, which is probably due to the higher social position held by women in this province than in Asia Minor (Lightfoot, Philippians, 55 ff). We find only two women of the rank of a provincial missionary work; the women proselytes of high social standing take a share in driving him from Pisdian Antioch (Acts 13:50), and Timothy's father is mentioned as a Jewess who believed (16:1). But in M. all is changed. To women the gospel was first preached at Philippi (ver 13); a woman was the first convert and the hostess of the evangelists (vs 14,15); a slave girl was restored to soundness of mind by the apostle (ver 18), and long after Paul mentions two women as having "labored with [him] in the gospel" and as endangering the peace of the church by their rivalry (Phil 4:23). At Thessalonica a considerable number of women of the first rank appear among the earliest converts (Acts 17:4), while at Beroea also the church included from the outset numerous Gr women of high position (ver 12).

The bond uniting Paul and the Macedonian Christians seems to have been a peculiarly close one, with a special intimacy and affection and a Jeu-ness and patience in trial and persecution, their activity in spreading the Christian faith, their love of the brethren—their "supercharacteristics which Paul specially commends in them (1 Cor 1:1; 2 Thess; Phil. 2 Cor 8:1 8), while they also seem
to have been much freer than the churches of Asia Minor from Judaizing tendencies and from the allurements of “philosophy and vain deceit.”

We know the names of a few of the early members of the Macedonian church—Sopater (Acts 20 4) or Sosipater (Rom 16 21): the identification is a probable, though not certain, one of Beroea; Aristarchus (Acts 19 29; 20 4; 27 2; Col 4 10; Phil 4 24), Jason (Acts 17 5–8; Rom 16 21) and Secundus (Acts 20 4) of Thessalonica; Clement (Phil 4 21; Eph 6 21; 2 Tim 4 19). Euodia (Phil 4 2; this, not Euodias [AV], is the true form), Syntyche (ib), Lydia (Acts 16 14.40; a native of Thyatira), and possibly Luke (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 201 ff.) of Philippi. Gaius is also mentioned as a Macedonian in Acts 19 29, but perhaps the reading of a few MSS has been corrected to refer to the TR Maxebo vs, in which case Aristarchus alone would be a Macedonian, and this Gaius would probably be identical with the Gaius of Debre mentioned in Acts 20 4 as a companion of Paul (Ramsay, op. cit., 280). The later history of the Macedonian churches, together with all of their known bishops, will be found in Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, II, 1–2; III, 306 ff; Ewing 104 ff.


M. Ν. Tod

MACAERUS, mac-a'reus (Μακαερος, Machairoros): Not mentioned in Scripture, canonical or apocryphal, but its importance in Jewish history justifies its inclusion here. Pliny (NH, v.16.72) speaks of it as, after Jerus, the strongest of Jewish fasts observed in the west. It was fortified by Alexander Jannaeus (BJ, VII, vii, 2). It was taken and destroyed by Gabinus (ib, I, viii, 5; Ant, XIV, vi, 4). Herod the Great restored it and, building a city here, made it one of his residences (BJ, VII, vii, 1, 2). It lies within the tetrarchy assigned to Antipas at the death of Herod. The wife of Antipas, daughter of Aretas, privately aware of his infidelity, asked to be sent hither (Ant, XVIII, vi, 1). Here Jos has fallen into confusion if he meant by the phrase "a place in the borders of the dominions of Aretas and Herod" that it was still in Herod’s hands, since immediately he tells us that it was "subject to her father." It was natural enough, however, that a border fortress should be held by now one and now by the other. It may have passed to Aretas by some agreement of which we have no record; and Herod, unaware that his wife knew of his guilt, would have no suspicion of her design in wishing to visit her father. If this is true, then the Baptist could not have been imprisoned and beheaded at Machaerus (ib, 2). The feast given is probably held at Tiberias; and there is nothing in the Gospel story to hint that the prisoner was some days’ journey distant (MK 6 14 ff). The citadel was held by a Rom garrison until 66 AD, which then evacuated it to escape a siege (BJ, II, xviii, 6). Later by means of a stratagem it was recovered for the Romans by Bassus, c. 72 AD (BJ, VII, vii, 4). The place is identified with the modern Maqur, a position of great strength on a prominent height between Wady ZebrKa Ma’in and Wady el-Majib, overlooking the Dead. There are extensive ruins. W. Ewing

MACHBANAI, mak-ba’ni, -ba’- '\(\text{םכ}ב\)\(\text{ןא, makbhanay}; AV Machbana\): A Gadite who attached himself to David in Ziklag (1 Ch 12 13).

MACHBENAI, mak-ben’-\(\text{םכ}ב\)\(\text{ןא, makbhe\-}\): Macben (Macben, Machabah), A. Macbap (Macbamat; AV Machbenah): A name which occurs in the genealogical list of Judah (1 Ch 2 49), apparently the name of a place, which may be the same as "Cabbon" (Josh 15 40), probably to be identified with the Kebabah, about 3 miles S. of Beit Jibrin.

MACCH, mā’k (מָכָה, makhi): Pesh and some MSS of LXX read "Macquir": A Gadite, father of Gezel, one of the 12 spies (Nu 13 15).

MACHIR, māk’hir (מָכִיר, makhir; Mach, Machir), MACHRITYE, māk-’hir-\(\text{םל}ו\)\(\text{תא, makhrit}'): (1) the eldest son of Manasseh (Gen 50 23). In Nu 26 29 it is recorded that Machir begat Gilead, but another name is used. In 1 Ch 5 13 it is stated that the children of Machir "went to Gilead, and took it, and dispossessed the Amorites that were therein. And Moses gave Gilead unto Machir the son of Manasseh; and he dwelt therein" (Nu 32 30–40; Josh 17 13, 14; cf. 1 Ch 2 21–25; 7 14–17; Dt 3 15; Josh 31 3). In the song of Deborah, Machir is used as equivalent to Manasseh (Jgs 5 14).

(2) Son of Ammiel, dwelling in Lo-debar (2 S 9 4–5), a wealthy landowner who protected Mephiboseth (Meribbaal), son of Jonathan, until assured of the friendly intentions of David (cf. 1 Ch, VII, ix, 8). Afterward, during the rebellion of Absalom, Machir with others came to David’s assistance at Mahanaim, bringing supplies for the king and his men (2 S 17 27 ff). John A. Lees

MACMASES, mak-m’ase. See MISHMAKH.

MACHNADEBAI, mak-na’dé-bi, mak-na’dé-bi (מַכְנַדְבָּי, makhnadbhay): Son of Bani, one of those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10 40).

MACHPELAH, mak-pê’la (מַכְפֶּלָה, ha-makhpèlah; "the double"; "the double cave"): The name of a piece of ground and of a cave purchased by Abraham for a burialplace. The word is supposed to mean "double" and refers to the condition of the cave. It is "double cave" (הַדָּבָלָה סַפֵּלָה, hî dâbalah safîlah) in the LXX in Gen 23 17. The name is applied to the ground in Gen 23 19; the cave in Gen 23 16; and to the cave in Gen 23 9; 26 5. In Gen 23 17 we have the phrase "the field of Ephron, which was in [the] Machpelah."

The cave belonged to Ephron the Hittite, the son of Zohar, from whom Abraham purchased it for 400 shekels of silver (Gen 23 16–18).

1. Scrip. — It is described as "before," i.e., "to the east, E. of" Mamre (ver 17) which (ver 19) is described as the same as Hebron (see, see, see, see, 25 9; 49 30; 50 13). Where were buried Abraham and Sarah, Isaac, Jacob and Leah. (Of however the curious variant traditions in Acts 7 16, "Shechem" instead of "Hebron.") Jos (BJ, IV, ix, 7) speaks of the monuments (mmemela) of Abraham and his posterity which are shown to this very time in that small city [i.e. in
Hebron; the fabric of which monuments are of the most excellent marble and wrought after the most excellent manner; and in another

2. Tradition place he writes of Isaac being buried Regard the Site where they had a monument belonging to them from their forefathers (Ant, I, xxi, 1). The references of early Christian writers to the site of the tombs of the patriarchs only very doubtfully apply to the present buildings and may possibly refer to Rōmet el-Khǎlit (see Mamre). Thus the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333 AD) mentions a square enclosure built of stones of great beauty in which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were buried with their wives. Antonius Murtýr (c 638) and Arculf (698) also mention this monument. Mukaddası speaks (c 985) of the strong fortress around the tombs of the patriarchs built of great squared stones, the work of Jims, i.e. of supernatural beings. From this onward the references are sure to the present site, and it is difficult to believe, if, as good authorities maintain, the great buttressed square wall enclosing the site is work at least as early as Herod, that the earlier references can not arise to say that the existing buildings are very largely those which the Crusaders occupied; there are many full references to this place in mediaeval Moslem writers. The Haram at Hebron, which present-day tradition, Christian and Jewish alike, recognizes as built over the cave of Machpelah, is one of the most jealously guarded sanctuaries in the world. Only on rare occasions held under much political pressure have a few honored Christians been allowed to visit the spot. The late King Edward VII in 1862 and the present King George V, in 1882, with certain distinguished scholars in their parties, made visits which have been carefully reported in the writings of their companions—Stanley in 1862 and Wilson and Conder in 1882. One of the latest to be acceded the privilege was C. W. Fairbanks, late vice-president of the United States of America. What such visits have seen and experienced was not been of any great antiquity nor has it thrown any certain light on the question of the genuineness of the site.

The space containing the traditional tombs is a great quadrangle 197 ft. in length (N.W. to S.E.) and 111 ft. in breadth (N.E. to S.W.). It is enclosed by four great walls of immense but very hard and akin to marble. The walls which are between 8 and 9 ft thick are of solid masonry throughout. At the height of 15 ft. from the ground, at indeed the level of the floor within, the wall is set back about 10 in. at intervals, so as to leave pilasters 3 ft. 9 in. wide, with space between each of 7 ft. all round. On the longer sides there are 16 and on the shorter sides 8 such pilasters, and there are also buttresses 9 ft. wide on each face at each angle. This pilastered wall runs up for 25 ft., giving the total average height from the ground of 40 ft. The whole character of the masonry is so similar to the wall of the Jerus Haram near the “wailing place” that Conder and Warren considered that it must belong to that period and be Herodian work.

The southern end of the great enclosure is occupied by a church—probably a building entirely of the crusading period—with a nave and two aisles. The rest is a courtyard open to the air. The cenotaphs of Isaac and Rebekah are within the church; those of Abraham and Sarah occupy octagonal chapels in the double porch before the church doors; those of Jacob and Leah are placed in chambers near the north end of the Haram. The six monuments are placed at equal distances along the length of the enclosure, and it is probable that their positions have no relation to the sarcophagi which are described as existing in the cave itself.

It is over this cave that the chief mystery hangs. It is not known whether it has been entered by any man at present alive, Moslem or Christian. The cave itself is a wonderful chamber, of which the visitor descends into a first cave which is empty, and the second is in the same state and at last reaches a third which contains six sepulchres—those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebeca and Leah, one opposite the other. A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchre continually, both night and day.” The account reminds us of the condition of many Christian tombs in Pal today.

It would appear from the description of modern observers that all entrance to the cave is now closed; the only known approaches are never now opened and can only be reached by breaking up the flagstones of the flooring. Through one of the openings—which had a stone over it—was passed by a circuit of 16 ft. in diameter—near the northern wall of the old church, Conder was able by lowering a lantern to see into a chamber some 15 ft. under the church. He estimated it to be some 12 ft. square; it had a plastered wall and there was a door which appeared like the entrance to a rock-cut tomb. On the outside of the Haram wall, close to the steps of the southern entrance gateway is a hole in the lowest course of masonry, which may possibly communicate with the western cave. Into this the Jews of Hebron are accustomed to thrust many written prayers and vows to the patriarchs.

The evidence, historical and archaeological seems to show that the cave occupies only the south end of the great quadrilateral enclosure under part only of the area covered by the church. See Hebron.


E. W. G. Masterman

MACONAH, mâkô'nah: AV Melkonah (q.v.).

MACRON, mâ'kron (Mákos, Mákoyn): Tolemy Macron who had been appointed by Tolemy Philometor VI governor of Cyprus and deserted to Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria (2 Mac 10 12 f). Under Antiochus he was governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (8 8). In 1 Mac 3 38 and 2 Mac 4 45 he is called “Ptolomy the son of Dorymenes.” At first he was a fierce and cruel enemy of the Jews and was one of those chosen by Lysias to destroy Israel and reduce Judas Maccabaeus (ib.). Later he apparently relented toward the Jews (2 Mac 10 12), fell into disfavor with Antiochus Eupator, before whom he was accused by the king’s friends, and was so galled by being constantly called traitor that he ended his life with poison (2 Mac 10 13).

S. ANGUS

MAD, MADNESS (βάσανος, káal, ἰσχία, náthgá); μαία, maia): These words, and derivatives from the same roots are used to express various conditions of mental derangement. Though usually translated “mad,” or “madness,” they are often used for temporary conditions to which one would scarcely
EXOTAPH OVER TOMB OF SARAH IN MOSQUE OF HEBRON ABOVE CAVE OF MACHPELAH
apply them today except as common colloquial inaccuracies. The madness exacerbated with folly in
Eeel is rather the excessive frivolity
1. In the
OT
dissipation on the part of the idle
rich (so in 1 17; 2 2-12; 7 25; 9 3; 10
13). The insensate fury of the wicked
against the good is called by this name in Ps 102 3. In Dt 28 28-34 it is used to characterize the state
of panic produced by the oppression of tyrannical
conquerors, or (as in Zec 12 4) by the judgment of
God on sinners. This condition of mind is meta-
phorically called "divine drunkenness with the wind
of God’s wrath (Jer 25 16; 61 7). The same mental
condition due to terror-striking idols is called "mad-
ness" in Jer 50 38. The madman of Prov 26 18 is a malicious person who carries his frivolous
jest to an unreasonable length, for he is responsible
for the mischief he causes. The ecstatic condition
of one under the inspiration of the Divine or of evil
spirits, as that described by Balaam (Nu 24 3 f), or that which Saul experienced (1 S 10 10),
is compared to madness; and conversely in the
Near East at the present day the insane are supposed
to be Divinely inspired and to be peculiarly under
the Divine protection. This was the motive which
led David, when at the court of Achish, to feign
madness (1 S 18 13-15). It is only within the last
few years that any provision has been made in Pal
for the restraint even of dangerous lunatics, and there
are many insane persons wandering at large there.

This association of madness with inspiration is
expressed in the name "this mad fellow" given to
the prophet who came to anoint Jehu, which did
not necessarily convey a disrespectful meaning (2 K
9 11). The true prophetic spirit was, however, differ-
entiated from the ravages of the false prophets by
Isaiah (44 25), these latter being called mad by
Jeremiah (23 25) and Hosea (9 7). The most interesting case of real insanity recorded
in the OT is that of Saul, who, from being a shy,
self-conscious young man, became, on his exaltation
to the kingship, put up with a megalomania,
alternating with fits of black depression with homi-
cidal impulses, finally dying by suicide. The cause
of his madness is said to have been an evil spirit
from God (1 S 18 10), and when, under the influence
of the ecstatic mood which alternated with his depression, he conducted himself like a lunatic
(18 23 f), his mutteredings are called "prophesyings."
The use of music in his case as a remedy (1 S
16 16) may be compared with Elisha’s use of the
same means to produce the prophetic ecstasy (2 K
3 15).

The story of Nebuchadnezzar is another history of
a sudden accession of insanity in one puffed up
by self-conceit and excessive prosperity. His de-
clusion that he had become as an ox is of the same
nature as that of the daughters of Procyus recorded
in the Song of Silenus by Virgil (Eccl vi.48). In
the NT the word “lunatic” (σελήνιασμονοι)
(AV Mt 4 24; 17 15) is correctly rendered in
RV “epileptic.” Undoubtedly many
2. In the
NT
of the demonsiacs were persons suffering
from insanity. The words “mad” or “madness” occur 8 t, but usually
in the sense of paroxysms of passion, excitement and foolishness. Thus in Acts 26 11 Paul says
that before his conversion he was "exceedingly
mad" (εμμαινασμονοι) against the Christians.
11 19 these who “speak with tongues” in
Christian assemblies are said to appear mad to the
outsider. Rhoda was called “mad” when she an-
nounced that Peter was at the door (Acts 12 15).
The madness with which the Jews were filled when
Our Lord healed the demoniac with the withered hand
is called δαιμον, which is literally senselessness (Lk
6 11), and the madness of Balaam is called para-
phonix, “being beside himself” (2 Pet 2 16). Paul
is accused by Festus of having become deranged
by overstudy (Acts 26 24). It is still the belief
among the fellahin that lunatics are people inspired
by spirits, good or evil, and it is probable that all
persons showing mental derangement would natu-
 rally be described as "possessed," so that, without
entering into the vexed question of demoniacal
possession, any cases of insanity cured by Our
Lord or the apostles would naturally be classed
in the same category. See also LUNATIC.

MADAI, mad’āi, mā’dî (םָדָי, mādiy). See MEDES.

MADIABUN, ma-dī’a-bun (Ma’diabōn, Madiabun, AV). See EMADIABUN.

MADIAN, ma’di’an (AV Jth 2 26; Acts 7 29
AV). See MIDIAN.

MADMANNAH, mad-man’ā (מְדַמְנָה, mad-
manah; B, Maγmūn, Māḥirmā, A, Μαδημάνη,
Babēbrón [Josh 15 31]; B, Μαρσων, Meρepnēn, A,
Māḏēmānā, Mādemēnā [1 Ch 2 49]): This town
lay in the Negeb of Judah and is mentioned with
Hormah and Ziklag. It is represented in Josh
19 7, 21, etc., by Beth-mara-sheshoth. Umm Dimeh, 12 miles N. of Beersheba, has been proposed on
etymological grounds (PEF, III, 392, 399, SH XXIV).

MADMEN, mad’men (מְדַמֶן, madmēn; kal
פַּאֹתי פַּאֹטֶרֶת, kāt paātēn paoteat): An
unidentified town in Moab against which Jer proph-
ecied (48 2). The play upon the words here suggests
a possible error in transcription: gam madmēn
tiddimm, “Also, Madmen, thou shalt be silenced.”
The initial M of “Madmen” may have arisen by
dittography from the last letter of gam. We should
then point Dimon, which of course is Dibon.

MADMENAH, mad-men’ā (מְדַמְנָה, madmēnāh;
Māḏēḇēnā, Mādēbēnā): A place mentioned only in
Isaiah’s description of the Assyrian advance upon
Jerus (10 31). It is not identified.

MADNESS, mad’nes. See MAD, MADNESS.

MADON, ma’don (מָדָן, madon; B, Maḏāḇōn,
Mariḥōn, A, Maḏāḇān, Madon [Josh 11 1], B,
Marāḇōn, Maḏāḇōn, A, Maḏāḇān [Josh 12 19]):
A royal city of the Canaanites named along with
Hazor of Galilee. El-Medineh, “the city,” on the
heights W. of the Sea of Galilee, with which it
might possibly be identified, probably dates only
from Moslem times. It seems likely that the common confusion of the Heb "for " has occurred,
and that we should read “Maron.” The place
may be then identified with Mejron, a village with
ancient ruins and rock tombs at the foot of Jebel
Jermuk, a little to the N.W. of Safed. W. Elwino

MAELUS, ma-el’us (A, Māḵlo, Māḵlo, B,
Māḵlo, Mitīlos): One of those who at Edras’s
request put away his foreign wife (1 Esd 9 26 =
“Miamin” in the § Ezra 10 25).

MAGADAN, ma-ga’dan, ma-gā’dan (Magaḏān,
Magadān; the reading of TE, Maγdāk [AV],
Magdal, is unsupported): This name appears
only in Mt 15 39. In the § passage, Mk 8 10,
it is placed by John Dalmanutha. From these
two passages it is reasonable to infer that “the
borders of Magadan” and “the parts of Dalma-
нутьa” were contiguous. We may perhaps gather
from the narrative that they lay on the western
shores of the Sea of Galilee. After the feeding of the
4,000, Jesus and His disciples came to these parts. Thence they departed to "the other side" (Mt 8:13), arriving at Bethsaida. This is generally believed to have been Bethsaida Julia, N.E. of the sea, whence He set out on His visit to Caesarea Philippi. In this case we might look for Dalmanutha and Magadan somewhere S. of the Plain of Gennesaret, at the foot of the western hills. Stanley (S.P., 383) quotes Schwartz to the effect that a cave in the face of these precipitous slopes bears the name of Teliman or Talmanutha. If this is true, it points to a site for Dalmanutha near Ain el-Fuliyeh. Magadan might then be represented by el-Mejdel, a village at the S.W. corner of the Plain of Gennesaret. It is commonly identified with Magdala, the home of Mary Magdalene, but without any evidence. The name suggests that this was the site of an old Heb. migdād, "tower" or "fortress." The village with its ruins is now the

property of the German Roman Catholics. The
land in the plain has been purchased by a colony of
Jews, and is once more being brought under cultiva-
tion.

The identification with Magdala is made more
probable by the frequent interchange of l for r, e.g. Nathan (Heb.), Nethel (Aram.). W. EWING

MAGBISH, mag'bish (מָגִיבֶּש, maghibsh; B, Magbesh, Magebés, A, Magتبט), Magbísh, Magbīs (magbíš): An unidentified town in Benjamin, 156 of the inhabi-
tants of which are said to have returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:50). It does not appear in Nehemiah's list (7:33). LXX (B), however, hasMagebés. The name is probably identical with Magnisah, "one who sealed the covenant" (Neh 10:20).

MAGDALA, mag'da-la. See MAGDAN.

MAGDALENE, mag'da-lén, mag-da'lé'ně. See Mary, III.

MAGDIEL, mag'di-el (מְגַדִיל, magdiel; Gen 36:43, A, Herodōu; Medevel, 1 Ch 1:54, A, Maγiδε, Magevēl, B, Me deliber, Medevel, Medevel): One of the "dukes" of Edom.

MAGED, mā'ged. See MAKED.

MAGI, ma'gəi, THE (Magyv, Magoi, [Mt 2:1,7:16; "Wise-men," RV and AV; "Magi," RVm]): Were originally a Median tribe (Herod. i,101); and in Darius' Inscriptions Magush means only a mem-

priests mentioned in the Avesta may have been of
their number, though only once does the word "Magus" occur in the book (in the compound Mōgha-thiśh), "Magus-hater," Psam, lv, 7, Geld-
der's ed.). The Magi in Herodotus' time had
expired a reputation for "magie" arts (cf Acts 13:68). They also studied astrology and astronomy (rational mundani motus et siderum [Amm. Marc., xxiii,8,32], partly learned from Babylon.

These latter studies explain why a star was used to lead them to Christ at Bethlehem, when Our Lord was less than two years old (Mt 2:16).

2. The Magi No reliable tradition deals with the
Magi at Beth-
lehem country whence these particular magi came. Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Epiphanius fancied that they came from Arabia, finding their opinion on the fact that "gold, frankincense and myrrh" abounded in Yemen. But the text says they came not from the S. but from the E. Origen held that they came from Chaldaea, which is possible. But Clement of Alexandria, Diodorus of Tarsus, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenecus, Prudentius and others are probably right in bringing them from Persia. Sargon's settlement of Israelites in Media (c 730-728 BC [2 K 17:6]) accounts for the large Hebrew element of thought which Darmesteter recognizes in the Avesta (SBE, IV, Intro, ch vi). Median astronomers would thus know Balaam's prophecy of the star out of Jacob (Nu 24:17). That the Jews expected a star as a sign of the birth of the Messiah is clear from the tractate Zohar of the G'mará and also from the title "Son of the Star" (Bar Kokhba) given to a pseudo-Messiah.

MAGDALA (LOOKING TO THE N.E.).
MAGIC, ma\dʒɪk, MAGICIAN, ma\dʒɪʃən:

I. Definition.

1. Magic as impersonal.
2. Magic as personal.

II. Division of the Subject.

1. Magic as personal.
2. Magic as impersonal.

III. MAGIC AND RELIGION.

1. Hostility to magic.
2. Potency of magical words.
3. Incantations.
4. Incantations as magic.
5. Incantation.
6. Repeated utterances.
7. Incantation.
8. Witchcraft.

IV. MAGIC TERMS USED IN THE BIBLE.

1. Divination.
2. Astrology.
3. Enchantment.
5. Incantation.
6. Repeated Utterances.
7. Divination.
8. Witchcraft.

LITERATURE.

The word comes from a Gr. adj. (μάγικος, ma\dʒɪk\oʊs) with which the noun τεχνές, τέχνη, "art," is understood. The full phrase is "magical art" (Wisd 17:10). But the Gr word is derived from the maji of Zarathustran (Zoroastrian) priests. Magic is therefore historically the art practiced in Persia by the recognized priests of the country. It is impossible in the present article, owing to exigencies of space, to give a full account of this important subject and of the leading views of it which have been put forth. The main purpose of the following treatment will be to consider the subject from the Bib. standpoint.

I. Definition.

In its modern accepted sense magic may be described as the art of bringing about results by means of incantations or other superhuman agencies. In the wide sense of this definition divination is but a species of magic, i.e. magic used as a means of securing secret knowledge, esp. a knowledge of the future. Divination and magic bear the same relation to prophecy and miracle respectively, the first and third implying special knowledge, the second and fourth special power. But divination has to do generally with omens, and it is better for this and other reasons to notice the two subjects—magic and divination—apart, as is done in the present work.

II. Division of the Subject.

There are two kinds of magic: (1) impersonal; (2) personal.

1. Magic as impersonal:

In the first, magic is a species of crude science, founded on man's own power by superhuman agencies. In the wide sense of this definition divination is but a species of magic, i.e. magic used as a means of securing secret knowledge, esp. a knowledge of the future. Divination and magic bear the same relation to prophecy and miracle respectively, the first and third implying special knowledge, the second and fourth special power. But divination has to do generally with omens, and it is better for this and other reasons to notice the two subjects—magic and divination—apart, as is done in the present work.

2. Magic as personal:

In the second, magic is an art or skill practiced by a magician or a spell-caster. In this second sense magic includes divination, chicanery, and the art of producing false omens. In the wide sense of this definition divination is but a species of magic, i.e. magic used as a means of securing secret knowledge, esp. a knowledge of the future. Divination and magic bear the same relation to prophecy and miracle respectively, the first and third implying special knowledge, the second and fourth special power. But divination has to do generally with omens, and it is better for this and other reasons to notice the two subjects—magic and divination—apart, as is done in the present work.

III. Magic and Religion.

Personal magic in its higher forms shades off into religion, and very commonly the two exist together. It is the practice to speak of sacrifice and prayer as constituting elements of the ancient and modern religions of India. But it is doubtful whether either of these has the same connotation that it bears in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. J. Frazer (Golden Bough, 1, 67 ff) says that where the operation of spirits is assumed (and "these cases are exceptional"), magic is "tinted and alloyed with religion." Such an assumption is, he admits, often made and the present writer thinks it is generally made, for even the operation of the laws of association implies it. But Frazer concludes from various considerations that "though the magic art began to fuse and amalgamate with religion in many ages and in many lands, there are some grounds for thinking that this fusion was not primitive." It is of course personal magic to which religion stands in closest relations. As soon as man comes to see in the beings by whose power marvels are wrought, personalities capable of emotions like himself and susceptible to persuasion, his magical art becomes an intelligent effort to propitiate these superior beings and invoke their superhuman agency.

IV. Magic in the Bible.

The general remarks made on the Bible and divination in Divination, V, have an equal application to the Bible and magic. For the same reasons that are given in connection with divination, magic must be judged according to its own proper evidence. But see II. end.

1. Hostility attitude of the Bible toward magic.

This attitude is distinctly hostile, as it could not but be in documents professing to inculcate the teaching of the ethical and spiritual religion of Israel (see Dt 18:10; 2 K 21:6; 2 Ch 33:6, etc.). Yet it is equally clear that
the actual power of magic is acknowledged as clearly as its illegitimacy is pointed out. In P's account of the plagues (Ex 7–11) it is assumed that the magicians of Egypt had real power to perform superhuman feats. They threw their rods and appeared to change them into the waters of the Nile into blood. It is only then when they produce gnats that they fail, though Aaron had succeeded by Yahweh's power in doing this and that showed that Yahweh's power was greatest. But that the magicians had power that was real and great is not so much as called in question.

Among the ancient Semites (Arabs, Assyrians, Hebrews, etc) there was a strong belief in the potency of the magical words of blessing and of curse. The mere utterance of Magical such words was regarded as enough Words to secure their realization. That the narrator of Nu 22–24 (J) ascribed to Balaam magical power is clear from the narrative, else why should Yahweh be represented transferring Balaam's service to the cause of Israel? We have other Bib. references to the power of the spoken word of blessing in Gen 12:3; Ex 12:32; Jud 17:2; 2 S 21:3, and of curse in Gen 27:38; Jgs 5:23; Job 3:8 (cf. the so-called Imprecatory Psalms, and see Century Bible, "Ps", vol II, 216). On the prevalence of the belief among the Arabs, see the important work of Goldziher, Abhandlungen Philologe, Theil I, 23 ff.

In Gen 30:14 (J) we have an example of the belief in the power of plants (here mandrakes) to stir up and strengthen sexual love, and 3. Influence we read in Arab. lit. of the very same use. A charm in connection with what is called Yabrūh, almost certainly the same plant. Indeed one of the commonest forms in which magic appears is as a love-charm, and as this kind of magic was often exercised by women, magic and adultery are frequently named together in the OT (see 2 K 9:22; Nah 3:4; Mal 3:5; and of Ex 22:18 [17], where the sorcress [AV "witch"] is to be condemned to death). We have an instance of what is called sympathetic magic (for a description of which see Jevons, Intro to Hist. of Religion, 28 ff, and Fraser, Golden Bough, I, 49 ff) in Gen 30:37 f. Jacob placed before the sheep and goats that came to drink water pealed rods, so that the pregnant ones might bring forth young that were speckled and striped. This practice is mentioned in Gen 31:19 ff and put away with wizardry during the drastic reforms of Josiah (2 K 23:24; cf Zec 10:2) were household objects supposed capable of warding off evil of every kind. The Babylonians and Assyrians had a similar custom. We read of an Assyr. magician that he had statues of the gods Lugalgi and Alamu put on each side of the main entrance to his house, and in consequence he felt perfectly impregnable against evil spirits (see Bittel, Assy. Beach, 29).

In Isa 3:2 the kāšāp ("magician" or "diviner") is named along with the knight warrior, the judge, prophet and elder, among the stays and supports of the nation; no disapproval is expressed or implied with regard to any of them. Yet it is not to be denied that in its essential features pure Yahwism, which enforced personal faith in a pure spiritual being, was radically opposed to all magical beliefs and practices. The fact that the Hebrews steered apart as believers in an ethical and spiritual religion from the Sem and other peoples by which they were surrounded suggests that they were Divinely guided, for in other respects—art, philosophy, etc—this same Heb nation held a lower place than many contemporary nations.

V. Magical Terms Used in the Bible. Many terms employed in the OT in reference to divination have also a magical import. See Divination, VII. For a fuller discussion of Bib. terms connected with both subjects, reference may be made to T. W. Davies, Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews, 44 ff, 78 ff; see also arts. "Divination" and "Magic" in EB, by the present writer.

Here a few brief statements are all that can be attempted. Kesem (קְסֵם), usually rendered "divination" (see Nu 23:23), has primarily a magical reference (Fleischer), though both Wellhausen (Reste des arabischen Heidenthumus, 133, 5) and W. Robertson Smith (Jour. Phil., XIII, 278) hold that its first use was in connection with divination. The Arab. vb. ("to exercise") and noun ("an ephod") have magical meanings. But it must be admitted that the secondary meaning ("divination") has almost driven out the other. See under I, where it is held that at bottom magic and divination are one.

The vb. kāšāp (קָשָׁפ), RV "to practise sorcery," comes, as Fleischer held, from a root denoting "to have a dark appearance," to look gloomy, to be distressed, then as a suppliant to seek relief by magical means. The corresponding nouns and m'tashākaph are rendered "sorcerer" in EV.

Labash (לֱבָשָׁה), EV "enchantment," etc (see Isa 3:3, nḇōn labash, RV "the skilful enchanter"), is connected etymologically with מַלָּשָׁה, "a serpent," the n and f often interchanging in Sem. Labash is, therefore, as might be expected from this etymology, used specifically of serpent charming (see Jer 8:17; Eccl 10:11; cf מַלְשָׁה [מַלָּשָׁה] in Ps 68:5 [6], EV "charmer").

Hebber (הֶבֶר) occurs in the plural only (Isa 47:9.12, EV "enchantments"). It comes from a root meaning "to bind," and it denotes probably amulets of some kind carried on the person to ward off evil. It seems therefore to be the Bib. equivalent of the Talmudic בֵּית (בֵּיתוֹ), lit. = "something bound," from קָשָׁם (קָשָׁם), "to bind."

Shikar (שִׁכָּר) (Isa 47:11) seems to have an etymological connection with the principal Arab. word used for "magic" (the term is explained by the great majority of recent commentators following J. H. Michaelis (Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, Whitehouse in Century Bible, etc) as meaning "to charm away" (by incantations). So also Tg., Rashi, JH and JD, Michaelis, Eichhorn, etc.

The vb. bātallogēō (βαταλογεύω) in Mt 6:7 (= "say not the same thing over and over again") refers to the superstition that the repeated utterance of a word will secure one's wish. In India today it is thought that if an ascetic says in one month the name of Radha, Krishna or Rom 100,–000 times, he cannot fail to obtain what he wants (see 1 K 18:26). See Repetition.

The term gōdēs (γόδης), AV "seducers," is used of a class of magicians who uttered certain magical formulae in a deep, low voice (cf. the vb. gōdō [γόδω], which = "to sigh," "to utter low mourning tones"). Herodotus (ii.33) says that there were persons of the kind in Egypt, and they are mentioned also by Euripides and Plato.

Paul in Gal 5:20 classes with uncleanness, idolatry, etc, what he calls pharmaēs (φαρμακεία), AV "witchcraft," RV "sorcery." The word has
8. Witchcraft

A very full bibliography of the subject will be found in T. Witton Davies, Magic, Divination and the Hebraeans and Their Neighbours, xi-xvi. See also the lit. under Divination and in addition to the lit. cited in the course of the foregoing art., note the following: A. Lehmann, "Aberglaube und Zauberelte" (1908); W. S. Robertson Smith, "Witchcraft in the OT." Bib. Soc., 1902, 23-35; W. R. Halley, Ge Divination: A Study of Its Methods and Principles, London, Macmillan (important) and the valuable art. on "Magic" by N. W. Thomas in Enc. Brit., and also the relevant arts in the Bible dictionaries.

T. Witton Davies

MAGISTRATE, magistra, magister, corresponding to της, σάρπασθ, "to judge," "to pronounce sentence" [Acts 13 17]: Among the ancients, the term corresponding to our "magistrate" had a much wider signification. "Magistrates and judges" (πραγμάτων της, σάρπασθ, ορατών) was Magistrate parenthesis. "Should be judged" (Acts 7:25) δεόμεθα, "rulers" or "nobles" to be as Babylonian or prefects of provinces (Jer 51:28, 57; Ezek 23:6). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jewish magistrates bore the same title of judge (Ezra 9:2; Neh 2:16; Neh 13:11). The Greek ἀρχήν, "archim" is "magistrate" (Lk 12:58; Tit 3:1 AV), signifies the chief in power (1 Cor 2:6.8) and "ruled" by Acts (Acts 4:26; Rom 13:3).

The Messiah is destined as the "prince of the house of God" (Ps 89:36; and on the same term Moses is destined the judge and leader of the Hebrews (Acts 7:27,35). The wide application of this term is manifest from the fact that it is used of magistrates of any kind, e.g. the high priest (Acts 23:3); civil judges (Lk 12:58; Acts 16:19); ruler of the synagogue (Lk 8:41; Mt 9:18,23; Mk 5:22); persons of standing and authority among the Pharisees and others in the Sanhedrin (Lk 14:1; Jn 3:1; Acts 3:17). The term also designates Satan, the prince or chief of the fallen angels (Mt 9:34; Eph 2:2).

In the NT we also find εὐροτρίδος, δικαστήριον, employed as the name of those in positions of power (Eng. "the rulers"). ἰδων, εὐροτρίδος, is found in Lk 12:11 AV; Rom 13:2; Tit 3:1. The "higher powers" (Rom 13:1) are all those who are placed in positions of civil authority from the emperor down.

In early Heb history, the magisterial office was limited to the hereditary chiefs, but Moses made the judicial office elective. In his time the heads of families were 59 in number, and these, together with the 12 princes of the tribes, composed the Sanhedrin or Council of 71. Some of the scribes were intrusted with the business of keeping the genealogies and in this capacity were also regarded as magistrates.

FRANK E. HIRSCH

MAGNIFICAltalal, mag-nifis-cal (της, gádhál, in Hiph. "to make great"); Old form retained from Gevnean VS in 1 Ch 22 25; in ARV "magnificent."

MAGNIFICANT, mag-nifis-cal: The name given to the hymn of Mary in Lk 1 46-55, concerning "My soul doth magnify the Lord." Three old Lat MSS substitute the name "Elisabeth" for "Mary" in ver 46, but against this is the authority of all Gr MSS and other 1st cent MSS modeled in part on that of Hannah in 1 S 2:1ff.

is peculiarly suitable to the circumstances of Mary, and plainly could not have been composed after the actual appearance and resurrection of Christ. Its early date is thus manifest.

MAGNIFY, mag-nifis-it (Hiph. of יְלַל, gádhál; יָרַע, megalán, to make great," "extol," "celebrate in praise"): Used esp. of exaltation of the name, mercy, and other attributes of God (Gen 19:19; 2 S 7:26, Ps 35:27; 40:16; 70:4 Lk 1:46; Acts 10:46; of God's "word" (Ps 138:2); or of mercy (Acts 19:17; Phil 1:20). Men also can be "magnified" (Josh 4:14; 1 Ch 29:25, etc.). In Rom 11:13, "magnify mine office," the word (Gr doxázō) is changed in RV to 'glorify.'

MAGOG, magog (יַם-גו, mágghād; Magy, Magog): Named among the sons of Japheth (Gen 10:2; 1 Ch 1:5). Ezekiel uses the word as equivalent to "land of Gog" (Ezk 38:2; 39:6). Joa identifies the Magogites with the Scythians (Ant, I, vi, 1). From a resemblance between the names Gog and Gyges (Gugu), king of Lydia, some have suggested that Magog is Lydia; others, however, urge that Magog is probably only a variant of Gog (Soyce in HDB). In the Apocalypse of John, Gog and Magog represent all the heathen opponents of Messiah (Rev 20:8), and in this sense these names frequently recur in Jewish apocalyptic literature.

JOHN A. LEES

MAGOR-MISSABBIB, magor-nis-sáb-ib (יִמְגְּרָבָע, maghôr misggâthibb, "terror on every side"): A name given by Jeremiah to Pashhur ben Immer, the governor of the temple, who had caused the prophet to be beaten and set in the stocks (Jer 20:8). The same expression is used (not as a proper name in its own) in several other passages (Ps 31:13; Jer 6:25; 20:10; 46:5; 49:29; Lam 2:22).

MAGPIASH, mag-phish. See Magnish.

MAGUS, mágus, SIMON. See Simon Magus; Mag; Magic.

MAHALAH, ma-hálá, ma-há-la (מַהֲלָה, maḥlah; RV has the correct form MAHALAH): A descendant of Manasseh (1 Ch 7:18).

MAHALALEL, ma-há-la-lel (מַהֲלָלֵל, mahalal-lel; AV Mahalaleel, ma-há-la-le-el, ma-há-la-le-1): (1) Son of Caanan, the grandson of Seth (Gen 5:12bff; 1 Ch 1:2).

(2) The ancestor of Athaliah, one of the children of Judah who dwelt in Jerusalem after the return from exile ( Neh 11:4).

MAHALATH, ma-há-la-th (מַהֲלָת, maḥlah;): (1) In Gen 26:9 the name of a wife of Esau, the daughter of Ishmael, and sister of Nebaloth, called in 36:5, Basmuth (q.v.) and the Sam, however, throughout ch 36 retains "Maalah." On the other hand, in 36:34 Basmuth is said to be "the daughter of Elon the Hittite," probably a confusion with Adaih, as given in 36:2, or corruption may exist in the lists otherwise.

(2) One of the 18 wives of Rehoboam, a granddaughter of David (2 Ch 11:18).

(3) The word is found in the titles of Ps 63 (RV "set to Mahalah") and Ps 88 (RV "set to Mahalath Leannah," m "for singing"). Probably some song or tune is meant, though the word is taken by many to denote a musical instrument. Hengstenberg and others refer it as indicating the subject of the Ps. See Psalms. JAMES ORR
Malahi, mā′hā-hī. See Māhîl.

Mahanaim, mā-ha-nāʿim (םַחָנָיִם, maḥa-nâyîm): the Gr is different in every case where the name occurs, B and A also giving variant forms; the dual form may be taken as having arisen from an old locative ending, as, e.g. in לְמַחָנִים, †yərəwâḥalonym, from an original לְמַחָנ, †ywâḥâlonym). In Gen 32 21 maḥāneḥ is evidently a △ form and should be rendered as a proper name, Mahaneh, i.e. Mahanaim): The city must have been one of great strength. It lay E. of the Jordan, and is first mentioned in the history of Jacob. Here he halted after parting from Laban, before the passage of the Jabok (Gen 32 2), "and the angels of God met him." Possibly it was the site of an ancient sanctuary. It is next noticed in defining the boundaries of tribal territory E. of the Jordan. It lay on the border of Gad and Manasseh (Josh 13 26 30). It belonged to the lot of Gad, and was assigned along with Ramoth in Gilead to the Merarite Levites (21 38; 1 Ch 6 80) — the former of these passages affords no justification to Cheyne in saying [EB, s.v.] that it is mentioned as a "city of refuge". The strength of the place doubtless attracted Abner, who fixed here the capital of Ishboseth's kingdom. Saul's chivalrous rescue of Jabesh-gilead was remembered to the credit of his house in these dark days, and the loyalty of M. could be reckoned on (2 S 2 8, etc.). To this same fortress David fled when endangered by the rebellion of Absalom; and in the "forest" hard by, that prince met his fate (2 S 17 24, etc.). It was made the center of one of Solomon's administrative districts, and here Abinadab the son of Iddo was stationed (1 K 4 14). There seems to be a reference to M. in Cant 6 13 RV. If this is so, here alone it appears with the article. By emending the text Cheyne would read: "What do you see in the Shulammite? A Thecus of the valleys."

It is quite clear from the narrative that Jacob, going to meet his brother, who was advancing from the S., crossed the Jabok after leaving M. It is therefore vain to search for the place of the city S. of the Jabok, and Conder's suggested identification with some place near et-Bube'a, L of es-Sallâh, must be given up.

On the N. of the Jabok several positions have been thought of. Merrill (East of the Jordan, 433 ff) argues in favor of Khirbet Solekhat, a ruined site of Wâdây Jâlûn, on the northern bank, 3 miles E. of Jordan, and 4 miles N. of Wâdây 'Ajlûn. From its height, 300 ft. above the plain, it commands a wide view to the W. and S. One running "by the way of the Plain" could be seen a great way off (2 S 18 22). This would place the battle in the hills to the S. near the Jordan valley. Ahimaz then preferred to make a détour, thus securing a level road, while the Cushite took the rough track across the heights. Others, among them Buhl (GAP, 257), would place M. at Maḥneh, a partly overgrown ruin 9 miles E. of Jordan, and 4 miles N. of 'Ajlûn on the north bank of Wâdây Maḥneh. This is the only trace of the ancient name yet found in the district. It may be assumed that M. is to be sought in this neighborhood. Cheyne would locate it at 'Ajlûn, near which rises the great fortress Kolâet-Rabûd. He supposes that the "wood of Mahanaim" extended as far as Maḥneh, and that the name of Maḥneh is really an abbreviation of the ancient phrase." Others would identify M. with Dera, where, however, there are no remains older than Gr-Rom times.

Objections to either 'Ajlûn or Maḥneh are: (1) The reference to "this Jordan" in Gen 32 10, which seems to show that the city was near the river. It may indeed be said that the great hollow of the Jordan valley seems clear for many miles on either side, but this, perhaps, hardly meets the objection. (2) The word kikkâr, used for "Plain" in 2 S 18 23, seems always elsewhere to apply to the "circle" of the Jordan. Buhl, who identifies M. with Maḥneh, sites this verse (GAP, 112) as a case in which kikkâr applies to the plain of the Jordan. He thus prescribes for Ahimaz a very long range. Cheyne sees the difficulty. The battle was obviously in the vicinity of M., and the nearest way from Maḥneh (the "city") kikkâr, "or, since no satisfactory explanation of this reading has been offered by the ṣin, nabâl, that is to say, the eager Ahimaz ran along in the wâdy in which, at some little distance, M. lay." (EB, s.v.). The site for the present remains in doubt.

W. Ewing

Mahaneh-Dan, mā-ha-ne-dan (מַחַנֶּה דָּן, maḥâneh-dân; παραπόλις ἅλαν, parepôlîs Dân): This place is mentioned twice: in Jgs 13 25 (AV "the camp of Dan"), and Jgs 18 12. In Mahaneh-dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol, the spirit of the Lord began to move him. Here the Lord of Dan, coming from Zorah and Eshtaol, encamped behind Kiriath-jearim. It has been thought that these two statements contradict each other; or at least that they cannot both apply to the same place. But if we accept the identification of Zorah with Surah, and of Eshtaol with Esh'ah, which seems no reason to question; and if, further, we identify Kiriath-jearim with Khirbet Erma, which is at least possible, the two passages may be quite reconciled. Behind Kiriath-jearim, that is Khirbet Erma, runs the Vale of Sorek, on the north bank of which, about 2 miles apart, stand Zorah and Eshtaol; the former 3 1/2 miles, the latter 2 1/2 miles from Khirbet Erma. No name resembling Mahaneh-dan has yet been recovered; but the place may have lain within the area thus indicated, so meeting the conditions of both passages, whether it was a permanent settlement, or derived its name only from the incident mentioned in 18 12.

W. Ewing

Maharai, mā-har′ā́i, mā′hârî (מָהָרָי, maḥâray, "impetuous"): One of David's "braves" (2 S 23 28; 1 Ch 11 30; 27 13). He was one of the 12 monthly captains of David's administration, and took the 10th month in rotation. He was of the family of Zerah, and dwelt in Netophah in Judah.

Mahat, mā-hāth (מָהָת, mahath, "snatching"); Mēh, Mēth: (1) One of the Kohathites having charge of the "service of song" in David's time, son of Amasa (1 Ch 6 35). Possibly the same as Abimoth (ver 25). He seems also to be the same as the person named in 2 Ch 29 12 during Hezekiah's time, though it is probable there is some confusion in the narrative. He is there represented as taking part in the new covenant of Hezekiah and the cleansing of the Lord's house.

(2) One of the overseers of the temple under Conaniah and Shimei (2 Ch 31 13); three passages of Scripture give the name, but it is difficult to individuate these because the genealogy identifies the two first named (1 Ch 6 35; 2 Ch 29 12), while the chronology seems to divide them — one in David's day, the other in Hezekiah's. It is not, however, impossible to identify the man of 2 Ch 29 12 with him of 2 Ch 31 13. Possibly the genealogy has been mistakenly repeated in 2 Ch 29 12.

Henry Wallace
_Mahali Maimed_

**Mahavite, mā-hā-vāt (מַהֲוָט, mahāwām, “villager”):** The description given to Eliel, one of David’s warrior guard (1 Ch 11:46), perhaps to distinguish him from the Eliel in the next verse. MT is very obscure here.

**Mahazioth, ma-hā-zī-oth, ma-hā-zī-th (מָהָזוֹת, mahāzōth, “visions”):** One of the 14 sons of Heman the Kohathite in the temple choir. “He was leader of the 23rd course of musicians whose function was to blow the horns” (1 Ch 25:4-30).

**Maher-Shalal-Haz-Baz, mā-hēr-shāl-āl-haz-baz (םַעֲרָשַׁל-לְחַז-בָּז, mahēr shālāl ḥaz baz), “(the spoil speedeth, the prey hasteth):”** A symbolic name given to Isaiah’s son to signify the sharp destruction of Rezin and Pekah by the Assyrian power (Isa 8:13). Cf. The Idea of Nemesis.

**Mahlah, mā-lā (מָלָה, mahlah, “sickness” or “song,” etymology doubtful):** (1) Eldest of Zelophehad’s 5 daughters (Nu 26:33; 27:1). As Zelophehad, grandson of Manasseh, had no sons (not to be distinguished from his father’s inheritance. The law was altered in their favor on condition that they married into their father’s tribe. They agreed and married their cousins (Nu 36:11). The whole chapter should be read and compared with Josh 17:3 ff, because the decision became a precedent. (2) Another (AV “Mahalah”), same Heb name as above, daughter of Hаммokeleth, granddaughter of Manasseh (1 Ch 7:16).

_Henry Wallace_

**Mahli, mā-li (מָלִי, mahli, “a sick or weak one”):** (1) A son of Merari (Ex 6:19, AV Mahali; Nu 3:20), grandson of Levi and founder of the Levitical family of Mahliotes (q.v.). (2) A son of Mushi, Mahli’s brother, bears the same name (1 Ch 6:47; 23:23; 24:30). Cf Ex 8:18 and 1 Esd 8:47.

**Mahliotes, mā-liotes (מַלְיוֹת, mahliotes, “descendants of Mahli, son of Merari” (Nu 3:33; 26:58). These Mahliotes appear to have followed the example of the daughters of Zelophehad, muttita mutandis. (See Mahlah; had become the name become the description of a practice?) They married the daughters of their uncle Eleazar (1 Ch 25:31-22).

**Mahlon, mā-lōn (מַלוֹן, mahlōn, “invalid”):** Ruth’s first husband (Ruth 1:25; 4:9-10). In the latter passage is further evidence of the unwillingness to allow a family connection or inheritance to drop (see Mahlah; Mahli). Note that David’s descent and that of his “Greater Son” come through Ruth and Boaz (Ruth 4:22).

**Mahol, mā-hōl (מָהֹל, mahōl, “dance”; cf מַחֵל, mahēl, “dance”), “dancing”):** The father of the passages reputed next in wisdom to Solomon (1 K 4:31). Their names were Ethan, Heman, Calcol, Darda.

**Maaseiah, mā-sē-ya, mā-sī’ā (מַסְעֵיָה, māseyyāh, “Jeh a refugee”):** 1. Great-grandfather of Burch (Jer 32:12) and of Jehoiada (Jer 51:59). The name (not to be confused with Maaseiah [q.v.] as AV has done even in the above passages) is spelt “Maaseas” (q.v.) in Bar 1:1.

**Maianas, mā-in’as (Maïdnos, Maïnnas; AV Maianess):** One of the Levites who taught the law for Ederas (1 Esd 9:48) = Maaseiah [q.v.] in Neh 8:7.

**Maid, mā’d, MAIDEN, mā’dn: “Used in AV in the sense of a girl or young female; of an unmarried woman or virgin, and of a female servant or handmaid. Thus it translates several Heb words: (1) The more generic word is מַיָּד, ma‘yd, “girl,” fem. form of the common מַיָּד, ma‘yd, “boy” (1 S 11:2; 2 K 5:24; Est 2:47 ff; Job 41:5; Am 2:7). In several places maye, form מַיָּד, ma‘yd, with fem. form of vb rendered “damsel” (Gen 24:14:16:28; 34:13:12; Dt 22:15); cf הָנָּר, hē na‘ar, “Virgin” (Lk 8:51:54); see also מַיָּד, ma‘yd, paidiskē, diminutive (Sir 41:22; Mk 14:66:67; Lk 12:45; κορία, koritsi‘, LXX as for na‘ar, “maid,” in Mt 9:39; with Job 6:13; Sus 15:19). (2) The Heb מַיָּד, ma‘yd, “maid,” also rendered “maiden,” refers to a woman of marriageable age (Ex 2:2; Prov 30:19), whether married or not, whether a virgin or not. The same word is trd “virgin” in several places (Gen 24:43 AV; Cant 1:3; 6:8; Isa 7:14). (3) The word מַיָּד, ma‘yd, bithālith, a common Heb word for “virgin,” a chaste woman (LXX θερισθείς, parthenos, is frequently rendered “maid” (Gen 22:16; Jgs 19:2; 2 Ch 36:17; Ps 78:63; 148:12; Jer 51:22; Lam 5:11; Ezek 9:6; 44:22; Zec 9:17; cf. Dt 22:14, having “the marks [tokens] of virginity”); מַיָּד, ma‘yd, bithālith, rendered “maid.” See VIRGIN. (4) Two Heb words covering the idea of service, handmaid, handmaiden, and in numerous passages so rendered: (a) מַיָּד, ma‘yd, trd “maid” (Gen 30:3; Ex 2:5; 21:30:26; Lev 25:6; Ex 2:65; Job 19:15; Nah 2:7); (b) מַיָּד, ma‘yd, chipshāḥ, “a family servant,” “a handmaid,” so rendered in numerous passages ("maid"). “maid,” Gen 15:22; 29:24:29; 70:7; 10:12; Isa 4:24:2; Ps 129:2; Eccl 7:1). In AV they are variously trd “maid,” “handmaid,” etc. (5) The rather rare word אֶבֶת, ḥebet, “favorite slave,” is rendered “maid” in Jth 10:2:5; 13:9; 16:23; Ad Est 15:2:7. (6) אֶבֶת, ḥebet, “female slave,” in AV Jth 12:49 (RV “servant”).

Maid servant means simply a female slave in the different positions which such a woman naturally occupies. They were the property of their masters; sometimes held the position of concubines (Gen 31:33); daughters might be sold by their owners for this condition (Ex 21:7). It is regrettable that no uniform tr was adopted in AV. And in RV of Tob 3:7; Jth 10:10; Sir 41:22. “Maid servants” replaces “maidens” of AV in Lk 12:45. Cf Job 31:13.

_Edward Bagby Pollard_

**MAIL, māl. See Armor.**

**Maimed, mā-mēd (מָמַד, hōrū; κατολός, πυγμακός, πυγμάκος, and púgmakos).** The condition of being mutilated or rendered imperfect as the result of accident, in contrast to congenital malformation. An animal thus affected was declared to be unfit to be offered in sacrifice as a peace offering (Lev 22:25); although under certain conditions a congenitally malformed animal might be accepted as a free-will offering, apparently the offering of a maimed animal was always prohibited (vs 23:24). The use of such animals in sacrifice was one of the charges brought against the Jews of his time by Malachi (1:8; 3:5). The word is not to be confused with those who were so mutilated. Among those made whole by Our Lord in Galilee were the maimed as well as the halt (Mt 16:30).

Figuratively the casting off of any evil habit or distracting condition, which interferes with the spiritual life is called “maiming” (Mt 16:8; Mk 9
43; with this may be taken the lesson in Mt. 19:12. In these passages "mained" (kullas) is used of injury of the fingers or toes, and of those affecting the feet, rendering one halt. Hippocrates, however, uses kllias for a deformation of the legs in which the knees are bent so far outward as to render the patient lame; while he applies the term chlos as a generic name for any distortion, and in one place uses it to describe a mutilation of the head (Procrhetica, 83). The mained and the hait are among the outcasts who are to be brought into the gospel feast according to the parable (Lk 14:13-21).

ALEX. MACALISTER

MAINSAIL, mān'sāl. See Ships and Boats.

MAKAZ, mā'kaz (מַּקָּצ, mā'kaz): One of the cities of the 21 of the 12 districts or prefectures which supplied victuals for Solomon (1 K 4:9).

Cheyne (EB, II, col. 2906) suggests that Makaz may be identical with Mejaszar (qv.) in the latter list.

MAKE, māk, MAKER, māk'ēr (מָּקָה, mākā; nāṭan, nāṭan; σκοτάω, σκοτάω, τίθημι, καθίσταμαι, kathistēma): "Make" 1. As Used is a frequently used word, meaning in the OT "to create," "construct," "cause," "constitute," etc., and represents different Heb words. It is very often in AV (1) the tr of 'āshāh, "to do," "make," etc., usually in the sense of constructing, effecting. In Gen 1:7,8,25,31, etc., it is used of the creation of man, with some of the angels (God 1:1); of the ark (6:14); of a feast (21:8); of the tabernacle and all the things belonging to it (Ex 25:8, etc.); of idols (Isa 2:8; Jer 2:28, etc.); of nāṭan (lit. "to give"), chiefly in the sense of constituting, appointing, causing; of a covenant (Gen 9:12; 17:2); of Abraham as the father of many nations, etc. (17:5,6); of Ishmael as a great nation (17:20); of Moses as a god to Pharaoh (Ex 7:1); of judges and officers (Dt 15:18); of laws (Lev 26:46, etc.).

In addition to the changes in the TR already noted may be mentioned, for "maketh colllops" (Job 15:27) "gaped fast"; for "set us in the way of his steps" (Ps 53:13), "made him eat the fruits of his iniquity"; for "did more grievously afflict her" (Isa 9:1), "hath made it glorious"; for "shall make him of quick understanding" (Isa 11:3), "his delight shall be in: for "makest shiles and ponds for fish" (Isa 19:10), "they that work for hire, m. or make dam", "ye that are Jehovah's remembrancers", for "is shall confirm the covenant" (Dn 9:27), "he shall make a firm covenant", for "maketh my way perfect" (2 S 22:33), "gildeth the perfect in his way" (see margin); for the "sire of a man is his freedom" (Prov 19:22), "that which maketh a man to be desired"; for "maketh intercession" (Rom 11:2), "pleadeth"; for "hath 104:8", "made him" (Eph 1:20); "freely bestowed on us", "m. wherewith he endowed us"; for "made himself of no reputation" (Phil 2:7), "emptied himself"; for "spoil you" (Col 2:8), "maketh himself nothing of you"; for "the enemy of God" (Jas 4:4), "maketh himself"; for "worketh among us or [maketh it] a lie" (Rev 21:27), "maketh [in "doeth"] an abomination and a lie together, therefore (Mt 4:3; Lk 3:5; 4:3), "became" (Rom 10:20; 1 Th 4:4,6; "becoming in" for "being made") (Phil 2:7 m)."

MAKABATES, māk'bātēs: This is the pl. of the word makebates, which means "one who stirs up to make a stir." It occurs only in AV of 2 Tim 3:3 and Tit 2:3 as an alternative translation of the Heb. dibsolōbō, which AV renders "false accusers," and RV "slanderers."
MAKED, mā'ked (Māˈked, Māˈkêd, Māˈkêb, Maˈkêb): A strong city E. of the Jordan, not yet identified. It is named along with Bosor, Alemah and Caphshor (1 Mac 5:26). In ver 36, AV reads “Maged.”

MAKER, mā'kēr. See Make.

MAKELOTH, mak-hĕˈloθ, mak-hĕˈlîth (יִלְתָּה, makheloth, “assemblies”): A desert camp of the Israelites between Haradah and Tahath (Nu 32:25-26). See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MAKKEĐAH, ma-kēˈdā (יִלְתָּה, makkedah; Maˈkëdā, Makked): A Canaanite royal city which Joshua captured, utterly destroying the inhabitants, and doing to the king as he had done unto the king of Jericho (Josh 10:28; 12:10). It lay in the Shephelah of Judah (15:41). It was brought into prominence by the flight thither of the 5 kings of the Amorites who, having united their forces for the destruction of Gibeon, were themselves defeated and numbered among their dead. In pursuing their danger, the men of Gibeon sought refuge in the camp at Gilgal beseeching Joshua to save and help them. That energetic commander marched all night with his full strength, fell upon the allies at Gibeon, slew them with a great slaughter, chased the fugitives down the valley by way of Beth-horon, and smote them unto Azekah and unto Makkeđah. It was during this memorable pursuit that in response to Joshua’s appeal:

“Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon,”

the sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down a whole day, until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies.

The 5 kings sought refuge in the cave at Makkeđah, where, by Joshua’s orders, they were blocked in with great stones, until the slaughter of the fugitives should be completed. Then the royal prisoners were brought out, and, after the chiefs of Israel had set their feet upon their necks, Joshua slew them and hanged them on five trees until sunset. This is an illustration of the old practice of impaling enemies after death. The bodies were then cast into the cave where they had sought to hide, and great stones were rolled against the entrance.

The flight of the allies was past Beth-horon and Azekah on the north and Makkeđah on the south. It is named with Gederoth, Beth-dagon and Naama (Josh 15:41). These are probably represented by Katrah, Dajôn and Na'an, so that in this district Makkeđah may be sought. The officers of the Pal Exploration Fund agree in suggesting el-Mughâr, “the cave,” on the northern bank of Wâdy es-Sûrâd, about 4 miles from the sand dunes on the shore. There are traces of old quarrying and many rock-cut tombs with loculi.

“The village stands on a sort of promontory stretching into the valley <...> divided into three plateaux on the lower of these to the S. is the modern village, el-Mughâr, built in front of the caves which are cut out of the sandstone” (Warren). In no other place in the neighborhood are caves found. The narrative, however, speaks not of caves, but of “the cave,” as of one which was notable. On the other hand the events narrated may have lent distinction to some particular cave among the many.

“The cave” would therefore be that associated with the fate of the 5 kings. Such a position is possible.

W. Ewing

MAKTESH, makˈtēš, THE (יוּדִּיתָה, ha-makhˈtēš, “the mortar”); cf Jgs 15:19, “the mortar,” EV “hollow place that is in Lehi”): A quarter of Jerusalem so named, it is supposed, on account of the configuration of the ground and associated (Zeph 1.10) with the “fish gate” and Mishneh (q.v.) or “second quarter.” Most authorities think it was in the northern part of the city, and many consider that the name was derived from the hollowed-out form of that part of the Tyropoion just N. of the walls, where foreign merchants congregated; others have suggested a hollow farther W., now occupied by the muriatan and the three long bazaars.

E. W. G. Masterman


The last book of the OT. Nothing is known of the person of Malachi. Because his name does not occur elsewhere, some scholars indeed have doubted whether Malachi is intended to be the personal name of the prophet. But none of the other prophetic books of the OT is anonymous. The form יִלְתָּה, mal’ăḵī, signifies “my messenger”; it occurs again in 1:3; cf 3:1; cf 3:7. But this form of itself would hardly be appropriate as a proper name without some additional syllable such as נֹדֶה (N. Nāḏeh, i.e. “messenger of Yahweh”). Haggai, in fact, is expressly designated “messenger of Yahweh” (Hag 1:13). Besides, the superscriptions prefixed to the book, in both the LXX and the Vulg, warrant the supposition that Malachi’s full name ended with the syllable Μ." (Hag 1:13). At the same time the LXX τααr the last clause of 1:1, “by the hand of his messenger,” and the Tg reads, “by the hand of my angel, whose name is called Ezra the scribe.” Jerome likewise testifies that the Jews of his day ascribed this last book of prophecy to Ezra (V. Praef, in duodecim prophetas). But if Ezra’s name was originally associated with the book, it would hardly have been dropped by the collectors of the prophetic Canon who lived only a century or two subsequently to Ezra’s time. Certain traditions ascribe the book to Zerubbabel and Nehemiah; others, still, to Malachi, whom they designate as a Levite and a member of the “Great Synagogue.” Certain modern scholars, however, on the basis of the similarity of the name Malachi with the name of the Prophet’s time, may declare it to be anonymous; but this is a rash conclusion without any substantial proof other than supposition. The best explanation is that of Professor G. G. Cameron, who suggests that the termination of the word Malachi is adjectival, and is equivalent to the Lat angelicus, signifying “one charged with a message or mission” (a missionary). The term would thus be an official title; and the thought would not be unsuitable to one whose message closed the prophetic Canon of the OT, and whose mission in behalf of the church was so sacred in character (1-vol HDB).

Opinions vary as to the prophet’s exact date, but nearly all scholars are agreed that Malachi prophesied during the Pers period, and after the reconstruction and dedication of the second temple in 516 BC (cf Mal 1:10; 3:1.10). The prophet speaks of the people’s “gover- nor” (Heb pehāb, Mal 1:8), as do Haggai and Nehemiah (Hag 1:1; Neh 8:14; 12:26). The social conditions portrayed are unquestionably those also of the period of the Restoration. More specifically, Malachi probably lived and labored during the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Serious abuses had crept into Jewish life; the priests had become lax and degenerate, defective and inferior

2. The Prophet’s Times

BC (cf Mal 1:10; 3:1.10). The prophet speaks of the people’s “gover- nor” (Heb pehāb, Mal 1:8), as do Haggai and Nehemiah (Hag 1:1; Neh 8:14; 12:26). The social conditions portrayed are unquestionably those also of the period of the Restoration. More specifically, Malachi probably lived and labored during the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Serious abuses had crept into Jewish life; the priests had become lax and degenerate, defective and inferior...
sacrifices were allowed to be offered upon the temple altar, the people were neglecting their tithes, divorce was common and God's covenant was ignored; just such abuses as we know from the Book of Neh were common in his day (cf Neh 3:5; 5:1–13). Yet, it is doubtful whether Malachi preached during Nehemiah's active governorship; for in Mal 1:6 it is implied that gifts might be offered to the "governor," whereas Nehemiah tells us that he declined all such (Neh 5:15,18). On the other hand, the abuses which Malachi attacked correspond so exactly with those which Nehemiah found on his 2d visit to Jerusalem in 445 BC (Neh 6:14ff) that it seems reasonably certain that he prophesied shortly before that date, i.e. between 445 and 432 BC. As Dr. J. M. P. Smith says, "The Book of Mal fits the situation amid which Nehemiah worked as snugly as a bone fits its socket" (ICC, 7). That the prophet should exhort the people to remember the law of Moses, which was publicly read by Ezra in the year 444 BC, is in perfect agreement with this conclusion, despite the fact that Stade, Cornill and Kautsch argue for a date prior to the time of Ezra. On the other hand, Nägelsbach, Köhler, Orelli, Reuss and Volck rightly place the book in the period between the two visits of Nehemiah (445–432 BC). The book, in the main, is composed of two extended polemics against the priests (1:6–2:9) and the people (2:10–4:3), opening with an exhortation to remember the Law of Moses (4:4–6). After the title or superscription (1:1) the prophecy falls naturally into six divisions: (1) 1:2–5, in which Malachi shows that Jeh still loves Israel (2:15), and closes with an exhortation to remember the Law of Moses (4:4–6). The style and diction (1:1) the prophecy falls naturally into six divisions: (1) 1:2–5, in which Malachi shows that Jeh still loves Israel (2:15), and closes with an exhortation to remember the Law of Moses (4:4–6). (2) 1:6–2:9, a denunciation of the priests, the Levites, who have become neglectful of their sacerdotal office, indifferent to the Law, and unmindful of their covenant relationship to Jeh. (3) 2:10–16, against idolatry and divorce. Some interpret this section metaphorically of Judah as having abandoned the religion of his youth (ver 11). But there are closely related. Many people are obviously required for literally putting away their own Jewish wives in order to contract marriage with foreigners (ver 15). Such marriages, the prophet declares, are not only a form of idolatry (ver 11), but a violation of Jeh's intention to preserve to Himself a "godly seed" (ver 15). (4) 2:17–3:6, an announcement of coming judgment. Men are beginning to doubt whether there is longer a God of justice (ver 17). Malachi reminds that the Lord whom the people seek will suddenly come, both to purify the sons of Levi and to purge the land of sinners in general. The nation, however, will not be utterly consumed (3:6). (5) 3:7–12, in which the prophet promises to give another concrete example of the people's sins: they have failed to pay their tithes and other dues. Accordingly, drought, locusts, and famine have ensued. Let these be paid and the nation will again prosper, and their land will become "a delightful land." (6) 3:13–4:3, a second section addressed to the doubters of the prophet's age. In 2:17, they had said, "Where is the God of justice?" They now murmur: "It is vain to seek God; and what profit is it that we have kept his charge?" The book closes with the words of the good alike prophet (3:14,15). But, the prophet replies, Jeh knows them that are His, and a book of remembrance is being kept; for a day of judgment is coming when the good and the evil will be distinguished; those who work iniquity will be exterminated, while those who do righteously will triumph. (7) 4:4–6, a concluding exhortation to obey the Mosaic Law; with a promise that Elijah the prophet will first come to avert, if possible, the threatened judgment by reconciling the hearts of the nation to one another, i.e. reconcile the zealots of the old to those of the young, and vice versa.

Malachi was content to write prose. His Hebrew is clear and forceful and direct; sometimes almost rhetorical. His figures are as numerous as should be expected in the brief remnants of his sermons which have come down to us, and in every case they are chaste and beautiful (1:6; 3:2.3.17; 4:1–3). His statements are bold and correspondingly effective. The most original feature in his style is the lecture-like method which characterizes his book throughout; more particularly that of question and answer. His style is that of the scribes. It is known as the didactic-dialectic method, consisting first of an assertion or charge, then a fancied objection raised by his hearers, and finally the prophet's refutation of their objection. Eight distinct examples of this peculiarity are to be found in his book, each one containing the same clause in Heb, "Yet ye say" (1:2.6.7; 2:14.17; 7:7.8.13). This debating style is the esp. characteristic of Malachi and identified it "the dialogistic" method. Malachi shows the influence of the schools (cf his use of "also" and "again" in 1:13; 2:13, which is equivalent to our "firstly," "secondly," etc). Malachi's message has a permanent value for us as well as an immediate value for his own time. He was an intense patriot, and accord-

5. Message ingly his message was clean-cut and severe. His primary aim was to encourage a disheartened people who were still looking for Haggai's and Zechariah's optimistic predictions to be fulfilled. Among the lessons of abiding value are the following: (1) That ritual is an important element in religion, but not as an end in itself. Titles and offerings are necessary, but only as the expression of sincere moral and deeply spiritual life (1:11). (2) That a cheap religion avails nothing, and that sacrifices given grudgingly are displeasing to God. Better a temple built with such offerings. (3) That divorce and remarriage with heathen idolators thwart the purpose of God in securing to Himself a peculiar people, whose family life is sacred because it is the nursery of a "godly seed" (2:15). (4) That there is eternal discipline in the Law. Malachi places the greatest emphasis upon the necessity of keeping the Mosaic Law. The priests, he says, are the custodians and expounders of the Law. At their mouth the people should seek knowledge. "To undervalue the Law is easy; to appraise it is a much harder task" (Weiske). With Malachi, no less than with Christ Himself, not one jot or tittle should ever pass away or become obsolete.

LITERATURE—Driver, "Minor Prophets," II, "New Century Bible" (1906); G. A. Smith, "The Book of Twelve Prophets," Expounder's Bible (1898); Dods, Post-Exilic Prophets; "Hag." "Sec. 1, The Handbooks for Bible Classes"; J. M. P. Smith, ICC (1912). Among the numerous other comm. on Mal may be mentioned: Eli- noyer (1807), Marti (1901), Neale (1898), Wellhausen (1898), Van Hoonacker (1898) and Ieorepel (1898). The various Introductions to the book should also be consulted, notably those by Driver (1910), Strack (1906), Wildeboer (1903), Gauthier (1908), Cornill (1907), König (1903), and the art. "Malachi" in the new C. F. Dantis and Bible Enc.: e.g. in EB (1902), by D. C. Gorrey, in HDB (1901), by A. C. G. Smith; in 1-vol HDB (1906), by G. G. Cameron; and IBRE (1907), by G. L. Robinso.
MALACHY, mal’k-ə-kəl: Another form of the name of the prophet “Malachī” (q.v.), found in RV and AV of 2 Esd 1 40.

MALCAM, mal’käm (םלקם), malkām (מלקם), “their king”; AV Malcham:
(1) A chief of the Benjaminites, son of Shaharaim (1 Ch 8 9).
(2) The name of an idol as well as the possessive pronominal form of מלק, melekh, “king” (2 S 12 20 RVM; Jer 49 1.3 [LXX Melchôd]; Zeph 1 5). In Am 1 15 it appears to be best transliterated “their king” as both AV and RV. Only a careful examination of the context can determine whether the word is the proper name of the idol (Molech) or the 3rd personal possessive pronoun for king. The idol is also spelt “Milcom” and “Molech.”

MALCHIAH, mal’k-ə. See Malchiah.

MALCHIEL, mal’k-ə-el (םלכיאל, mal’kē-ēl): Descendants of Malchiel (Nu 26 45).

MALCHIJAH, mal’k-ja (םלכיה, mal’kē-yāh, “Jeh is king”); Mal’kias, Mal’kēson, with variants:
(1) A Levite, descendant of Gershom, of those whom David set over the “service of song” in the worship (1 Ch 6 40).
(2) The head of the 5th course of priests (1 Ch 24 9).
(3) One of the laymen who had taken “strange wives” during the exile (Ezr 10 25); the “Melchias” of 1 Esd 9 26.
(4) Another of the same name (Ezr 10 25; two in same verse). Called “Asibias” in 1 Esd 9 26.
(5) Another under the same offence, son of Harim (Ezr 10 31). “Melchias” in 1 Esd 9 32.
(6) One of the “repairers” who helped with the “tower of the furnaces” (Neh 3 11).
(7) Son of Rechab ruler of Beth-haccerem, repairer of the dung gate (Neh 3 14).
(8) A goldsmith who helped in building the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3 31).
(9) One of those at Ezra’s left hand when he read the law (though possibly one of the above) (Neh 8 4).
In 1 Esd 9 44 “Melchias.”
(10) One of the covenant signatories (Neh 10 3).
(11) The father of Pashhur (Neh 11 12; Jer 21 1; 38 1).
(12) A priest, a singer at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh 12 42).
(13) מלקיה (malékîyâh, as above with un ending): Son of Ham-melech (or, as 1 K 22 26; 2 Ch 28 7 translates it, “king’s son”). Jeremiah was cast into his dungeon or pit (Jer 38 6). AV spells “Malchiah” or “Malchijah” indiscriminately with “Melchias” in Jer 21 1; ERV has “Malchias” in Jer 21 1; 38 1.6, elsewhere “Malchijah”; ARV has “Malchijah” throughout.

HENRY WALLACE

MALCHIRAM, mal’k-ə-răm (םלכירהם, malkērām, “uplifted king”): Son of Jeconiah, descendant of David (1 Ch 3 18).

MALCHI-SHUA, mal’kē-shō’ō (םלכישוע, malkē-shō’ō, “my king saves”): One of the sons of Saul (1 S 14 49; 31 2, AV “Malchishua”; 1 Ch 8 33; 9 36). He was slain by the Philistia with his brothers at the battle of Gilboa (1 Ch 10 10; 1 S 31 2).

MALCHUS, mal’kūs (Μαλχος, Málchos, from מלק, melek, i.e. “counselor” or “king”): The name of the servant of the high priest Caiaphas whose right ear was smitten off by Simon Peter at the arrest of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane (cf Mt 26 51; Mk 14 47; Lk 22 50; Jn 18 10). It is noteworthy that Luke “the physician” alone gives an account of the healing of the wound (Lk 22 51). As Jesus “touched” his ear, and healed him, the ear was not entirely severed from the head. The words of Jesus, “Suffer ye them to speak,” may have been addressed to either the disciples, i.e. “Suffer ye that I thus far show kindness to my captors,” or to those about to bind him, i.e. asking a short respite to heal Malchus. They were not addressed directly to Peter, as the Gr form is used; nor do the words of Jesus there refer to the healing but to the action of his disciple. Akinsim of Malchus, also a servant, was one of those who put the questions which made Peter deny Jesus (Jn 18 26).

C. M. Kerr

MALEFACTOR, mal-ē-fak'ter (κακοποίος, kako-
poiôs, a bad doer, i.e. "evildoer", "criminal",
κακοδιοίς, kakodiō̂s): The former occurs in Jn 18 30 AV, the latter, which is the stronger term, in Lk 23 32 39. The former describes the subject as doing or making evil, the latter as creating or originating the bad, and hence designates the more energetic, aggressive, initiating type of criminality.

MALEEL, ma-le-lē′el, mal′ē-lēl (Mallalḗ, Malladḗ, AV): Gr form of "Mahalel" (Lk 3 37); RV "Mahalelah."  

MALICE, mal′ēs, MALIGNITY, ma-lig′ni-ti (κακία, kakiā, πονερός, ponērôs, κακοφθία, kakōthēia); "Malice," now used in the sense of deliberate ill-will, by its derivation means badness, or wickedness "generally, and was so used in Older Eng. In the Apoc it is the tr of kakiā, "evil," "badness" (Wis 12 10.20; 16 14; 2 Mace 4 50, RV "wickedness"); in Eccles 27 30; 28 7, we have its "perversity" in the more restricted sense as the tr of μητία, "confirmed anger." In the NT "malice" and "maliciousness" are the tr of kakiā (Rom 1 29a; 1 Cor 5 8; 14 20; Col 3 8); malicious is the tr of ponērôs, "evil" (3 Js ver 10, RV "wicked"); it also occurs in Acts 13 47, ver 4 "maligment;" Wis 1 4, RV "that devieth evil;" 2 Mace 5 23; malignity occurs in Rom 1 29b as the tr of kako-
θēia, "evil disposition;" "malevolently" Sus vs 43 62; 2 Mace 14 11, RV "having ill will."  

W. L. WALKER

MALLUS, mal′ōs. See Mallus.

MALLOTHI, mal′ō-thi, ma-lō′thi (mallo-
θi, "my discourse"): Son of Heman, a Kohathite singer (1 Ch 6 38; 25 4). The song service in the house of the Lord was apportioned by David and the captains of the host to the 3 families of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (1 Ch 25 1). Their place in the "counsels" was, however, settled by "lot" (1 Ch 25 20 9). Mallothi was one of Heman's 17 children—14 sons and 3 daughters (1 Ch 25 5)—and was chief of the 19th course of twelve singers into which the temple choir was divided (1 Ch 25 26).  

HENRY WALLACE

MALLOWS, mal′ōs. See SALT-WORT.

MALUCH, mal′uk (malūk, malūkah, "coun-
seller"):  
(1) A Levite of the sons of Merari, ancestor of Ethan the singer (1 Ch 6 44; cf ver 29). 
(2) Son of Bani, among those who had foreign wives (Ezr 10 29). He is a descendant of Judah (1 Ch 9 4) and is the Mamuchus of 1 Esd 30. 
(3) A descendant of Harem, who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10 20). 
(4) 5 Two who sealed the covenant with Neh-
hemiah (Neh 10 427). 
(5) Possibly the same as (4). One of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 12 2). Doubt-
lessly the Melche of ver 14 m.  

HENRY WALLACE

MALUCHI, mal′ū-chi (malūkhi, malūkki, "my counsellor"): A family of priests that came over with Zerubbabel (Neh 10 4; 12 14). May be the patronymic MALUCH, (4) (q.v.).

MALLUS, mal′ōs (Mallōs, Mallus; AV Mal-
los): A city in Cilicia, the inhabitants of which along with those of Tarsus, revolted from An-
tiochus Epiphanes in protest against his action in giving them to his concubine, Antiochus (2 Mace 4 30). The ancient name was Mallus. The river Pyramos divides about 10 miles from the sea, one branch flowing to the W., the other to the E. of the low range of hills along the coast on which stands Kara-Tash. Mallus stood on a height (Strabo, 773) to the E. of the western arm, a short distance from the shore. The site is a little W. of Kara-
Tash, where inscriptions of Antiocheia and Mallus have been found. Tarsus lay about 35 miles to the N.W. The two cities were rivals in trade. The position of Mallus with her harbor on the coast gave her really no advantage over Tarsus, with her river navigable to the city walls. The fine wagon road over the mountain by way of the Cilician Gates opened for her easy access to the interior, compared with that furnished by Mallus by the old caravan track to the N. by way of Adana. This sufficiently explains the greater prosperity of the former city.  

W. EWING

MALOBA THRON, mal-o-bath′ron: RVm sug-
uggests that this tr may be right instead of Bether in the phrase τέμπε ἵμηρα, háre bethr (Cant 2 17). But this spice never grew wild in Pal, and so could hardly have given its name to a mountain, or mountain range. The name Bether ought therefore to be retained, notwithstanding Wellhausen (Prol., 415). The spice is the leaf of the Cassa lignea tree.

MAL TANNEUS, mal-tan-nē′us (Mallanaios, Mallanaios, B and Sweete; Altaneus, Altanaitos, A and Pritzbe—the M being a strike through—because of the final M in the preceding word; AV Altaneus): One of the sons of Asom who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esd 9 33) = "Mattennai" in Ex 10 33.

MAMAIAS, ma-mā′yas. See SAMAIAS, (3).

MAMDAI, man′di-ā, man′di (B, Maβdā, Momdā, A, Mattādā, Mandā): One of those who consented to put away their "strange wives" at Esdras' order (1 Esd 9 34) = AV "Mabdai" = "Be-
nahā" in Ezr 10 35.

MAMMON, man′un (Māwōnās, Mamōnda): A common Aram. word (Malwān, māmōn) for riches, used in Mt 6 24 and in Lk 16 9.11.13. In these passages mammon merely means wealth, and is called "unrighteous," because the abuse of riches is more frequent than their right use. In Lk 16 13 there is doubtless personification, but there is no proof that there was in NT times a Syrian deity called Mammon. The application of the term in Mt is apparent and requires no comment. In Lk, however, since the statement, "Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness," follows as a comment on the parable of the Unjust Steward, there is danger of the inference that Jesus approved the dishonest conduct of the steward and advised His disciples to imitate his example. On the contrary, the statement is added more as a corrective against this inference than as an application. 'Do not infer,' He says, 'that honesty in the use of money is a matter of indifference. He that is unfaithful in little is unfaithful in much. So if you are not wise in the use of earthly treasure how can you hope to be intrusted with heavenly treasure?' The commendation is in the matter of foresight, not in the mere money which he tried to serve two masters, his lord and his lord's creditors, but the thing could not be done, as the sequel shows. Neither can men serve both God
and riches exalted as an object of slavish servitude. Wealth, Jesus teaches, does not really belong to men, but as stewards they may use wealth prudently to their eternal advantage. Instead of serving God and mammon alike we may serve God by the use of wealth, and thus lay up treasures for ourselves in heaven. Again, the parable is not to be interpreted as teaching that the wrong of dishonest gain may be atoned for by charity. Jesus is not dealing with the question of separation. The object is to point out how one may best use wealth, tainted or otherwise, with a view to the future.

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

MAMNITANEMUS, man-ni-te-nae'mus (Μαμνιτανɛμος, Mamnītānēmos, B. Μαμνιτάναιμος, Mamnītānāmos, AV Mamnitanaimus): 1 Esd 9:34, where it represents the two names Mattaniah and Mattenai in the LXX of Ezr 10:37, which probably represent only one person. It must be a corruption of these names. The Aldine gives a still more corrupt form, Μαμνιταναιμος, Mamnitanaimos.

MAMRE, man're (מָמְר, mam're; LXX Μαμρή, Mamrē;): (1) In Gen 14:24 Mamre is mentioned as the name of one of Abraham's allies, who in ver 13 is described as the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and Aner. The name of the grove of trees is evidently considered as derived from this sheikh or chief-tain. The "oaks" ("terebinths") of Mamre where Abram pitched his tent (Gen 14:13; 18:1) are described (13:18) as "in Hebron." Later on MACHPELAI (q.v.) is described as "before," i.e., "to the E. of Mamre" (Gen 23:17; 25:9; 49:30; 50:13), and Mamre is identified with Hebron itself (23:19).

It is probable that this inclosure surrounded a magnificent terebinth; if so, it was at this spot that

before the days of Constantine a great annual fair was held, attended by Jews, Christians and heathen who united to pay honor to the sacred tree, while the well was on the same occasion illuminated, and offerings were made to it. Similar customs survive today at several shrines in Pal. Constantine suppressed these "superstitions," and built a church in the neighborhood, probably the so-called "Abraham's house," Beit Ibrahim of today. The tree which stood here is apparently that mentioned by Jos (BJ, IV, ix, 7) as having continued "since the creation of the world." At this inclosure, too, Jewish women and children were sold at auction after the suppression of the revolt of Bar Cochba.

Whatever the origin of the veneration paid to this terebinth—now long centuries dead and gone—early Christian tradition associated it with Abraham and located Mamre here. This tradition is mentioned by Jerome (4th cent.), by Eucherius (6th cent.), by Aurelius (700 AD) and by Benjamin of Tudela (1165 AD). Among the modern Jews it is looked upon as the site of "Abraham's oak." It is probable that the view that Abraham was connected with this tree is one attached to it much later than its original sanctity; it was originally one of the many "holy trees" of the land venerated by primitive Semitic religious feeling, and the nearness of Hebron caused the Bible story to be attached to it. Judging from the Bible data, it appears to be too far from Hebron and Machpelah to suit the conditions; the site of Mamre must have been nearer to Deir el Arba'in, but it has probably been entirely lost since very early times.

For a very good discussion about Mamre see
Mambré by Le R. P. Abel des Frères Prêcheurs in the Conférences de Saint Étienne, 1909-10 (Paris).

(2) An Amorite chief, owner of the "oaks" mentioned above (Gen 14:13).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

MAMUCHUS, ma-mu'kus (Μάμουχος, Māmouchos); One of those who put away their "strange wardrobe" (Ezr 9:30); identical with "Malchus" in Ex 10:20.

MAN. See ANTHROPOLOGY.

MAN, NATURAL, na't-'ral, nach-'u-ral (ψυχικός ἀνθρώπος, psuchikós anthrōpos); Man as he is by nature, contrasted with man as he becomes by grace. This phrase is exclusively Pauline.

I. Biblical Meaning.—The classical passage in which it occurs is 1 Cor 2:14 AV: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." In his anthropology Paul uses four groups of descriptive adjs. in contrasted pairs: (1) the old man and the new man (Rom 6:5; Eph 4:22; Col 3:10; Eph 2:15; 4:24; Col 3:10); (2) the outward man and the inward man (2 Cor 4:16; Rom 7:22; Eph 3:16); (3) the carnal man and the spiritual man (Rom 8:1-14; 1 Cor 3:1.3.4); (4) the natural man and the spiritual man (2 Cor 4:3-3.4; Eph 2:3; 1 Cor 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; 15:46; Gal 6:1). A study of these passages will show that the adjs. "old," "outward," "carnal," and "natural" describe man, from different points of view, prior to his conversion; while the adj. "new," "inward" and "spiritual" describe him, from different points of view, after his conversion. To elucidate the meaning, the expositor must respect these antitheses and let the contrasted words throw light and clarity upon each other.

The "old man" is the "natural man" considered chronologically—prior to that operation of the Holy Spirit by which he is renovated into

1. The Old the "new man" Man

The old house is the house as it was before it was remodelled: an old garment is the garment as it was before it was re-fashoined; and the "old man" is man as he was before he was regenerated and sanctified by the grace of the Spirit. "Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might henceforth have no power over us to bring us intobondage unto sin." (Rom 6:6 AV). Here the "old man" is called the "body," of sin; with the same implications it is called the body of the soul or spirit, and is to be "crucified" and "destroyed," in order that man may no longer be the "servant of sin." "Put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt... Put on the new man, which is created after God's likeness, having the righteousness and true holiness" (Eph 4:22.24 AV). Here the "old man" is said to be "corrupt," and we are called upon to "put it off." The figure is that of putting off old clothes which are unclean, and putting on those garments which have come from the wash clean and snowy white. We have the same idea, in a different language and with a slightly different imagery, in Col 3:10.

When Paul calls the "natural man," the "old man," and the "body of sin," which is "coiled up" in its nature and "deeds," and tells us that it must be "crucified" and "destroyed" and "put off," in order that we may "not serve sin," he has these "righteousness" and "true holiness" and "knowledge" and the "image of God, we got some conception of the moral meaning which he is endeavoring to convey by these contrasts (Gal 5:19-24). He has reference to that sinful nature which is as old as the individual is old as the race of which he is a member, which must be graciously recreated according to that gospel which he preaches. It is the old man and the "body of sin," the flesh, as "the old man" is a figure of speech for that sinful human nature, common to us all. It is equivalent to the theological phrases: the "sinful inclination," the "sinful disposition," the "apostate will," "original sin," "native depravity," "propensity," and in the understanding as blindness, in the heart as hardness, in the will as obstinacy. See MAN, NEW.

Robert Alexander WEBB

2. The Out- the outward manward Man by day" (2 Cor 4:16). Now what sort of man is the "outward man" as contrasted with the "inward man?" In Gr, the}

é-ó-anthrópos is set over against the éso-anthrópos. See OUTWARD MAN.

"The contrast here drawn between the outward man and the inward man, though in contrast in Rom 7:22 between the "law in the members" and the "inner man," and in Eph 4:22 between the "old man" and the "new man" is not precisely the same. Those contrasts relate to the difference between the sensual and the moral nature, as "flesh" and "spirit"; and to this difference between the material and the spiritual nature" (Stanley, in loc.).

"The outward man" is the body, and "the inward man" is the soul, or immaterial principles of the human make-up. As the body is wasted by the afflictions of life, the soul is renewed; what is death to the body is life to the soul; as afflictions depotentiate man's physical organism, they impotentiate man's spiritual principle. That is, the afflictions of life, culminating in death itself, have diametrically opposite effects upon the body and upon the soul. They kill the one; they quicken the other.

"The inward man" is the whole human nature as renewed and indwelt and dominated by the Spirit of God as interpreted by the spirit of grace. As the one is broken down by the adverse dispensations of life, the other is built up by the sanctifying discipline of the Spirit.

There is another Pauline antithesis which it is necessary for us to interpret in order to understand what he means by the "natural man."

3. The Carnal Man

It is the distinction which he draws between the "carnal mind" and the "spiritual mind." The critical reference is Rom 8:1-14. In this place the "carnal mind" is identified with the "law of death," and the "spiritual mind" is identified with the "law of the Spirit." These two "laws" are two principles and codes: the one makes man to be "cruel against God" and leads to "death"; the other makes him the friend of God, and conducts to "life and peace." The word "carnal" connotes all that is fallen and sinful and unregenerate in man's nature. In its gross sense the "carnal" signifies that which is contrary to nature, or nature expressing itself in low and bestial forms of sin.

"The carnal mind" is the "old man," the "outward man," the "carnal man"—man as he is by nature, as he is firstborn, contra dictively moral nature, that resultant of our spiritual and immaterial nature, and that resultant of that depraved nature which we inherit from Adam fallen, the source and seat of all actual and personal transgressions.

4. The Natural Man

Regenerated. There is an "old" life, an "outward" life, a "carnal" life, a "natural" life, as contrasted with the "new" life, the "inward" life, the "spiritual" life, the "true" life. The "natural man" is a bold and vivid personification of that depraved nature which we inherit from Adam fallen, the source and seat of all actual and personal transgressions.
MAN, NEW (νέος or καινὸς ἰδρυμος, νέος or καινός ἀνθρώπος): Generally described, the "new" man is man as he becomes under the transforming power of the Holy Spirit, contrasted with man as he is by nature. The phrase has (1) its Bib., and (2) its theological, meaning.

1. Biblical Meaning.—There are four Bib. contrasts which must be considered as opposites: (1) the "old man" (παλαῖος ἀνθρώπος) and the "new man" (νεος or καινός ἀνθρώπος); (2) the "outward man" (ἐξωτερικὸς ἄνθρωπος) and the "inward man" (ἐσωτερικὸς ἄνθρωπος); (3) the "carnal man" (παρακάρδιος ἄνθρωπος) and the "spiritual man" (πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος); (4) the "natural man" (ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος) and the "spiritual man" (πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος). These are not four different sorts of men, but four different sorts of man. Take up these antitheses in their reverse order, so as to arrive at some clear and impressive conception of what the Bib. writer means by the "new man."

The "spiritual man" is a designation given in opposition to the "carnal man" and to the "natural man" (Rom 8 1–14; 1 Cor 2 15; 3 1.3.4; 2 14; 3 11; 14 37; 15 Spiritual Man 46; Gal 6 1; Eph 2 3). All three of these terms are personifications of human nature and human nature viewed as ruled and dominated by sensual appetites and fleshly desires—as energized by those impulses which have close association with the bodily affections. The "natural man" is humanized and dominated by the unsanctified reason—those higher powers of the soul not yet influenced by Divine grace. The "spiritual man" is this same human nature after it has been seized upon and interpreted and determined by the Holy Spirit. The word "spiritual" is sometimes used in a poetical and idealistic sense, as when we speak of the spirituality of beauty; sometimes in a metaphysical sense, as when we speak of the spirituality of the soul; but in its prevalent Bib. and evangelical sense it is an adj. with the Holy Spirit: as its own-form. The spiritual life is that life of which the Holy Spirit is the author and preserver; and the "spiritual man" is that nature or character in man which the Holy Spirit originates, preserves, determines, disciplines, sanctifies and glorifies.

The "outward man" is the whole human nature viewed as internally and centrally regenerated, as contrasted with the "outward man" (2 Cor 3 16; Rom 7 22; Eph 2 14; see Man, Outward). This phrase indicates the whole human nature conceived as affected from within—in the secret, inside, and true springs of activity—by the Holy Spirit of God. Such a change—regeneration—is not superficial, but a change in the inner central self; not a mere external reform, but an internal transformation. Grace operates not from the circumference toward the center, but from the center toward the circumference, of life. The product is a man renovated in his "inward parts," changed in the dynamic center of his heart.

The "new man" is an appellation yielded by the contrasted idea of the "old man" (Rom 6 6; Eph 4 22; Col 3 9; Eph 2 15; 4 24; Col 3 10). The "old" is "corrupt" and even evil "deeds;" the "new" possesses the "image of God" and is marked by "knowledge," "righteousness," and "holiness." There are two Gr. words for "new."

3. The New Man Man.—The former means new in the sense that the new-born child is a young thing; the latter means "new" in the sense of renovated, as when the house which has been rebuilt is called a new house. The converted man is a "new" (νεο-ανθρώπος) in the sense that he is a "babe in Christ," and a "new" (καινο-ανθρώπος) in the sense that his moral nature is renovated and built over again.

In the NT there are 5 different vbs. used to express the action put forth in making the "old man" a "new man." In Eph 2 10 and 4 24, he is said to be "created" (κτίσθαι), a renovated creature. Out of the "old man" the Holy Spirit has created the "new man." (2) In 1 Pet 1 23 and 2 2, he is to be "renewed again" (αναγεννηθῆ), and the product is a "new" (καινός). (3) In Eph 5 25 and elsewhere, he is said to be "quickened" (συνίστασθαι), and the product is represented as a creature which has been made "alive from the dead" (Rom 6 13).

The "old man," being "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph 2 1), is brought forth from his sin-grave by a spiritual resurrection. (4) In Eph 4 22 he is represented as being made "young" (γεννηθῆ), and the product is a child of the Spirit at the commencement of his religious experience. The "old man," dating his history back to the fall in Eden, has become, through the Spirit, a young man in Christ Jesus. (5) In 2 Cor 5 17 and in Rom 12 2, he is said to be "renovated" (ανακαινισθῆ). The "old man" is renovated into the "new man." Sinful human nature is taken by the Spirit and morally renewed.

II. Theological Meaning.—The "new man" is the converted, regenerated man. The phrase has its significance for the great theological doctrine of regeneration as it expands into the broad work of sanctification. Is the inner dead? Regeneration is a new life. Is holiness no-existent in him? Regeneration is a new creation. Is he born in sin? Regeneration is a new birth. Is he determined by his fallen, depraved nature? Regeneration is a spiritual determination. Is he the subject of carnal appetites? Regeneration is a holy apprehensiveness. Is he thought of as the old sinful man? Regeneration is a new man. Is the sinful mind blinded? Regeneration is a new understanding. Is the heart stony? Regeneration is a heart of flesh. Is the conscience section of regeneration is no good conscience. Is the will impotent? Regeneration is a new impotency. The regenerated man is a man with a new governing disposition—a "new man," an "inward man," a "spiritual man."

(1) The "whole regenerate man"—is not a theological transubstantiation: a being whose substance has been supernaturally converted into some other sort of substance.

(2) He is not a metaphysical transmutation: a species of one kind which has been naturally evolved into a species of another kind.

(3) He is not a metaphysical reconstruction: a being with a new mental equipment.

(4) He is an evangelical conversion: an "old man" with a new regnant moral disposition, an "outward man" with a new inward fons et origo of moral life; a "natural man" with a new renovated spiritual heart. See Man, Natural; Regeneration.
2. The Varying Interpretations

There is the view, favored by "moderns," that the passage contains no genuine prediction (Paul "could not know" the future), but represents a speculation of the apostle's own, based on Dei 22:8 (ii. 9. 10). But for such a reading, all the text of this passage is full of meaning. In any case, the position of the teaching (see ANTICHRIST; BELLIA; of Boussert, Der Antichrist, 93 ff., etc.). This view will not satisfy those who believe in the reality of Paul's apocalyptic vision (6). Some connect the description with Caligula, Nero, or others of the Roman emperors. Caligula, indeed, ordered supplication to be made to himself as the supreme god and wished to set up his statue in the temple of Jesus (Suet. Cal. 33, Jos. Ant., XV. 8, viii). But this was long before Paul's visit to Thessalonica, and the acts of such a madman could not furnish the basis of a prediction so elaborate and important as the present (cf. Lünemann and Boussert). (7) The favorite Protestant interpretation (a) refers the prediction to the papacy, in whom, it is contended, many of the blasphemous features of Paul's representation are unmistakably realized. The "temple of God" is here understood to be the church; the power of the Rom emperors (b) the "man of sin" not an individual, but the personification of an institution or system. It is difficult, however, to resist the impression that the apostle regards "the mystery of lawlessness" as a mystery in an individual—a personal Antichrist—and in any case the interpretation oversteeps everything that can be conceived of as even nominally Christian. (4) There remains the view held by most of the Fathers, and in recent times with modified approbation, that "the man of sin" is the Antichrist (5). This passage is an individual in whom, previous to the advent, sin will embody itself in its most lawless and God-denying form. The attempts to identify this individual with historical characters may be set aside; but the idea is not thereby invalidated. The difficulty is that the apostle evidently conceives of the manifestation of the "man of sin" as taking place, certainly not immediately, but at no very remote period—not 2,000 years later—and as connected directly with the final advent of Christ, and the judgment. It is often asked, with apparent reference to the "millennial period," either before or after. It seems safest, in view of the difficulties of the passage, to confine one's self to the general idea it embodies, leaving details to be interpreted by the actual fulfilment. There is much support in Scripture—not least in Christ's own teaching (cf Mt 13 30; 24 11-14; Lk 18 8)—for the belief that before the final triumph of Christ's kingdom there will be a period of great tribulation, of faith, of apostasy, of culmination of both good and evil ("Let both grow together until the harvest," Mt 13 30), with the seeming triumph for the time of the evil over the good. There will be a crisis-time—a sharp, severe, and probably by a decisive interposition of the Son of Man ("the manifestation of his coming," RVm "Gr presence"); in what precise form may be left undetermined. Civil law and government—the existing bulwark against anarchy (in Paul's time represented by the Roman power)—will be swept away by the rising tide of evil, and lawlessness will prevail. It may be that impiety will concentrate itself, as the passage says, in some individual head; or this may belong to the form of the apostle's apprehension in a case when "gods" and "his image" are really full revealed: an apprehension to be enlarged by subsequent revelations (see REVELATION, BOOK OF, or left to be corrected by the actual course of God's providence. The kernel of the prediction is not, more that at the OT period depended on its literal realization in every detail. Neither does the final manifestation of evil exclude partial and anticipatory realizations, embodying many of the features of the prophecy. See Thessalonians, Second Epistle to, III. JAMES OPP.

MAN OF WAR. See War.

MAN, OLD. See MAN, NEW; OLD MAN.

MAN, OUTWARD. See MAN, NATURAL; OUTWARD MAN.

MAN, SON OF. See SON OF MAN.

MANAEN, man'a-en (Mavrov, Manaen, Gr form of Heb name "Menahem," meaning "consoler"); Manaeon is mentioned, with Barnabas, Saul and others, in Acts 13:1, as one of the "prophets and teachers" in the recently founded church at Antioch, at the time when Barnabas and Saul were "separated" by Divine call for their missionary service. He is further described as "the foster brother [sotrophos] of Herod the tetrarch" (i.e. HEROD ANTIPAS, q.v.). He was a handsome, influential one, whether he himself ranked among the "prophets," or perhaps only among the "teachers." JAMES OPP.

MANAHATH, man'a-hath (אָמָהְתָּה, mānahāth; Manahath, Machanath): (1) A place to which certain Benjamites, victims, apparently, of intra-tribal jealousy, were carried captive (1 Ch 8 6). Of this town the Manahathites were probably natives. It is possibly denoted by Manacho which LXX adds to the list of towns in Josh 18:7-11. This place is named along with Bether (Bittir). The name seems to be preserved in that of Matlah, a large village not far from Bittir, S.W. of Jerus. The change of l to n, and vice versa, is not uncommon. The same place may be intended by Menahah (Jgs 20 13.)
MANAHATHITES, man-a’-hath-its (מָנָחָתים, mānāḥāths). Mentioned in 1 Esdr 8:30. See Manahathites. MANASSEAS, man-a’sé-as (מָנַסֶּהַּס, Ma’asheas). One of those who had married "strange wives" (1 Esd 9:31). See Manasseh. MANASEH: One of the sons of Joseph by Asenath, daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On. See Manasseh. MANASSEH: Of the children of Machir, son of Manasseh. See Manassseh. MANASSEH, man-as’eh (מַנָּשֶׁה, mānasheh), "causing to forget"; of Gen 41:51; Mal 1:6; Man 3:1. (1) The firstborn of Joseph by Asenath, daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On. (2) The son of Manasseh, half of which, with Gad and Reuben, occupied the E of Jordan (Nu 27:1, etc.). See next article. (3) The "Manasseh" of Jgs 18:30-31 AV is really an intentional mistake for the name Moses. A small name (n) has been inserted over and between the first and second Heb letters in the word Moses, thus נֵעֶשׁ for נִעְשׁ. The reason for this is that the individual in question is mentioned as priest of a brazen image at Dan. His proper name was Moses. It was felt to be a disgrace that such a one bearing that honored name should keep it intact. The insertion of the n with the disgrace and, moreover, gives to the person a name already too familiar with idolatrous practices; for King Manasseh's 55 years of sovereignty were thus disgraced. (4) King of Judah. See separate article. (5) Son of Pahath-Moab (g.v.), who had married a foreign wife (Exr 10:30). Manasseh in 1 Esd 9:31. (6) The Manasses of 1 Esd 9:33. A layman of the family of Hashum, who put away his foreign wife (Exr 10:31). In RV of Mt 1:10 and Rev 7:6 the spelling "Manassah" is given for AV "Manasseh." The latter is the spelling of the husband of Judith (Jdt 8:27; 10:3; 16:32-22.24.29); of a person named in the last words of Tobit and otherwise unknown (Tob 14:10), and also the name given to a remarkable prayer probably referred to in 2 Ch 33:18, which Manasseh (4) is said to have uttered at the end of his long, unsatisfactory life. See Manasseh, Praxias. 1a. Manasseh in Jgs 12:4, RV reads "Manassah" for AV "Manasses." HENRY WALLACE MANASES: Following the Bib. account of Manasseh (patriarch, tribe, and territory) we find that he was the elder of Joseph's two sons by Asenath, the daughter of Joseph Poti-pherah, priest of On (Gen 41:51). The birth of a son marked the climax of Joseph's happiness after the long bitterness of his experience. In the joy of the moment, the dark years were forgotten; therefore he called the name of the firstborn Manasseh ("causing to forget"), for, said he, God hath made me to forget all my toil. When Jacob was near his end, Joseph brought his two sons to his father who blessed them. Himself the younger son who had received the blessing of the firstborn, Jacob preferred Ephraim, the second son of Joseph, to M.'s elder brother, thus indicating the relative positions of their descendants (Gen 48). Before Joseph died he saw the children of Machir the son of M. (50:23). Machir was born to M. by his concubine, an Amorite (1 Ch 7:14). Whether he married Maacah before leaving for Egypt is not said. She was the sister of Huppim and Shuppim. Of M.'s personal life no details are recorded in Scripture. According to Jewish tradition he became steward of his father's house, and acted as interpreter between Joseph and his brethren. At the beginning of the desert march the number of M.'s men of war is given at 32,200 (Nu 1:34 a). At the 26 census they had increased to 52,700 (26:34). Their position in the tribes in the wilderness was with the tribe of Benjamin, by the standard of the tribes in the portion in the plains of Moab, M. is named before Ephraim, and appears as much the stronger tribe (26:28 f). The main military exploits in the conquest of Eastern Palestine were performed by Manassites, Machir, son of M., conquered the Amorites and Gilgal (32:30). Jair, the son of M., took all the region of Gilead containing three scores of cities; he called by his own name, "Havwoth-jair" (32:41; Dt 3:14 f). Nobah captured Kenath and the villages thereof (Nu 32:42; Josh 17:15). Land for half the tribe was thus provided, their territory stretching from the northern boundary of Gad to an undetermined frontier in the N., marching with Geshur and Maacah on the W., and with the desert on the E. The warriors of this half-tribe passed over with those of Reuben and Gad before the host of Israel, and took their share in the conquest of Western Palestine (Josh 22). They helped to raise the great altar in the Jordan valley, which so nearly led to disastrous consequences (22:10 f). Golan, the city of refuge, lay within their territory. The possession of Ephraim and Manassah W. of the Jordan appears to have been undivided at first (Josh 17:16 f). The portion which ultimately fell to M. marched with Ephraim on the S., with Asher and Issachar on the N., running out to the sea on the W., and falling into the Jordan valley on the E. (17:7 f). The long dwindling slopes to westward and the flat reaches of the plain included much excellent soil. Within the territory of Issachar and Asher, Beth-shan, Iblees, Don, Edor, Taanach and Megiddo, with their villages, were assigned to M. Perhaps the men of the West lacked the energy and enterprise of their eastern brethren. They failed, in any case, to expel the Cannanites from these cities, and for long this great chain of fortresses seemed to mock the strength of Israel (Josh 17:11 f). Ten cities W. of the Jordan, in the portion of M., were given to the Levites, and 13 in the eastern portion (Josh 21:5-6). M. took part in the two glorious conflicts with the host of Sisera (Jgs 5:14). Two famous judges, Gideon and Jephthah, belonged to this tribe. The men of the half-tribe E. of Jordan were noted for skill and valor as warriors (1 Ch 5:18.23 f). Some men of
M. had joined David before the battle of Gilboa (1 Ch 12:19). Others, all mighty men of valor, and captains in the host, fell to him on the way to Ziklag, and helped him against the band of the Philistines (vs 20 f.).

3. Its Place in Later History

18,000 men, expressed by name, came to David at Hebron to make him king (ver 31); while those who came from the E. numbered, along with the men of Reuben and Judah, 120,000. David organized the eastern tribes under 2,700 overseers for every matter pertaining to God and for the affairs of the king (26:32). The rulers of M. were, in the W., son of Pedahiah, and in the E., Ido, son of Zebadiah (28:1). They designedly came to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (2 Ch 30:11). Although not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary, they ate the Passover. Pardon was sure to them by the king, because they set their hearts to seek God (vs 18 f.).

Of the eastern half-tribe it is said that they went a-whoring after the gods of the land, and in consequence they were overwhelmed and expatriated by Palti and Tiglath-Pileser, kings of Assyria (1 Ch 5:25 f.). Reference to the idolatries of the western half-tribe are also found in 2 Ch 31:1; 34:6.

There is a portion for M. in Ezekiel's ideal picture (48:4), and the tribe appears in the list in Rev (7:6).

The genealogies in Josh 17:1 f.; Nu 26:28–34; 1 Ch 2:21–23; 7:14–19 have fallen into confusion as they stand. As they are, they are mutually contradictory, and it is impossible to harmonize them.

The theories of certain modern scholars who reject the existence of these tribes are beset with difficulties: e.g. the name is derived from the Aram. massa, “to injure a tendon of the leg.” M., the Pel part, would thus be the manner of a supernatural being of whom the infliction of such an injury was characteristic. It is not clear which of the wretches at the Jabbok suffered the injury. As Jacob is said to have prevailed with gods and men, the suggestion that it was his antagonist who was lamed. “It would appear therefore that in the original story the epithet Masseah was a fitting title of Jacob himself, which might be borne by the king, as in the case of Gad” (E.B., n.y., par. 4).

It is assumed that the mention of Machir in Jgs 5:14 designates the Masseatis at that time on the W. of the Jordan. The raids by members of the tribe on Eastern Pal must therefore have taken place long after the days of Moses, which reasoning is precarious. After the mention of Reuben (vs 15:16), Ephish (ver 17) may refer to the same if this warlike tribe were passed over (Guthrie). Machir, then probably the strongest clan, stands for the whole tribe, and may be supposed to indicate particularly the noted soldiers of the eastern half.

4. The relation of the genealogies, the “difficult name” Zelahpahad must be got rid of. Among the suggestions made is one by Dr. Cheyne, which first supposes the existence of a name Salash, and then makes Zelahpahad a corruption of this.

The genealogies certainly present difficulties, but otherwise the narrative is incoherent and self-inconsistent without resort to such questionable expedients as those referred to above.

W. Ewing

MANASSEH: A king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah; reigned 55 years (2 K 21:1; 2 Ch 33:1), from c 685 onward. He was one of the few royal names not compounded with the name of Jeh (his son Amon's was the only other if, as an Assyrian inscription gives it, the full name of Ahaz was Jehoahaz or Ahaziah); but it was no heathen name like Amon, but identical with that of the elder son of Joseph born within the 38 years, years of trembling faith and tender hope (of Isa 38:15 f.), his name may perhaps memorialize the father's sacred feelings; the name of his mother Hophrahiah too was used long afterward as the symbol of the happy union of the land with its loyal sons (Isa 60:4). All this, however, was long forgotten in the memory of Manasseh's apostate career.

I. Sources of His Life.—The history (2 K 21:1–18) refers for the "rest of his acts" to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah," but the body of the account, instead of reading like state annals, is almost entirely a censure of his idolatrous reign in the spirit of the prophets and of the Deuteronomic strain of literature. The "rest of his acts" among the acts of the kings of Israel," and mentions his prayer (a prayer ascribed to him in the Apocrypha) and "the words of the seers that spoke to him in the name of Jeh." This history of Ch mentions his captive journey to Babylon (2 Ch 33:10–13), also his building operations in Jerusalem and his resumption of Jeh-worship (vs 14–17), which the earlier source lacks. From these sources, which it is not the business of this article either to verify or question, the estimate of his reign is to be deduced.

II. Character of His Reign.—During his reign, Assyria, principally under Esar-haddon and Assur-bani-pal, was at the height of its power; and his long reign was the peaceful and uneventful life of a willing vassal, contented to count as tributary king in an illustrious world-empire, hospitable to all its religious and cultural ideas, and ready to take his part in its wars and other enterprises. The two mentions of his name in Assyrian inscriptions (see G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 182) both represent him in this tributary light.

His journey to Babylon mentioned in 2 Ch 33:11 need not have been the penalty of rebellion; more likely it was such an enforced act of allegiance as was perhaps imposed on all provincial rulers who had incurred or would avert suspicion of disloyalty. Nor was his fortification of Jerusalem after his return less necessary against domestic than foreign aggression; the more so, indeed, as in so long and undisturbed a reign his capital, which was now practically synonymous with his realm (Esar-haddon calls him "king of the city of Judah"), became increasingly an important center of wealth and commercial prosperity. Of the specific events of his reign, however, other than religious, less is known than of almost any other.

That the wholesale idolatry by which his reign is mainly distinguished was of a reactionary and indeed conservative nature may be 2. Reaction—understood alike from what it sought—idolatry to maintain and from what it had to react against. On the one side was the tremendous wave of ritual and mechanical heathen cultus which, proceeding from the world-centers of culture and civilization (of Isa 2 6–8), was drawing all the tributary lands, Judah with the rest, into its almost irresistible sweep. M., it would seem, met this not as the temper of an amateur, as had his grandfather Ahas, but in the temper of a fanatic. Everything old and new that came to his purview was of momentous religious value—except only the simple and austere demands of prophetic insight. He restored the debasing cultus of the aboriginal Nature-worship, with which his father had suppressed, thus making Judah revert to the sterile Baal-cultus of Ahab; but his blind devotion in the black arts so prevalent in all the surrounding nations, imported the elaborate worship of the heathen's addicted gods, with its temple-courts with its numerous rites and altars; even went to the horrible extremes of human sacrifice, making an institution of what Ahaz had tried as a desperate expedient. All this, which to the matured prophetic sense was heading wickedness, was the mark of a desperately earnest soul,
seeking blindly in this wholesale way to propitiate the mysterious Divine powers, his nation’s God among them, who seemed so to have the world’s affairs in their inscrutable control. On the other side, there confronted him the prophetic voice of a religion which decried all insincere ritual (‘wickedness and worship,’ Isa 1:3), made straight demands on heart and conscience, and had already vividly in the faith which had wrought the deliverance of 701. It was the flight of the decadent formal against the uprisings spiritual; and, as in all such struggles, it would grasp at any expedient save the one plain duty of yielding the heart to repentance and trust.

3. Persecution through the permeating influence of literature and education the “remnant” was becoming a power to be reckoned with. It is in the nature of things that such an innovating movement must encounter persecution; the significant thing is that already there was so much of it. Persecution as truly the offspring of fear as of fanaticism. M.’s persecution of the prophets and their adherents (tradition has it that the aged Isaiah was one of his victims) was from their point of view an enormity of wickedness. Too much a movement to be quite so simple; it looks also like the anti-pathy of an inveterate formal order to a vital movement that it cannot understand. The vested interests of almost universal heathenism must needs die hard, and “much innocent blood was shed of people guilty only in the upper hand.” To say this of M.’s murderous zeal is not to justify it; it is merely to concede its sadly mistaken sincerity. It may well have seemed to him that a nation’s piety was at stake, as if a world’s religious culture were in peril.

The Chronicler, less austere in tone than the earlier historian, preserves for us the story that, like Saul of Tarsus after him, M. got his eyes open to the truer meaning of things; that after his humiliation and mind repentance in Bab. he “knew that Jeh he was God” (2 Ch 33:10–13).

He had the opportunity to see a despotic idolatry, its evils with its splendors, in its own home; a first-fruit of the thing that the Heb exiles were afterward to return, accordingly, he removed the altars that had encroached upon the sacred precincts of the temple, and restored the ritual of the Jeh-service, without, however, removing the high places. It would seem to have been merely the concession of Jeh’s right to a specific cultus of His own, with perhaps a mitigation of the more offensive extremes of exotic worship, while the toleration of the various fashionable forms remained much as before. But this in itself was something, was much; it gave Jeh His chance, so to say, among rivals; and the growing spiritual fiber of the heart of Israel could be trusted to do the rest. It helps us also the better to understand the situation when, only two years after M.’s death, Josiah came to the throne, and to understand why he and his people were so ready to accept the religious sanity of the Deuteronomic law. He did not succeed, after all, in committing his nation to the wholesale away of heathenism. M.’s reactionary reign was indeed not without its good fruits; the crisis of religious syncretism and externalism was met and passed.

JOHN FRANKLIN GENNUP

MANASSES, ma-nas'æs (Mânas's, Manasses, B, Manasseh):

1. One who had married a “strange wife” (1 Esd 9:33) = “Manasses” of Exr 10:33.

2. The wealthy husband of Judith; died of sunstroke when employed at the barley harvest (Jth 8:21; 10:3; 16:22 ff).

3. A person mentioned in Tob 14:10, who “gave alms, and escaped the snare of death.” It must be admitted that Manasses here is an awkward reading and apparently interrupts the sense, which would run more smoothly if Manasses were omitted and Achiacharus read. There is great variety of text in this verse. B (followed by Fritzsche, Libri apoc. Test Gr., 1871) reads en to poid√α√γα me elémmousèn exèthilen, where Manasses is omitted and Achiacharus is understood as the subject. Itala and Syr go a step further and read Achiacharus as subject. But B (followed by Swete, AV and RV) reads Manasses, which must be the correct reading on the principle of being the most difficult. Explanations have been offered (1) that Manasses is simply the Heb name for Achiacharus, it not being uncommon for a Jew to have a Gr and a Heb name; (2) that on reading ‘Aadw, Amôn, Manasses was inserted for Achiacharus according to 2 Ch 33:22 ff; (3) that M. here is an incorrect reading for Nasbas (Tob 11:18), identified by Grotius with Achiacharus as impossible at present to arrive at a satisfactory explanation (Fuller, Speaker’s Comm.). There is as great uncertainty as to the person who conspired against Manasses: ‘Aadw, Amôn, in A, followed by AV and RV, who is some one identified with the Hanan of Est, and Achiacharus with Mordecai; A’dor, Addin, in B, followed by Swete; Itala Nadab; Syr Ahab (Acab).

4. A king of Judah (Mt 1:10 AV, Gr form, RV “Manassiah”), whose prayer forms one of the apocryphal books. See MANASSES, Bible.

5. The elder son of Joseph (Rev 7:6, AV Gr form, RV “Manasseh”).

S. ANGUS

MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF:

1. Name
2. Canonicit and Position
3. Contents
4. Original Language
5. Authenticity
6. Author and Motive
7. Date
8. Text and Versions

(1) Greek
(2) Latin

LITERATURE

The Prayer of Manasses purports to be, and may in reality be, the prayer of that king mentioned in 2 Ch 33:13.18 f.

In Cod. A it is called simply “A Prayer of Manasses,” in the London Polyglot “A Prayer of Manasses, King of the Jews.” In the Vulg. title in the Vulg. is “A Prayer of Manasses, King of Judah, when He was Held Captive in Babylon.” In Baxter’s Apoc, Gr and Eng, this Prayer appears at the end with the heading, “A Prayer of Manasses, son of Ezechias” (= Hezekiah).

The Greek church is the only one which has consistently reckoned this Prayer as a part of its Bible. Up to the time of the Council of Trent (1546–63 AD), it formed a part of the Greek, Vulg, and Syriac Bibles. But by that council it was relegated with 3 and 4 (1 and 2) Esd to the appendix (which included uncanonical scriptures), lest they should become wholly lost, since they are occasionally cited by the Fathers and are found in printed copies. Yet it is wholly absent from the Vulg of Sixtus V, though it is in the Appendix of the Vulg of Clement VIII. Its position varies in MSS, VSS and printed editions of the LXX. It is most frequently found among the odes or canticles following the Psalter in cod. A. (the Zurich Palat.) and in Ludolf’s Ethiopic Palat. In Swete’s LXX the Ps Sol followed by
Manasses, Prayer
Manifold
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The odes ("]šāi, ʿōdai"), of which Pr Man is the 8th, appear as an Appendix after 4 Mace in vol III. It was placed after 2 Ch in the original Vulg, but in the 14th cent. Vesp, it was shifted before 2 Ch and corrected by 3 and 4 (1 and 2) Esd in the apocryphal Appendix. It is found in all MSS of the Armenian Bible, where, as in Svet's LXX, it is one of many odes. Though not included in Coverdale's Bible or the Geneva Vts, it was inserted (at the Apostolic or Luther's tr.) in Mathew's Bible and in the Bishops' Bible, whence it passed into our EV.

According to 2 Ch 33 (cf 2 K 21) Manasses was exiled by the Assyrians to Babylon as a pen- 
3. Contents. penitent and earnestly prayed to God for pardon and deliverance. God answered his prayer and restored him to his kingdom and to the throne. Though the prayer is mentioned in 2 Ch 33 13.18 f. it is not given, but this full Version

4. Original Language

5. Authenticity

6. The Author

7. Date

That the author was an Alexandrian Jew is made possible by the (Gr) language he employs and by the sentiments he expresses. See also 2 K 21.

The Prayer as described first, the text as presented by 3 and 4 Esd, is as follows. With 3 and 4 Esd the prayers are divided into two. The bulk of the scholars (Fritzsche, Reuss, Schürer, Ryssel, etc) agree that this Prayer was composed in Gr. The Gr recension is written in a free flowing and somewhat rhetorical style, and can be read like an "original work, not like a tr. Though there are some Hebraisms, they are not numerous or striking than usually meet us in Hellenistic Gr. It is of importance also to note, although Jewish tradition adds largely to the legends about Manasses, it has never supplied a Heb VS of the Prayer (see Text and Versions, VIII). On the other hand, Ewald (Hist. Isr., 1, 186, IV, 217, n. 5, Gen. ed. 1840, 3, 366), Furst (Gesch. d. bibl. Lkt., 3, 399), Bude (ZA W, 1892, 39 f), Ball (Speaker's Apoc) and others argue for a Heb original, perhaps existing in the source named of 2 Ch 33 18 f (see Ryssel in Kautzsch, Die Apoc des AT, 187).

Have we here the authentic prayer of Manasses offered under the circumstances described in 2 Ch 33 ? Ewald and the other scholars named (see for- 

5. Authenticity

6. The Author

7. Date

8. Text and the variations of T. It is omitted from the bulk of ancient MSS and edd of the LXX, as also from modern editions (Tischendorf, etc). Nestle (Septuaginta Studien, 1899, 3) holds that the Gr text of Codd. A, T, etc., has been taken from the Apoc Const or from the Didaskalia. The common view is that it was extracted by the latter from the LXX.

LITERATURE. — The outstanding literature has been cited in the foregoing art. Reference may be made to Howorth ("Some Unconventional Views on the Text of the Bible," PSB 4, XXXI, 89 ff); he argues that the narrative concerning Manasseh, including the Prayer for forgiveness, is a late addition to the Apoc Const, represents a portion of the true LXX of 2 Ch 33).

T. WITTON DAVIES

MANASSITES, ma-nas'stis ("wśp"), m'nashšāth; ḫ Manāsərēh, ho Manaso): Members of the tribe of Manasseh (Dt 4 43; Jgs 12 4 AV; 2 K 10 33).

MAN-CHILD, m'an-child (ARV; "man-child," ERP; not in AV; יי' פ"פ לודג, maseh b'k'r): The expression is used with the meaning of "male," but it is found only in the canonized text (Ad Est 13 8—14 19), and also to the prayer of Azarias (Three 1 2—22) and the song of the Three Young Men (Three 38—45) appended to the canonical Book of Dan.

MAN-CHILD, m'an-child (ARV; "man-child," ERP; not in AV; יי' פ"פ לודג, maseh b'k'r): The expression is used with the meaning of "male," but it is found only in the canonized text (Ad Est 13 8—14 19), and also to the prayer of Azarias (Three 1 2—22) and the song of the Three Young Men (Three 38—45) appended to the canonical Book of Dan.
MANDRAKES, man’drak’s (Μανδράκες, μανδράκος; χρυσάριον, māndrakojs; Gen 30 14 f.; Cant 7 13); the marginal reading "love apples" is due to the supposed connection of δεδήλωμ, διδήλωμ, "love"); Mandrakes are the fruit of the Mandragora officinarum, a member of the Solanaceae or potato order, closely allied to the Atropa belladonna. It is a common plant all over Pal, flourishing particularly in the spring and ripening about the time of the wheat harvest (Gen 30 14). The plant has a rosette of handsome dark leaves, dark purple flowers and orange, tomato-like fruit. The root is long and branched; to pull it up is still considered unlucky (cf Jos, Ez 17, vi, 3). The fruit is called in Arab. baid el-jinn, the "eggs of the jinn"; they have a narcotic smell and sweetish taste, but are too poisonous to be used as food. They are still used in folklore medicine in Pal. The plant was well known as an amulet by the ancients (Cant 7 13).

MANEH, man'e, or MINA, mî'nâ (מֹנֶה, māneh; מַעַד, mā'ād, "pound" [EV]): A weight containing 50 shekels, according to Heb usage, but which varied according to the standard adopted. Estimated on the Phoen. or commercial, standard, it was equal to 11,200 grains, or about 2 lbs. troy, or about 1.6 lbs. avoirdupois. This is probably the weight intended in 1 K 10 17; Ezr 2 69 and Neh 7 71 f. (see Weights and Measures). When used in a monetary sense, the māneh of silver was about the weight of £6 10s. or $34; the gold māneh was equal to about £102 10s. or $510. H. PORTER

MANES, mā'nēs (Μάνης, Mānēs): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 21). It represents the two names Maseeiah and Elijah of the || Ezr 10 21. The real equivalent is probably Maseeiah, Elijah being dropped. RV and AV give Harim of Ezr 10 21 as identical—apparently incorrectly, for the words "and the sons of Harim" (Ezr 10 21) are simply omitted. AV bundlers strangely here in reading Eanes after a misprint Ḥarim, Bētēús (for Mānēs, Mānēs) in the Aldine edition.

MANGER, mā'n-register (φανέρος, φάνερος): Properly the place in a stall or stable where the food of cattle is placed (in the OT "crib" [Job 39 9; Prov 14 4; Isa 1 3]); thus also, apparently, in the narrative of the nativity in Lk 2 7; 12. In LXX, the Gr word, representing different Heb Hebrews. The extended meaning of "stall" (2 Ch 32 28; Hab 3 17); thus also in Lk 13 15, where RV has "manger." Old tradition says that Jesus was born in a cave in the neighborhood of Bethlehem; even so, a place for food for cattle may have been cut in the side of the rock. JAMES ORK

MANI, māni (Mānī, Manī): Head of a family (1 Esd 30 38) = "Bani" in Ezr 10 29, the form which appears in 1 Esd 5 12.

MANIFEST, man'i-fest, MANIFESTATION, man'i-fes-tā'shun (φανέρω, phanerō, φανέρως, phanérōs): "To manifest" is generally the tr of phanēro, "to make apparent" (Mic 1 2; Rom 8 7; Rom 11 7; 1 Cor 13 12; 1 Cor 13 13; 1 Cor 13 10, etc.) to make manifest (phanēroō) (Rom 11 7; Rom 16 25; of emphanēs, to make fully manifest) (He 11 11). of emphārēs, "fully manifest" (Rom 10 20); of δέλω, "evident," tr of manēst, "manifest" (1 Cor 15 27; RV "evident"); of ἀπὸδηλοῖς, "very evident" (2 Tim 3 9; RV "evident"); of proδηλοῖς, "evident beforehand" (1 Tim 5 25; RV "evident"); of apophānēs, in "not manifest" (He 4 2; "There is no creature that is not manifest in his sight"); "manifest," occurs once in the OT as the tr of bārār, "to clear," "to purify" (Ecc 3 18, RV "prove"); of phanēroō (2 Mac 3 28, RV "manifestly").

Manifestation is the tr of apokolābōs, "uncovering" (Rom 8 19, the "manifestation of the sons of God," RV "revealing"); of phanēroōsis, "manifestation" (1 Cor 12 7; 2 Cor 4 2).

RV has "manifest" for "shew" (Jn 7 4); "was manifested" for "appeared" (Mk 16 12 14); was manifested for the, for "shewed himself to his" (Jn 21 14); "be made manifest" for "be seen" (Mk 4 22; Jn 17 6; Rev 3 18); "became manifest" for "was made known" (Acts 7 13); "gave him to be made manifest for "shewed him openly" (Acts 10 40); "He who was manifested for God was manifested" (1 Tim 3 16) in "The word of God, in place of a word sufficiently ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read whol); "is not yet manifest, for not yet appear" (1 Jn 3 2); by the manifestation for "with the brightness" (2 Thes 2 8). he manifested for "appear Pet (Col 1 24) for he shall be manifested for "when he shall appear" (1 Jn 2 28; 3 2), etc.

W. L. WALKER

MANIFESTLY, man'i-fes-tli (Μανιφέστως, marē, "in personal presence"): Has the meaning of "by direct vision; as in 1 Cor 13 12, "face to face," stating positively (Nu 12 6) what the next clause states negatively, viz., "not in dark speech." "Apparently" of AV is ambiguous.

MANIFOLD, man'i-fōld (Μανιφεστός, rabbi; τοιχός, pokilos): "Manifold," which occurs only a few times, is in the OT the tr of rabh, "man," "abundant" (Neh 9 19 27; Am 5 12, where it is equivalent to "many"); and of rabbāb, "to multiply," "to increase" (Ps 104 24, "O Jehovah, how manifold are thy works"); pokilos, properly, "many colored," "spotted," "variegated," tr of manifold (1 Pet 5 8, "manifold temptations"); 49, "manifold grace," suggests variety, diverseness; polypokilos has this meaning more intensely (Eph 3 10, "the manifold wisdom of God"). With this may be compared a fine passage in Wisd 7 22, where it is said that in Wisdom there is "an understanding spirit, holy, one only [RV alone in kind], in "Our sole-
MANKIND, man-kind'; In Lev 18 23; 20 13, the term is applied to meath, as distinguished from women; in Job 12 10, to the human race; in Jas 3 7, to the human nature.

MANLIUS, man-li-us, TITUS. See MANLIUS, TITUS.

MANNA, man'a (תָּנָן, mānā; μάννα, mānna): The Heb mānā is probably derived, as Ebers suggests, from the Egyptian mann, 'food.' In Ex 15 18, we have a suggested source of the name, "they said one to another, What is it?" i.e. manu, which also means, "It is manna" (see n). This substance is described as occurring in flakes or small round grains, lit. 'honey', 'starch'; it fell with the dew (Nu 11 9) and appeared when the dew left the ground (Ex 16 14); 'It was like coriander seed, white; and the taste of it was like waxed food made with honey' (ver 31).

In Nu 11 8, its taste is described as "the taste of fresh oil," i.e. "cakes baked with oil." "And the children of Israel did eat the manna forty years, until they came . . . unto the borders of the land of Canaan" (Ex 16 35). It ceased the day after they ate the produce of the land, unleavened cakes and parched grain, in the plains of Jericho (Josh 5 10-12). Although an important article of diet, it was by no means the sole one as seems implied in Nu 21 5; there are plenty of references (e.g. Ex 17 3; 24 5; 34 3; Lev 6 23-31; 9 4; 10 12; 24 5; Nu 7 13,19, etc.). The food was eaten every morning, "every man according to his eating: and when the sun waxed hot, it melted" (Ex 16 21); a portion of the previous day's gathering bred worms and stank if kept (ver 20); on the 6th day a double amount was gathered, the Sabbath portion being miraculously preserved (vs 22-27). A pot—a golden one (He 9 4)—with an omer of manna was "laid up before Jeh" in the tabernacle (Ex 16 33). Manna is referred to in Neh 9 20, "It is described poetically as "bread of heaven" and "bread of the mighty" (Ps 78 24 f); as "bread of heaven" (Ps 105 40); and as "angels' bread" (2 Esd 1 19; Wisd 16 20).

In Jn 6 31-63, Our Lord frequently refers to "the manna" or "bread from heaven" as typical of Himself. St. Paul (1 Cor 10 3) refers to it as "spiritual food," and in Rev 2 17 we read, "To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna."

Manna, as might be expected, figures largely in rabbinical lit. It was, it is said, adapted to the taste of each individual who could by wishing taste in the manna anything he desired (cf. Wisd 15 21). This manna is referred to as "the future manna" (cf Rev 2 17), for which purpose it is ground in a mill situated in the third heaven (Hag 12; Tan. Bahehal 22).

No substance is known which in any degree satisfies all the requirements. The Sumerians, however, by rolling them into long, honey-like substance which in a later period is called an insect, Giuseppe manna (also). It collects upon the twigs and falls to the ground. The Arabs who gather for sell to pilgrims the man-as-rena, man's food, it is a is probable, it is a remarkable substance which grows in the Arabian and other deserts upon the limestone. The older masses become detached and are rolled about by the wind. When swept together by sudden rain storms in the rainy season they may collect in large heaps. This lichen has been used by the Arabs in time of need for making bread. It is a quite remarkable form of nourishment in the desert, esp when eaten with the sweet manna from the trees.

E. W. G. Masterman

MANNER, man'er, MANNERS, man'ers (יוֹוָי, dādbhār, יְדוֹד, derekh, לֶמֶשׁ, mishpāh; θέος, θέσις, οὖρα, hóttō): 'Manner' (probably 1. As Used from manus, "the hand," mode of in the OT. But in the New Testament, or the Bible in general (1) to way, custom, habit, etc., (2) to kind or sort. There are some special senses, however, and archaic usages. It is frequently the Heb. dādbhār, 'speaking,' 'word,' 'thing' (Gen 18 25, "That be far from thee to do after this manner" i.e. in this way); 32 19, "On this manner shall ye speak unto Esau" (in this way); 39 19, "After this manner [in this way] did thy servant to me!" Ex 22 9, "every manner of trespass" (Ps 15 3; 25 3; Le 12 5; 19 19; Deut 15 2; 1 S 17 27 30 bisd; also of derekh, "way" (Gen 19 31, "after the manner of all the earth"

way); 1 S 21 5 AV ["the bread is in a manner common"; "manner" here might be taken as equivalent to "way" or "measure," but the passage is a difficult one and the text uncertain, RV "manner," and in the text makes the reference to be to the journey, not to the bread, but in m it has "common [bread]; Isa 10 23, "after the manner of Egypt" [after the way or fate of Egypt]; so also Am 4 10; 8 14) food beyond." The food was eaten every morning, "every man according to his eating; and when the sun waxed
ship); of mišāpās, "judgment," "ordinance," hence also "manner" or "custom" (Gen 40 13; Ex 21 9; 2 K 1 7, "what manner of man" [sort or kind]; 17 26 AV; 1 C 24 19; Ezk 11 12, "after the manners [RV "ordinances"] of the nations"); tōrāh, "instruction," "law," is also tr. "manner" (2 K 17 19, "he judged the manner [in law] of man, O Lord God"); RV "and this [too] after the manner of men, O Lord Jeh," m "and is this the law of man, O Lord Jeh"?). Other words are: "broad," "path," "custom" (Gen 16 11); dōhēr, "leading," "pasturer," (cf. "sheep-walk," "sheep-fold"); Isa 5 17, "Then shall the lambs feed after their manner," RV "as in their pasture" (in Mic 2 12, the same word is tr. AV "fold"); RV "pasture"); dōmāth, "likeliness" (Ezk 23 15); dān, "law," "sentence" (Est 2 12); hukkar, "statute," "custom" (Lev 20 23) in AV. In Nu 5 13 "with the manner" is supplied to "taken" (in adultery). "Manner" here is an old law-French phrase, "a thief taken with the mainour"—that is, with the thing stolen upon him in his hand (in his hand) (Blackstone, Commentaries, etc); RV "in the very act" (cf. Lev 4, 4, "in the very act"); gam, "also" is tr. (1 S 19 24) "in like manner," RV "also.

In Apoc, 2 Mac 4 13 AV, we have "increase of heathenish manners," RV an extreme of Gr Wisd 10 0, to 13 20.

2. As Used Gentiles, RV "the Gr rites"; in 2 in the Apoc- Esd 9 19, AV and RV, "manners" rypha appears in the sense of "morals"; cf 1 Cor 15 35, RV "Evil companionships corrupt good morals."

In the NT various words and phrases are rendered by "manner;" we have ethos, "custom," "usage," "manner" (Jn 19 40; Acts 16 1, 3. As Used RV "custom"); katā to eōthēs (Lk 4 In the NT 16, RV "as his custom was"); tēpōs, a "turning," "manner," "way" (Dude ver 7); hōn tēpōn, "in which manner" (Acts 11 11); hōutēs, "thus," "so," "accordingly," is "after this manner," "in like manner" (Mt 6 9; Mk 13 29 AV); in Acts 15 23, "after this manner" stands in A. for "by their hands," RV "thus;" pōs (Acts 20 18), "after what manner;" agōgē, "course of life" (2 Tim 3 10, RV "conduct"); bōsēs, "mode of life" (Acts 26 4); in 1 Cor 33 33, we have manners in the moral sense, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," RV "Evil companionships corrupt good morals."

Acts 13 18 is interesting because of diversities of rendering: AV has "suffered they were the manner in the wilderness," m "etropophōrēsen, perhaps for etropophōrēsen, bore, or fed them as a nurse breast or fedeth her child, Dt 1 31 (2 Mac 7 27) according to LXX, and so Chrysostom;" ERV text, same as AV, m "Many ancient authorities read 'bear he them as a nursing father in the wilderness.' See Dt 1 31; "ARV (text) "as a nursing-father bare he them in the wilderness," m "Many ancient authorities read 'Suffered he them in the wilderness.' SeeDt 9 7." The Gr words differ only by a single letter, and authorities are pretty equally divided.

Among other changes RV has frequently "ordinance," for Jn 19 40; He 10 25, etc. "manner of" is introduced (1 S 4 8, etc), "manner of" and "manner omitted (Lk 8 20, etc); "manner of" and "manner of being for where is the house" (Isa 66 1); "manner of" for "conversation" (Gal 1 31, Eph 4 22); after φωνηία in "manner of" or "manner" for" a man (Rom 3 2; 1 Cor 9 8); "how to inquire concerning these things" (Acts 25 20) for "conversations"; "in an unpril manner," ARV, for "unworthily" (1 Cor 11 27); "who for" "what manner of man," (Mk 4 41; Lk 8 25; "when they knew not what manner of spirit ye are of," is omitted, with the m "Some ancient authorities added said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," W. L. WALKER

MANOH, ma-nōh (מָנוֹה, manōh, "cane"); A man of Zorah and of the family of the Danites. M. was the father of Samson, and his life-story is but imperfectly told in the history of the conception, birth and early life of his son. No children had been born to M. and his wife, and the latter was considered barren (Jgs 15 2). Finally it was revealed to her by an angel of the Lord that she would conceive and bear a child. She was cautioned against strong drink and "unclean" food, for her child was to be born and reared a Nazirite to the end that he might save Israel out of the hands of the Philistines (13 3-5). That M. was a devoted man seems certain in view of the fact that, upon hearing of the angel's visit, he offered a prayer for the angel's return, in order that he and his wife might be instructed as to the proper care of the child to be born (13 8). The request was granted and the angel repeated the visit and the instructions (13 9-13). M. with true hospitality would have the guest remain and partake of food. The angel refused, but commanded a sacrifice unto Jeh. When M. had prepared this sacrifice, he set it upon the altar, the angel ascended in the flame from the altar and appeared no more (13 15-21). The child was born according to the promise and was named Samson. M. and his wife appear twice in the narrative of Samson's early life (14 3, 6). M. attestingly accompanied him to sue for the hand of a Philistine woman of Timnah in marriage, and again when they went with him to Timnah for the wedding.

MANSERVANT, man'sēr-vant (מֶנשֶׁר vant, 'ebēl dāheth): A male slave; usually coupled with manservant (Gen 12 16; Ex 20 10; (1 S 8 16; Job 31 13; Lk 12 45). See SERVANT; SLAVE.

MANSION, man'shun (מֶנְשֶׁה, monê, "abode"): In Jn 14 2, the word is used in the pl.: "In my Father's house are many mansions." RV "hedging places." The ideas conveyed are those of abundance of room, and permanence of habitation, in the heavenly world.

MANSLEY, man'slē (מַנְסֶל, manēlē̂, μνηστήρ from ἡμέρα, 'ēmērā, "remembrance") from (אַבֵּד, abēd, 'ēbed, "servant") from 'ēbed, "to serve," is a modern term, employed to distinguish unpremeditated killing from coldblooded murder, but formerly (2 Esd 1 26) it was used in a more general sense. See MURDER.

FRANK E. HIRSCH
MANSTEALING, man’stē-ing. See Crime, under “Kidnapping”; Punishment.

MANTELET, man’tel-et, man’t’l-et, mant’let (Nah 2 5). See Sizes, 4, (d).

MANTLE, man’tl: Used 5 t of Elijah’s mantle (R’BS, ‘addereth, 1 K 19 18.19; 2 K 2 8.13.14), which was probably of hair. Found in pl. once (Isa 3 22), where it (ma’ōṣaphūkh) is an upper wide tunic with sleeves (lēḇōthâ). See DRESS; Ken- chief.

MANUSCRIPTS, man’h-scripts: In the broadest sense manuscripts include all handwritten records as distinguished from printed records. In a narrower sense they are handwritten codices, rolls and folded documents, as distinguished from printed books on the one hand and inscriptions, or engraved documents, on the other. More loosely, but commonly, the term is used as synonym of the codex.

The Heb and Gr manuscripts of the OT and NT, respectively, form the primary sources for establishing the text or true original words of the respective authors. The subordinate sources, VSS and quotations have also their text problem, and manuscripts of the VSS and of the church Fathers, and other ancient writers who refer to Bib. matters, play a part both in establishing the true words of the VSS or the writer that the Heb and Gr manuscripts play in establishing the original of Scripture. For discussion of the textual aspects, see arts. on TEXT and MSS of the NT, TEXT of the OT, on Versions, and esp. the Septuagint. For the material, writing instruments, form of manuscripts, etc. see Book; and esp. the lit. under Writing.

E. C. RICHARDSON

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE OT. See Languages and TEXT of the OT.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NT. See TEXT and Manuscripts of the NT.

MAOCH, mā’ok (םואך, ma’ākh, “oppressed,” “prised”): The same as Maschach (1 K 2 39). The father of that Achish, king of Gath, with whom David and his 600 sojourned under fear of Saul’s treachery (1 S 27 2).

MAON, mā’on, MAONITES, mā’on-ites, mā’ōnites (םואה, mā’ōn; B, Maap, Maor, Ma:v, Mada, A, Ma’an, Maon): (1) A town in the mountain of Judah named along with Carmel and Zipph (JoSh 15 55). It appears again as the home of Nabat, the great flockmaster (1 S 26 2). In the genealogical list of 1 Ch 2, Maon stands as the “son” of Shammai and the “father” of Beth-sure (vs 44-45). This evidently means that Shammai was the founder of Maon. About a mile S. of el-Karmil, the ancient Carmel, lies Tel Ma’an. This may be confidently identified with Maon, the radicals of the names being the same. It suits the requirements of the narratives in other respects, being near to Carmel, while the surrounding wilderness is still used as the wide pasture land for multitudinous flocks. In this district, the wilderness of Maon, David was hiding when his whereabouts was betrayed to Saul by the men of Ziph (1 S 25 24), and only a timely raid by the Philis delivered him out of that monarch’s hands (vs 27 ff).

(2) (Ma’daw, Mad’in): Maon is named along with the Edomians and Amalek as having at some time been mentioned, oppressed Israel (Jgs 10 12). The LXX “Midian” has been accepted by some scholars as restoring the original text, since, otherwise, the Midianites remain unmentioned. But the Moabites are evidently identical with the Meunim of 1 Ch 4 41 (RV), the pastoral people destroyed by Hesekiah. In 2 Ch 20 1 AV, instead of “other beside the ‘ammonites’” we must read “some of the Meunim,” as associated with the Ammonites in the battle with Jehoshaphat. Against them also Uzziah was helped of God (2 Ch 26 7). They are included among the inhabitants of Mt. Seir (20 10 23), so that an Edomite tribe is intended. It is natural to connect them with Mā’ān, a place on the great pilgrim road, and now a station on the Damascus-Hejaz Railway, to the S.E. of Petra. It undoubtedly represents an ancient stronghold.

The Moabites appear in the lists of those who returned from exile (Ezr 2 50, AV “Mehunim,” RV “Meunim”; Neh 7 52, “Meunim”). These may possibly be the descendants of prisoners taken in the wars of Jehoshaphat and Uzziah, to whom menial tasks may have been appointed in the temple services.

W. EWING

MAR, mār: “To mar” means “to destroy,” “to disfigure,” “to damage.” Job 30 13 “My mar my path” (RVm “my way,” AV “my path”); Neh 2 2, “and destroyed their vine” (AV “and marred their vine”); cf Lev 19 27; 2 K 3 19; Isa 52 14; Jer 13 9.

MARA, mā’ra, mā’ra (מָרוֹא, mārō’ā, “bitter”): The term which Naomi applies to herself on her return from Moab to her native country (Ruth 1 20). Changed beyond recognition, she creates astonishment among her former acquaintances, who ask, “Is this Naomi?” She replies, “Call me not Naomi” (i.e. “pleasant” or “the wife”), but “call me Mara” (i.e. “bitter”). In the light of her bitter experience, and her present pitiable plight, the old name has become peculiarly inappropriate.

MARAH, mā’ra, mā’ra (מַרָה, mārā’ā, “bitter”): The first camp of the Israelites after the passage of the Red Sea (Ex 15 23; Nu 33 8 f). The name is derived from the bitterness of the brackish water. Moses cast a tree into the waters which were thus made sweet (Ex 15 23). See Wanderings of Israel.

MARALAH, mar’a-lâ (מָרָלָה, mar’a-lâh; B, Maragelâ, Marageldâ, A, Mâsalâ, Mariłâ): A place on the western border of Zebulun (Josh 19 11). Pesh render Râmah tâ’lê, ‘height of the fox.’ It is not identified.

MARANATHA, mar-a-nâ’tha (מָרָנָתָה, mar’a-nâ’thâ), mar-an-â’thâ (from Aram. words, מָרָנָתָה, máranâ’thâ, “our Lord cometh, or will come”; according to some, “has come”; to others, “Come!” an invitation for his speedy reappearance (cf Rev 22 20); παρανάθη, maranathâ, or μαραναθή, maro aðhâ): Used in connection with ἄνθεμα, ἀνάθεμα, “accursed” (1 Cor 16 22), but has no necessary connection therewith. It was used by early Christians to add solemn emphasis to previous statement, injunction or adjuration, and seems to have become a sort of watchword; possibly forming part of an early liturgy.

MARBLE, mārb’l (מרבל, shaqish, שׁוֹאֵשׁ, shō’āsh, יָשָׁב, yâshôb, “abhdhē shapish, “stones of marble” [1 Ch 29 2]; מַרְבָּלְלָה, mārlâlî; r’hashb hâshh w’-shôar w’-shâřârêth, “a pavement of red, and white, and yellow, and black marble,” or, according to m, “a pavement of porphyry, and white marble, and alabaster, and stone of blue color” [Est 1 6]; מַרְבָּלֶה, mārlêh
shēš, "pillars of marble" [Est 1 6; Cant 5 15];
cf. א printf, AVM "silk" or RV "fine linen"
[Gen 41 42; Ex 25 4, etc]; מִדְנָנִים, מִדְנָנִים, "illies" [Cant 2 16, etc], apparently from a root signifying "white; מְדוֹנָנִים, מְדְרָנִים, "marble" [Rev 10 12]). Marble is properly crystalline limestone, usually pure white or veined with black, the former being in demand for statuary, while the latter is used in architecture, esp. for floors and pillars. True marble is not found in Pal, but is obtained from Greece or Italy. Much of the stone described as marble is non-crystalline limestone capable of being smoothed and polished. White or yellow stone of this character is abundant in Pal. Non-crystalline rocks of other colors are also sometimes called marble. In the passage from Est cited above (cf m), it is a question whether the reference is to marble and other stones or to marble of different colors. In 1 Ch 29 2, "marble stones" are mentioned among the materials brought together by David for the building of the temple. In Est 1 6, pillars and a pavement of marble are features of the palace of Ahasuerus. In Cant 5 15, the various parts of the body of the "beloved" are likened to gold, beryl, ivory, sapphire, and marble. In Rev 18 12, marble occurs in the list of the materials of Babylon. All these references imply a costly stone, and therefore probably one imported from other countries, and make it likely that true crystalline marble is meant.

ALFRED ELY DAY

MARCH, march, MARCHES, march'iz. See Army; War.

MARCHESHAN, mâr-chesh'-an. See Time.

MARCION, mâr-shûn. GOSPEL OF. See Apocryphal Gospels.

MARCUS, mâr'kus. See Mark, John.

MARDOCEUS, mär-dô-kè'us (Maprochos, Mardochaios): (1) One of the Jewish leaders who accompanied Zerubbabel on the return from Babylon to Judah (1 Esd 5 8, where it stands for "Mordecai") on Ezra 2 51. (2) Another form of Mordecai, the uncle of Esther (Est Ad 10 4; 11 2.22; 12 1.4.f; 16 13).

MARE, mär [L. marius, gūshā, "steed," AV "company of horses"]; LXX ἡ ἡποπός, ἡ ἐκπός, "mammy" [Cant 1 9]; [2] the white, or, blac, kā, ἁραμμακχίν, "brood of the stud," AV and RV "young dromedaries" [Est 8 10]; cf. Arab. ὰυτός, ramakah, "mare"). The word "mare" does not occur in EV, but in Cant 1 9 we find gūshā, the fem. of gūsh, "horse," and in Est 8 10, ἁραμμακχίν is by some tel "sons of mares." See Camel; Horse.

MARESHAH, mär-es'ha (mişׂרֶשָׁה, mārēshāh; B, Μορσόρα, Bathpard, A, Maproá, Marseu): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Keilah and Aziz (Josh 15 44). It occupied such a position that Rehoboam thought well to fortify it for the protection of Judah (2 Ch 11 8). In the valley of Zephathah at Maresiah, Ass overwhelmed Zerah the Ethiopian and his army, pursuing them as far as Gezer (2 Ch 14 9 f). From M. came Elizer the prophet who denounced disaster upon the commercial commerce of Jeshobahat and Ahaziah (20 37). The place is mentioned in Mic (1 15). M. was plundered and burned by Judas Maccabaes (Ant, XII, viii, 6; 1 Mace 5 66 RvM). Hither Gorgias escaped, having been rescued from the hands of Dositheus by a Thracian horseman (2 Mace 12 35). It was taken by John Hyrcanus, who allowed the inhabitants to remain on condition that they adopt circumcision and submit to the Jewish law. This they did; and later avenged an injustice done to M. by the Samaritans. It is then described as a colony of Jews (Ant, XIII, ix, 1; x 2). The city was treated with favor by Pompey (XIV, iv, 4). When the Parthians invaded Judaea in support of Antigonus they demolished M. (xii, 9).

According to Onom, M. was 2 Rom miles from Eleutheropolis (Belt Jobrēt). Until recently it was thought that Khurbet Mīr'ash, where the old name lingers, not far S.W. of Belt Jobrēt, represented the ancient city. The work of Dr. Bliss, however ("Excavations in Pal., PEF), shows that it must be located at Tell Sandahannah, about a mile S. of Belt Jobrēt. A series of remarkable tombs was discovered here. From 1 Ch 2 42 we may perhaps gather that Hebron was colonized by the men of M.

E. W. WING

MARMOTH, mär-mōth, mär'-mōth: An ancestor of Eedars (Ezra, 2 Esd 1 2), identical with Marmathio (Est 7 3). In Est 2 8-22, it appears also as "Mememoth" [AV "Mermoth"]).

MARINER, mär-i-nër. See Ships and Boats, II, (2), (3), III 2.

MARISA, mär'i-sa (Maproá, Marias): The Gr form of Maresiah (q.v.) in 2 Mace 12 35.

MARISH, mär'i-sh (םיִשָּׁה; gēbēh; Íb, hēbōs): An old form of "marsh," found in AV, EV, and LXX 47 11 (ARV "marsh"). Some (not all) edd of the AV Apoc have retained this same spelling in 1 Mace 9 42 45 (RV "marsh").

MARK, mark: In the AV this word is used 224 as a noun and 26 as a predicate. In the former case it is represented by 5 Heb and 3 Gr words; in the latter by 11 Heb and 2 Gr words. As a noun it is purely a physical term, gaining almost a technical significance from the "mark" put upon Cain (Gen 4 15 15), the stigma of Christ in Paul's body (Gal 6 17); the "mark of the beast" (Rev 16 2).

As a vb. It is almost exclusively a mental process: e.g. to be attentive, understand: יָשָׁה, יָשָׁה (Job 18 2 22, AV), rightly rendered in RV יָשָׁה. "Mark ye well her bullwarks" (Ps 48 13 15), i.e. turn the mind to, notice, regard; יָשָׁה, יָשָׁה, i.e. observe, keep in view; so Ps 37 37, "Mark the perfect man"; of Job 29 15 AV. This becomes a unique expression in 1 x 1 12, where El, noticing the movement of Hannoah's lilies in prayer, is said to have "marked her mouth." Jesus "marked" how invited guests chose out (Luke 7), etc. (especially, i.e. observed) the chief seats (Lk 14 17); so כָּשׁוֹר, כָּשׁוֹר (Rom 16 17; Phil 3 17), "Mark them," i.e. look at, signifying keen mental attention, i.e. scrutinize, observe carefully. The only exceptions to this mental significance of the vb. are two vs in the OT: Isa 44 13, "He marketh it out with a pencil" ("red ochre, AV "line"), and with the compasses, where the vb. is כָּשׁוֹר, כָּשׁוֹר, "to delineate," "mark out": Jer 2 22, "Thine iniquity is marked (בָּשָׁה, בָּשָׁה) kathām, "cut (engraved) before me," signifying the deep and irrevocable nature of sin. It may also be rendered "written," in indelible hieroglyphics.

As a noun the term "mark" may signify, according to its various Heb and Gr originals, a sign, a "target" an object of assault, a brand or stigma cut or burnt in the flesh, a goal or end in view, a stamp or impressed or engraved sign.

(1) יָשָׁה, 3rd, a sign: Gen 4 15 AV, "The Lord set a mark upon Cain" (AV "appointed a sign"). It is impossible to tell the nature of this sign.
Delitzsch thinks that the rabbins were mistaken in regarding it as a mark upon Cain’s body. He considers it rather “a certain sign which protected him” (Wencke, 6), the consequence of his life being necessary for the preservation of the race. It was thus, as the Heb indicates, the token of a covenant which God made with Cain that his life would be spared.

(2) ἁρπάζω, _mal'Črē_; “an aim,” hence a mark to shoot at. Jonathan arranged to shoot arrows at a mark, for a sign to David (1 S 20 20); Job felt himself to be a target for the Divine arrows, i.e. for the Divinely decreed sufferings which wounded him and which he was called to endure (Job 15 12); so Jeremiah, “He hath set me as a mark for the arrow!” (Lam 3 12); closely akin to this is ἄρχω, _miphqal_, an object of attack (Job 7 20), where Job in bitterness of soul feels that God has become his enemy, and says, Why hast thou made me the mark of hostile attack?; “set me as a mark for the arrow.”

(3) Ψ, _taw_, “mark” (Ezk 9 4 6). In Ezekiel’s vision of the destruction of the wicked, the mark to be set upon the forehead of the righteous, at Jeh’s command, was, as in the case of the blood sprinkled on the door-posts of the Israelites (Ex 12 22 23), for His purposes. As the Servants of God (Rev 7 3 2)—the elect—were kept from harm by being sealed with the seal of the living God in their foreheads, so the man clothed in linen, with a writer’s inkhorn by his side, was told to mark upon their foreheads those whom God would save from judgment by His sheltering grace. _Taw_ also appears (Job 31 35) for the attesting mark made to a document (RV “signature,” in “mark”).

The letter Ψ in the Phoen alphabet and on the coins of 133 B.C. in Macabeæ, had the form of a cross (τ). In the form of an oriental synod it was used as a signature by bishops who, like Cyprian, were “biΙΣης,” “His mark set as a sign of ownership.” It was burnt upon the necks or thighs of horses and camels. It may have been the “mark” set upon the forehead of the righteous in Ezekiel’s vision.

(4) ἄρχω, _ba'ăkā_, “a stigma” cut or burnt. The Israelites were forbidden (Lev 19 25) to follow the custom of other oriental and heathen nations in cutting, disfiguring or branding their bodies.

The specific prohibition “not to print any marks upon any man’s body” (AV) who seems evidently a custom of tattooing common among savage tribes, and in vogue among both men and women of the lower orders in Asia, Africa, and many other lands. It was intended to cultivate reverence for and a sense of the sacredness of the human body, its divine creation, known in the Christian era as the temple of the Holy Spirit. See also CUTTINGS in the FLESH.

(5) σχίζω, _skopōs_, something seen or observed in the distance, hence a goal. The Christian life seemed to St. Paul, in the intensity of his spiritual ardor, like the stadium or race-course of the Greeks, with runners stretching every nerve to reach the goal and win the prize. “I press on toward the goal [AV “mark”] unto the prize” (Phil 3 14). That goal is the ideal of life revealed in Christ, the prize, the attainment and possession of that life.

In Wisd 5 21 “they fly to the mark” is from ἄρχω, _eisatōchō_, “with true aim” (so RV).

(6) στίχωμα, _stigma_, “a mark pricked or branded upon the body.” Slaves and soldiers, in ancient times, were stamped or branded with the name of their master. Paul considered and called himself the bondslave of Jesus Christ. The traces of his sufferings, scourging, stonings, persecution, wounds, were from time to time permanent scars on his body (cf 2 Cor 11 23 27). Thus, he bore the “stigma” of Jesus, marks branded in his very flesh as proofs of his devotion to his Master (Gal 6 17).

This passage gives no ground for the Romanist superstition that the very scars or wounds reproduced in Paul’s hands and feet and side. It is also “alien to the lofty self-consciousness” of these words to find in them a contrast in Paul’s thought to the scar of circumcision.

(7) χαραγμός, _chāragma_, “a stamp” or “imprinted mark.” “The mark of the beast” (peculiar to Rev) was the badge of the followers of Antichrist, stamped on the forehead or right hand (Rev 13 16; cf Ezk 9 4 6). It was symbolic of character and was thus not a literal or physical mark, but the impress of paganism on the moral and spiritual life. It was the sign or token of apostasy. As a spiritual state or condition it subjected men to the wrath of God and to eternal torment (Rev 14 9 11); to noisome disease (16 2); to the lake of fire (19 20). Those who received not the mark, having faithfully endured persecution and martyrdom, were given part in the first resurrection and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years (Rev 20 4). The “beast” symbolizes the anti-Christian empires, particularly Rome under Nero, who sought to devour and destroy the early Christians.


DWIGHT W. PRATT

MARK, _mārk_, JOHN: John (Ἰωάννης, Ἰωάννης) represents his Jewish, Mark (Μάρκος, Mārkos) his Roman name. Why the latter was as

1. Name sumed we do not know. Perhaps the and Family sistor participle in Acts 12 25 may be intended to intimate that it dated from the time when, in company with Barnabas and Saul, he turned to service in the great gentile city of Antioch. Possibly it was the badge of Roman citizenship, as in the case of Paul. The standing of the family would be quite consistent with such a suppression.

His mother’s name was Mary (Acts 12 12). The home is spoken of as hers. The father was probably dead. The description of the house (with its large room and porch) and the mention of the Or slave, suggest a family of wealth. They were probably among the many zealous Jews who, having become rich in the great world outside, retired to Jerusalem, the center of their nation and faith.

M. was “cousin” to Barnabas of Cyprus (Col 4 10), who also seems evidently to have been a man who perhaps a man who, having found a large place in the esteem of the brethren, as is shown by his being chosen to accompany Barnabas and Saul to Antioch, a little later. The home was a resort for Christians, so that M. had every opportunity to become acquainted with other leaders such as James and John, and James the brother of the Lord. It was perhaps from the latter James that he learned the incident of Mk 3 21 which Peter would be less likely to mention.

His kinship with Barnabas, knowledge of Christian history and teaching, and proved efficiency account for his being taken along on the first missionary journey as ‘minister’ (συμμαχός, _hupērētēs_) to Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13 5). Just what the term implies is not clear. Chase (HDB) conjectures the meaning to be that he had been _hupērētēs_, “attendant” or _hazzān_ in the synagogue (cf Lk 4 20), and was known as such an official. Wright (I, February, 1924) suggests that he was a teacher in newly founded churches a teaching service similar to that of the synagogue _hazzān_. Hackett
thought that the esv of this verse implies that he was to be doing the same kind of work as Barnabas and Saul and so to be their “helper” in preaching and teaching. The more common view has been (Meyer, Swete, et al.) that he was to perform “personal service not evangelical,” “official service but not of the same kind”—to be a sort of business agent. The view that he was to be a teacher, a catechist for converts, seems to fit best all the facts. Why did he turn back from the work (Acts 13 13)? Not because of homesickness, or anxiety for his mother’s safety, or home duties, or the desire to return to the scene of his first work, but rather because he objected to the offer of salvation to the Gentiles on condition of faith alone. There are hints that M’s family, like Paul’s, were Hebrews of the Hebrews, and it is not without significance that in both verses (Acts 13 5 13) he is given only his Heb name. The terms of Paul’s remonstrance are very strong (Acts 15 38), and we know that nothing stirred Paul’s feelings more deeply than this very question. The explanation of it all may be found in what happened at Paphos when the Rom Sergius Paulus became a believer. At that time Paul (the change of name is here noted by Lk) stepped to the front, and henceforth, with the exception of 15 12.25, when naturally enough the old order was maintained, Luke speaks of Paul and Barnabas, not Barnabas and Saul. We must remember that, at that time, Paul stood almost alone in his conviction. Barnabas, even later, had misgivings (Gal 2 13). Perhaps, too, M. was less able than Barnabas himself to see the latter take second place.

We hear nothing further of M. until the beginning of the second missionary journey 2 years later, when Paul’s unwillingness to take him with them led to the rupture between Paul and Barnabas and to the mission of Barnabas and M. to Cyprus (Acts 15 39). He is here called Mark, and in that quiet way Luke may indicate his own conviction that Mark’s mind had changed on the great question, as indeed his willingness to accompany Paul might suggest. He had learned from the discussions in the council at Jerusalem and from subsequent events at Antioch.

About 11 years elapse before we hear of him again (Col 4 10; Philem 24). He is at Rome, where Paul, whose breach is healed. He is now one of the faithful few among Jewish Christians who stand by Paul. He is Paul’s honored “fellowworker” and a great “comfort” to him.

The Colossian passage may imply a contemplated visit by M. to Asia Minor. It may be that it was carried out, that he met Peter and went with him to Babylon. In 1 Pet 5 13 the apostle sends M’s greetings along with that of the church in Babylon. Thence M. returns to Asia Minor, and in 2 Tim 4 11 Paul asks Timothy, who is at Ephesus, to come to him, pick up M. by the way, and bring him along. In that connection Paul pays M. his final tribute; he is “useful for ministering” (διακονεῖν διὰ συνελεύσεως), εὐθύτατος εἰς διακονίαν, so useful that his ministry is a joy to the very God’s heart.

The most important and reliable tradition is that he was the close attendant and interpreter of Peter, and has given us in the Gospel that bears his name an account of Peter’s teaching. For that reason the NT facts furnish a basis, and much in the NT history leave plenty of room. An examination of the tradition will be found in Mark, this Gospel according to Lk. Other traditions add but little that is reliable. It is said that M. had been a priest, and that after becoming a Christian

3. His History as Known from Other Sources

he amputated a finger to disqualify himself for that service. His name κολοβώταιος, κολοβωτης, which, however, is sometimes otherwise ex-plained. He is represented as having remained in Cyprus until after the death of Barnabas (who was living in 57 AD according to I Cor 9 5) and then to have gone to Alexandria, founded there, became his first bishop and there died (or was martyred) in the 9th year of Nero (62-63). They add that in 815 AD Venetian soldiers stole his remains from Alexandria and placed them under the church of St. Mark at Venice.


J. H. FARMER

MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO:

I. OUR SECOND GOSPEL

II. CONTENTS AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Scope

2. Material Peculiar to Mark

3. Quotations

4. A Book of Mighty Works

5. The Worker is Also a Teacher

6. A Book of Graphic Details

III. THE TEXT

IV. LANGUAGE

1. General Character

2. Vocabulary

3. Style

4. Original Language

V. AUTHORSHIP

1. External Evidence

2. Internal Evidence

VI. SOURCES AND INTEGRITY

1. Person of Christ

2. The Trinity

3. Salvation

4. Eschatology

LITERATURE

I. Our Second Gospel.—The order of the Gospels in our NT is probably due to the early conviction that this was the order in which the Gospels were written. It was not, however, the invariable order. The question of order only arose when the roll was superseded by the codex, our present book-form. That change was going on in the 3rd cent. Origen found codices with the order Jn, Mt, Mk, Lk—due probably to the desire to give the apostles the leading place. That and the one common today may be considered the two main groupings—the one in the order of dignity, the other in that of time. The former is Egypt and Lat.; the latter has the authority of most Gr MSS, Catalogues and Fathers, and is supported by the Old Syr.

Within these, however, there are variations. The former is varied thus: Jn, Mt, Lk, Mk, and Mt, Jn, Mk, Lk, and Mt, Jn, Lk, Mk; the latter to Mt, Mk, Jn, Lk. Mk is never first; when it follows Lk, the time consideration has given place to that of length.

II. Contents and General Characteristics.—The Gospel begins with the ministry of John the Baptist and ends with the announcement of the Resurrection, if the last 12 vs be not included. These postsurrection appearances, the Commission, the Ascension, and a brief summary of apostolic activity. Thus its limits correspond closely with those indicated by Peter in Acts 10 37-43. Nothing is said of the early Judecan ministry. The Galilean ministry and Passion Week with the transition from the one to the other (in ch 10) practically make up the Gospel. Matter peculiar to Mk is found in 4 26-29 (the seed growing secretly); 3 21 (his kindred’s fear); 7 32-37 (the deaf and dumb man); 2 6 (the blind man); 12 33-37 (the householder and the exhortation to watch); 14 51 (the young man who escaped). But, in addition to this, there are many vivid word-touches with which the common material is lighted up, and in not a few
of the common incidents Mk's account is very much fuller; e.g. 6 14–29 (death of John the Baptist); 7 1–23 (on eating with unwashed hands); 9 1–29 (on the demoniac) and the multiplication (the questioning scribe). There is enough of this material to show clearly that the author could not have been wholly dependent on the other evangelists. Hawkins reckons the whole amount of peculiar material at about fifty verses (Hor. Syn., 11).

In striking contrast to Matthew who, in 8 passages, calls attention to the fulfillment of prophecy by Jesus, Mark only once quotes the OT and that is in the preface of His Gospel. The Isa part of his composite quotation appears in all 4 Gospels; the Mal part in Mk only, though there is a refection of it in Jn 3 25. This fact alone might convey an erroneous impression of the attitude of the Gospel to the OT. Though himself only makes himself on this one twofold reference, yet he represents Jesus as doing so frequently. The difference is thus between him and Matthew is not great. He has 19 formal quotations as compared with 30 occurrences in Lk, 15 in Mt, 10 in Jn, where they are not

found elsewhere. The total for the NT is 160, so that Mk has a fair proportion. When OT references and notes citations are considered the result is much the same. WH give Mt 100, Mk 58, Lk 86, Jn 21, Acts 10.

3. Quotations

The phrase, "Intro to the OT in Gr. 390" points out that in those quotations which are common to the LXX and LXX is usually followed: in others, the Heb more frequently. (A good illustration is where the Lk 1 is followed in the phrase, "in vain do they worship me"—a fair paraphrase of the Heb; but "teaching as their doctrine the precedent correct representation of this (comparing the Heb than his words for His works. The teachings grew as the Gospel to Mk 13 and

24 respectively. But in 7 1–23; 9 33–50; 10 5–31, 39–45 and 12 1–44 we have quite extensive sayings. If Jesus is a worker, He is even more a teacher. He works to prepare His words rather than His words for His works. The teachings grew naturally out of the occasion and the circumstances. He did and taught. Because He did what He did He could teach with effectiveness. Both works and words reveal Him.

There is a multitude of graphic details: Mk mentions actions and gestures of Jesus (7 33; 9 36; 10 16) and His looks of inquiry (6 32) in prayer (6 41; 7 34), of details approval (3 34), Jesus telling (to Judas esp. 10 23), anger (3 5), and in judgment (11 11). Jesus hungers (11 12), seeks rest in seclusion (6 31) and sleeps on the boat cushion (4 38); He pistes the multitude (6 34), wonders at men's unbelief (6 6), sighs over their sorrow and blindness (7 34; 8 12), grieves at their hardening (3 5), and rebukes in sadness the wrong thought of His mother and brothers, and in indignation the mistaken zeal and selfish ambitions of His disciples (8 33; 10 14). Mk represents His miracles of healing usually as instantaneous (1 31; 2 11 f.; 3 5), sometimes as gradual or difficult (1 26; 7 32–35; 9 26–28), and once as flatly impossible "because of their unbelief" (6 6). With confidence and vividness he tells the pomp of the people and the impression made on them by what Jesus said or did. They bring their sick along the streets and convert the market-place into a hospital (1 32), throng and jostle Him by the seaside (8 10), and carry as the astonishment of the multitude a note of authority (1 22) and power (2 12). Disciples are awed by His command over the sea (4 41), and disciples and others are surprised and alarmed at the strange look of dread as He walks ahead alone, going up to Jesus and the cross (10 39). Many other picturesque details are given, as in 1 13 (He was with the wild beasts); 2 4 (digging through the roof); 4 38 (lying asleep on the cushion); 5 4 (the description of the Gerasene demoniac); 6 39 (the companies, dressed in many colors and looking like flower beds on the green mountain side). Other details peculiar to Mk are: names (1 29; 3 6; 13; 16 21), numbers (6 13; 6 7), time (1 35; 2 11; 11 19; 16 2), and place (2 13; 3 9; 7 31; 12 41; 13 3; 16 58 and 16 39).

These strongly suggest the observation of an eyewitness as the final authority, and the geographical references suggest that even the writer understood the general features of the country, esp. of Jesus and His neighborhood. On the complete lists see Lindsay, St. Mark's Gospel, 26 f.)

III. Text.—Of the 53 select readings noted by WH (Intro), only a few are of special interest or
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The most important textual problem is that of 16 9–10, which Miller and Salmon believe it to be genuine. Miller supposes that up to that point Mk had held the view, contrary to Peter's words, that for some reason those then failed him and that vs 9–10 are drawn from his own store. The majority of scholars regard these verses as a later and possibly quite significant addition to the Synoptic Gospels, which was supplied later to the other accounts. It has been noted by Neusner in his commentary on the Synoptic Gospels that these verses are in accordance with the Aramaic text.

The style is very simple. The common conception is that the stater periods of the class of anacreontics, the style is not to be found in the Gospel of Matthew.

The original language was Greek, which is the language of the New Testament and the modern Greek Bible. The author of the Gospel of Matthew is thought to be one of the Twelve Apostles, possibly Thomas. Papias, an early Christian writer, records that Matthew was the author of the Gospel.

The external evidence for the authorship of the Gospel of Matthew is found in the works of the Fathers and the MSS. The most important patristic statements are the following:

- Tatian: In his Diatessaron, he states that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Aramaic and translated into Greek by Matthew himself.
- Origen: He states that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Aramaic and translated into Greek by Mary Magdalene, who was the first to translate it.
- Eusebius: He states that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Aramaic and translated into Greek by John the Baptist.

The evidence for the authorship of the Gospel of Matthew is scanty and inconclusive, and the identity of the author remains uncertain.

The narrative of the Gospel of Matthew is written in a style that is both simple and concise. It is divided into twelve sections, each of which contains a series of sayings or miracles of Jesus. The first section is the Sermon on the Mount, which is a collection of sayings on various topics, including love, forgiveness, and the doing of good works. The second section is the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in which Jesus feeds a large crowd with five loaves and two fish. The third section is the Transfiguration, in which Jesus is transfigured before his disciples. The fourth section is the Healing of the Paralytic, in which Jesus heals a paralytic who is brought to him by his friends. The fifth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Galilee, which include the Healing of the Paralyzed Man, the Feeding of the Five Thousand again, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Bethesda. The sixth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Jerusalem, which include the Healing of the Paralytic on the Road to Emmaus, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a third time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam. The seventh section is the Miracles of Jesus in Herod's Court, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the Temple, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a fourth time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam again. The eighth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Capernaum, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the House of Simon, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a fifth time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam a third time. The ninth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Judea, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the House of Simon the Pharisee, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a sixth time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam a fourth time. The tenth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Galilee, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the House of Simon the Pharisee, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a seventh time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam a fifth time. The eleventh section is the Miracles of Jesus in Jerusalem, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the Temple, the Feeding of the Five Thousand an eighth time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam a sixth time. The twelfth section is the Miracles of Jesus in Galilee, which include the Healing of the Paralytic in the House of Simon the Pharisee, the Feeding of the Five Thousand a ninth time, and the Healing of the Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam a seventh time.
apostles were clothed with the power of the Holy Spirit and fully furnished for the work of universal evangelization. 'I will send you to the ends of the earth preaching the gospel. Mark was sent to Rome, and he preached to them in their own tongue, in which language he also [had?] published a writing of the gospel, while Peter and Paul were still in Jerusalem, preaching in the church in Rome. But after the departure [Iēdēo, "departure"] from those, Mark, the disciple and interpreter [μαθητὴς, heterōndēil], of Peter, even he has delivered us to writing the things which were preached by Peter.

Clement of Alexandria—c. 200 AD—(Hypotyp. In Eus., H. E., 2: 31). The Gospel, to Mk was as follows: After Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome and declared the gospel by the spirit, Mark came and met the apostles, as one who had followed him for a long time and remembered whatever he had, to write down what he had spoken, and Mk, after curry-combing the whole, presented it to his betters.

When Peter became aware of it he neither eagerly hindered nor did he approve it.

Also [Eus., H. E., II, 15]: "So charmed were the Romans with that show in upon their minds from the apostle Mark, that he himself, with single hearing and the vivē voces of the proclamation of the truth, they urged with the utmost solicitation on Mark, whose Gospel is in circulation and, who was Peter's attendant, that he would leave them in writing a record of Peter's teaching as they had received it by word of mouth. They did not give over until they had prevailed, though they became the cause of the composition of the so-called Gospel according to Mk. It is said that when the apostle knew this, he was pleased with the ease of the men and authorized the writing to be read in the churches."

Tertullian—North Africa, c. 207 AD—(Adv. Marc., iv. 5). The speech of the author to the four Gospels, namely, by apostles and two by companions of apostles, 'not excluding that which was published by Mark, for it may be said to be the Mark of Peter, whose Interpreter Mark was.'

Origen—Alexandria and the East, c. 240 AD—("Comm. on Mk"), H. E., 21: 31). The second is that according to Mk who composed it, under the guidance of Peter (οἱ Πέτρος ἐπίσκοπος ἡμῶν, ἡ ἡδήν Πέτρος ἐπισκόπος ἐστιν τῶν ἡμῶν), and who therefore, he acknowledged the evangelist as his son.

Eusebius, c. A.D. 325, in his "Eusebius, Eusebius, (1) Epiphanius. The discourses of Peter concerning the doings of Jesus. "Mark indeed writes this, but Peter who so testifies about himself, for all that is in Mk are memoirs (or records) of the discourses of Mk.

Ephraim of Cyprus, c. 350 AD—(Haer., 41): "But immediately after Matthew, Mark, having become a disciple of the holy city of Rome, is entrusted with the putting forth of a gospel. Handing over his work, he left the city of the holy Peter into the country of the Egyptians."

Jerome—East and West, c. 350 AD—(De vir. illust., vi. 30). The Gospel of Mark, according to the request of the brethren in Rome, wrote a brief Gospel in accordance with what he had heard Peter narrating. When Peter heard it he approved it and authorized it to be read in the churches.

Also Eus.: "Accordingly he had Titus as interpreter just as the blessed Peter had Mark as his Gospel was composed, Peter narrating and Mark writing."

Preface to the "Comm. on Mt": "The second is Mark, interpreter of the apostle Peter, and first bishop of the Alexandria church; who did not himself came the Lord Jesus, but accurately, rather than in order, narrated those of His deeds, which he had heard his teacher preaching."

To these should be added the Muratorian Fragment—c. 170 AD—which gives a list of the NT books with a brief summary of their contents. As to the account of Mt and most of that of Mk are lost, only these words remain concerning the 5:25, "quibus tamen interfuit, et adhuc non posuit," (see below).

These names represent the churches of the 2d, 3d and 4th cents., and practically every quarter of the Rom world. Quite clearly the common opinion was that Mark had written a Gospel and in it had given us mainly the teaching of Peter. Therefore Gospel is the one referred to in these statements there can be no reasonable doubt. Our four were certainly the four of Irenaeus and Tatian; and Salmon (Intro) has shown that the same four must have been accepted by Justin, Papias and their contemporaries, whether orthodox or Gnostic. Justin's reference to the surname "Boanerges" supports this so far as Mark is concerned, for in the Gospel of Mk alone is that fact mentioned (3:17).

A second point is equally clear—that the Gospel of Mk is substantially Peter's. Mark is called disciple, interpreter of Peter. Origen expressly quotes "Marcus, my son" (1 Pet 5: 13 AV) in this connection. "Disciple" is self-explanatory. "Interpreter" is its equivalent, not simply a traveling companion. "Interpreter" is less clear. One view equates it with "disciple," because Mar, and either Peter's Aram. discourses into Gr for the Hellenistic Christians in Jerus. (Adeney, et al.), or Peter's Gr discourses into Lat for the Christians in Rome (Swete, et al.). The other view—that of the patristics and most moderns (e.g. Zahn, Salmon)—is that it means "interpreter" simply in the sense that Mark put in writing what Peter had taught. The contention of Chase (HDB, III, 247) that this was a purely metaphorical use has little weight because it may be so used here. The conflict in the testimony as to date and place will be considered below (VII).

There is no clear declaration that Mark himself was a disciple of Jesus or an eyewitness of what he records. Indeed the statement of Papias seems to affirm the contrary. However, that statement may mean simply that he was not a personal disciple of Jesus, not that he had never seen Him at all.

The Muratorian Fragment is not clear. Its broken sentences have been much discussed but not well understood. Zahn completes it thus: "[all] quibus tamen interfuit, of its put."

... And understands it to mean that 'at some incidents [in the life of Jesus], however, he was present and so put them down.' Chase (HDB) and others regard "quibus tamen" as a Latin idiom, and believe the meaning to be that Mark, who had probably just been spoken of, was, as Peter, "was present at some of his discourses and so recorded them." Chase feels that the phrase following respecting Luke, also, a common name, so rich in con. ... compels the belief that Mark like Luke had not seen the Lord. But Paul, not Mark, may be there in mind, and further, this interpretation rather belittles Mark's association with Peter.

The patristic testimony may be regarded as summarized in the title of the work in our earliest MSS, viz. σάραπας Μάκσος, κατὰ Μάρκον. This phrase must refer to the author, not his source of information, for then it would necessarily have been σάραπας Μέρτρον, κατὰ Πέτρον. This is important as throwing light on the judgment of antiquity as to the authorship of the Gospel which the MSS all entitle σάραπας Μάθαιον, κατὰ Μάθαιον.

The internal evidence offers much to confirm the tradition and practically nothing to the contrary. That Peter is back of it is congruous with such facts as the Evidence following:

(1) The many vivid details referred to above (III. 6) must have come from an eyewitness. The frequent use of κἀκεῖνος, ἐπίθετον, in Mk and Mt, where Lk uses καὶ ἔπεισε, works in the same direction.

(2) Certain awkward expressions in lists of names can best be explained as due to his having altered and added in ἐπίθετον, e.g. 1:29, where Peter may have said, "We went home, the names and John accompanying us," in 1:36 (contrasted with Lk's impersonal description): Mk 3:16; 13:3.

(3) Two passages (9:6 and 11:21) describe Peter's own thoughts; others mention incidents which Peter would be most likely to mention; e.g. 14:37 and vs 66-67 (esp. imp. ἐπίθετον, ἤπειρον) in Acts 10:15.

(4) In 3:7 the order of names suits Peter's Galilean standpoint rather than that of Mark in Jerus.-Gallic, Judea, Jerus., Perea, Tyre, Sidon. The very artlessness of these hints is the best kind of evidence. The touch with one who saw with his own eyes and speaks out of his own consciousness.

(5) Generally Mark, like Matthew, writes from the standpoint of the Twelve more frequently than Luke; and Mark, more frequently than Matthew, places the center of the three most honored by Jesus. Of Mk 5:27 with Mt 9:28, where Mt makes no reference to the three;
the unusual order of the names in Lk's corresponding passage (8:51) suggests that James was his ultimate source. Mt Mk 14 is clearly from the three, Lk may be, but Mt's is not. The contrast in this respect between the common synoptic matrix and Mk Lk 18:14 lends weight to this consideration.

The scope of the Gospel which corresponds to that outlined in Peter's address to Cornelius (Acts 10:37-43).

(7) The book suits Peter's character—impressionable rather than reflective, and emotional rather than logical. To such men arguments are of minor importance. It is easier to believe than to think. It may seem to militate against all this that the three striking incidents in Peter's career narrated in Mt 14:22-33 after Peter: 17:24-27 (tribute money) and 16:15-16 (the church and the keys), should be assigned to this is just a touch of that courtesy and modesty which companionship with Jesus bred. We see John in his Gospel hiding himself in a similar way. These men are more likely to mention things that reflect discredit on themselves. It is only in Mk's list of the Twelve that by itself is called "the publican." So Peter never appears in a separate role in Mk except to receive a rebuke (Bacon).

As to Mark's authorship, the internal evidence appears slight. Like the others, he does not observe or reflect at that very reason what hints there are become the more impressive.

There may be something in Zahn's point that the description of John as brother of James is an unconscious hint that the author was John. There are two other passages, however, which are clearer and which reinforce each other. The description of John in the 15:28 is very different from the Gospel incidents. But if Mark himself was the author, its presence and implication is supported. In that case, it is likely that the Superb was celebrated in his own home and that the upper room is the same as that in Acts 1:13. This is favored by the fuller description of Mk, esp. the word "ready"—a most natural touch, the echo of the housewife's exclamation of surprise everything was ready for the guests. It is made almost a certainty when we compare 14:17 with the parallel in Mt Lk. Mt 26:30 reads: "Now when even came, he was sitting at meat with the twelve disciples: Lk 22:14: And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him; while Mk has: "And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve. The last represents exactly the standpoint of one in the house who sees Jesus and the Twelve approaching. (And how admirably the term the twelve disciples the apostles the twelve suit Mt Lk, and Mk respectively.) Such phenomena, undesigned (save by the Inspiring Spirit), are just those that would not have been invented later, and become the strongest attestations the reliability of the tradition and the historicity of the Gospel. Modern modernist critics have ignored this view. We have seen, also, subtle but weighty reasons for believing that Mark added a little himself. Need we seek further sources, or does inquiry resolve itself into an analysis of Peter's teaching?

B. Weiss believes that Mark used a document now lost containing mainly sayings of Jesus, called Logia (L) in the earlier discussions, but now commonly known as Q. In that opinion he has been joined by Sanday and Street. In recent years, the language and wording of L and Q have sought to reconstruct Q on the basis of the non-Markan matter in Mt and Lk. Allen extracts it from Mt alone, thinking that Mk also may have drawn a few sayings from it. Some assign a distinct source for Lch 15. Sanday considers it a document written for the use of the church and respecting after the fall of Jesus, incorporating a few utterances by Jesus and itself incorporated bodily by Mark. Other sources, oral or written, are postulated by Bacon for smaller portions and grouped under X. He calls the final redactor R— not Paul but a Paulinist of a radical type.

In forming a judgment much depends upon one's conception of the teaching method of Jesus and the apostles. Teaching and preaching are not synonymous terms. Mt sums up the early ministry in Galilee under "teaching, preaching and healing" and gives us the substance of that teaching as it impressed itself upon him. Mk reports less of it, but speaks of it more frequently than either Mt or Lk. Jesus evidently said much, but said it in place, and a large proportion of the time thus spent was devoted to the special instruction of the inner circle of disciples. The range of that instruction was not wide. It was intensive rather than extensive. He held Himself to the vital topic of the kingdom of God. He must have gone over it again and again. He would not hesitate to repeat instructions which even chosen men found it so difficult to understand. Teaching by repetition was common then as it is now in the East. The word "catechize" (κατακηχεῖν) implies that, and that word is used by Paul of Jewish (Rom 2:18) and by Luke of Christian teaching (Lk 1:4). See CATECHIST.

The novelty in His teaching was not in method so much as in content, authority and accompanying miraculous power (Mk 1:27). Certainly He was far removed from vain repetition. His supreme concern was for the spirit. Just as certainly He was not concerned about a mere reproduction for originality or for variety of resources. He was concerned about teaching them the truth so effectively that they would be prepared by intellectual cleanness, as well as spiritual sympathy, to make it known to others. He stated His evidence, so kind to all but so often thwarted by human self-will, was free to work His perfect work for Him and make all things work together for the furtherance of His purpose. Thus incidents occur, situations arise and personal and typical aspects of the scene, calling for fresh inspiration, furnishing illustration and securing the presentation of truth in fulness with proper balance and emphasis and in right perspective.

Thus before His death the general character of that kingdom, its principles and prospects, were taught. That furnished the warp for the future Gospels. The essence, the substance and general form were the same for all the Twelve; but each from the standpoint of his own individuality saw particular aspects and views opposed to this are touched upon in what follows.

VI. Sources and Integrity. — We have seen that, according to the testimony of the Fathers, Peter's teaching and preaching are at least the main source, and that many of the sayings were given to us by him. We have seen, also, subtle but weighty reasons for believing that Mark added a little himself. Need we seek further sources, or does inquiry resolve itself into an analysis of Peter's teaching?

B. Weiss believes that Mark used a document now lost containing mainly sayings of Jesus, called Logia (L) in the earlier discussions, but now commonly known as Q. In that opinion he has been joined by Sanday and Street. In recent years, the language and wording of L and Q have sought to reconstruct Q on the basis of the non-Markan matter in Mt and Lk. Allen extracts it from Mt alone, thinking that Mk also may have drawn a few sayings from it. Some assign a distinct source for Lch 15. Sanday considers it a document written for the use of the church and respecting after the fall of Jesus, incorporating a few utterances by Jesus and itself incorporated bodily by Mark. Other sources, oral or written, are postulated by Bacon for smaller portions and grouped under X. He calls the final redactor R— not Paul but a Paulinist of a radical type.

In forming a judgment much depends upon one's conception of the teaching method of Jesus and the apostles. Teaching and preaching are not synonymous terms. Mt sums up the early ministry in Galilee under "teaching, preaching and healing" and gives us the substance of that teaching as it impressed itself upon him. Mk reports less of it, but speaks of it more frequently than either Mt or Lk. Jesus evidently said much, but said it in place, and a large proportion of the time thus spent was devoted to the special instruction of the inner circle of disciples. The range of that instruction was not wide. It was intensive rather than extensive. He held Himself to the vital topic of the kingdom of God. He must have gone over it again and again. He would not hesitate to repeat instructions which even chosen men found it so difficult to understand. Teaching by repetition was common then as it is now in the East. The word "catechize" (κατακηχεῖν) implies that, and that word is used by Paul of Jewish (Rom 2:18) and by Luke of Christian teaching (Lk 1:4). See CATECHIST.

The novelty in His teaching was not in method so much as in content, authority and accompanying miraculous power (Mk 1:27). Certainly He was far removed from vain repetition. His supreme concern was for the spirit. Just as certainly He was not concerned about a mere reproduction for originality or for variety of resources. He was concerned about teaching them the truth so effectively that they would be prepared by intellectual cleanness, as well as spiritual sympathy, to make it known to others. He stated His evidence, so kind to all but so often thwarted by human self-will, was free to work His perfect work for Him and make all things work together for the furtherance of His purpose. Thus incidents occur, situations arise and personal and typical aspects of the scene, calling for fresh inspiration, furnishing illustration and securing the presentation of truth in fulness with proper balance and emphasis and in right perspective.

Thus before His death the general character of that kingdom, its principles and prospects, were taught. That furnished the warp for the future Gospels. The essence, the substance and general form were the same for all the Twelve; but each from the standpoint of his own individuality saw particular aspects and views opposed to this are touched upon in what follows.
come. When He has come they will be ready to witness in power.

The apostles' conception of their task is indicated in some measure by Peter when he insisted that an inauguration in a successor to Jesus was that he must have been with them from the beginning to the end of Christ's ministry, and so be conversant with His words and deeds. From the day of Pentecost onward they gave themselves predominantly to teaching. The thousands converted on that day continued in the teaching of the apostles. When the trouble broke out between Hebrews and Hellenists, the Seven were appointed because the apostles could not leave the word of God to serve tables. The urgency of this business may have been one reason why they stayed in Jerusalem when persecution scattered so many of the church (Acts 8:2). They were thus in close touch for years, not only through the struggle between Hebrews and Hellenists, but under the administration of the gentle Cornelius and his friends by Peter had been solemly ratified by the church in Jerusalem and possibly until the Council had declared against the contention that circumcision was necessary for salvation. These years they had every opportunity for mutual conference, and the vital importance of the questions that arose would compel them to avail themselves of such opportunities. Their martyr-like devotion to Jesus would make them willing undertakers to write down a misrepresentation of His teaching. The Acts account of their discussions at great crises proves that conclusively. To their success in training others and the accuracy of the body of catachetical information are due in large part to the "certainty" or undoubted truth of it (Lk 1:4).

Thus Jesus' post-resurrection appearances, the experience of the years and the guidance of the Spirit are the source and explanation of the apostolic presentation of the gospel.

Of that company Peter was the recognized leader, and did more than any other to determine the mold into which at least the post-resurrection teachings were cast. Luke tells us of many attempts to record them. He himself in his brief reports of Peter's addresses sketches their broad outlines. Mark, at the request of Rom Christians and with his "teacher's" approval, undertook to give an adequate account. Two special facts influenced the result—one, the people for whom he wrote; the other, the existence (as we may assume) of Matthew's Q. It would be natural for him to supplement rather than duplicate the apostolic source. The Q, he presented mainly the ethical or law side of Christianity that would naturally present the gospel side of it—and so become its complement—while at the same time this presentation and the needs of the people for whom he specifically wrote it, made it necessary to add something from the body of catachetical material, oral or written, not included in Q, as his frequent use of ἵνα, κατὰ διδάσκαι, seems to imply (Buckley, 152 ff.). So Mk's is the "beginning of the Gospel." He introduces Jesus in the act of symbolically devoting Himself to that death for our sins and rising again, which constitutes the gospel and then entering upon His ministry by calling upon the people to "repent and believe in the gospel." The book is written from the standpoint of the resurrection, and gives the story of the passion and of the ministry in a perspective thus determined. About the time or place in which he may have been, Matthew, writing for Jewish Christians, combines this gospel side of the teaching with his own Q side of it, adding from the common stock or abridging as his purpose might suggest or space demand. Later Luke does a similar service for Gentile Christians (cf. Harack, The Twofold Gospel in the NT).

The only serious question about the integrity of the book concerns the last twelve vs., for a discussion of which see under III above. Some have suggested that 11:1-13 is akin to 16:9-20, and may have been added by the same hand. But while vocabulary and connection are main arguments against the genuineness of the latter, in both these respects 11:1-13 is bound up with the main body of the book. Nor is there sufficient reason for denying ch. 13 as a true report of what Jesus said.

Wendling's theory of three strata assignable to three different writers—historian, poet, and theologian—is quite overdrawn. Barring the closing verses, there is nothing which could be anything more than an earlier and a later edition by Mark himself, and the strongest point in favor of that is Luke's omission of 6:45—8:26. But Hawkins gives other reasons for that.

VII. Date and Place of Composition—Ancient testimony is shadowy. The Preface Chronicle puts it in 40 AD, and many MSS, both uncial and cursive (Harnack, Chronologie, 70, 124) 10 or 12 years after the Ascension. These Swete sets aside as due to the mistaken tradition that Peter began his work in Rome in the year 42 AD. Similarly he would set aside the opinion of Chrysostom (which has some MSS subscriptions to support it) that it was written in Alexandria, as an error growing out of the statement of Eusebius (HE, II, 16) that Mark went to Egypt and preached there the Gospel he composed. This he does in deference to the strong body of evidence that it was written in Rome about the time of Peter's death. Still there remains a discrepancy between Irenaeus, as a probable author of the quotation, and Eusebius, as so understood, Irenaeus places it after the death of Peter, whereas Jerome, Epiphanius, Origen and Clement of Alexandria clearly place it within Peter's lifetime. But it does not seem necessary to so explain the quotations. They may be composed while Peter was living, but only published after his death. Christophorson (1570 AD) had suggested that and supported it by the conjectural emendation of ἐνδοκιν, ἐνδοκῶν, "surrendering," to ἐνδοκίνα, "imprisonment," found in Lk 4:38. Grabe, Mill and others thought Irenaeus referred, not to Peter's death, but to his departure from Rome on further missionary tours. But if we take εὐαγγελία in that sense, it is better to understand it as the speech of Peter, rather than from Rome. Irenaeus' statement that the apostles were now fully furnished for the work of evangelization (Adv. Haer., iii.1) certainly seems to imply that they were now ready to leave Pal; and his next statement is that Matthew and Mark wrote their respective Gospels. And Eusebius (HE, II, 24) states explicitly that Matthew committed his Gospel to writing "when he was about" to leave Pal "to go to other peoples." The same may very possibly be true of Mark. If the first of Mark was in Caesarea or Antioch made the request of Mark 1:13-15 be necessary. How, by the time of Irenaeus, the whole incident might be transferred to Rome.

If this view be adopted, the date would probably not be before the council at Jerusalem and the events of Gal 2:11 ff. It is true the NT hints are that the apostles had left Jerusalem before that, but that they had gone beyond Syria is not likely. At any rate, at the time of the clash at Antioch they had not become so fixed on the question touching Jews and Gentiles in the church as to be "fully furnished for the work of universal evangelization." But may it not be that Paul's strong statement of the seriousness of their error actually did settle those questions in the minds of the leaders? If so, and if, with new vision and ardor, they turn to the work of world-wide evangelism, that would be a natural and worthy occasion for the composition of the Gospel. The place may be Caesarea or Antioch, and the date not earlier than 50 AD. This is the simplest synthesis of modern opinion as to date has ranged more widely than the ancient. Baur and Strauss were compelled by their tendency and mythical theories to place it in the 2d cent. Recent criticism tends strongly to fix the date in the sixties of the 1st cent., and more commonly the last sixties. This is based partly on
hints in the Gospel itself, partly on its relation to Mt and Lk. The hints usually adduced are 2:26 and 15. The former, representing the temple as still standing only if the relative clause be Mark's explanatory addition. Ch 13 has more force because, if Jesus had already fallen, we might expect some recognition of the fact.

Two other slight hints may be mentioned. The omission by the synoptists of the raising of Lazarus, and of the resurrection in general, in connexion with the announcement of the Resurrection, shows that Jesus argues an early date when mention of them might have served the family. When the Fourth Gospel was published, they may have been no longer alive. The description of John as the brother of James (Jn 21:2) may also take us back to an early date when the name James was the more honored of the two brothers—though the usual order of the names may be, as Zahn thinks, to the author's instinctively distinguishing that John from himself.

The relation of Mk to Mt and Lk is important if the very widespread conviction of the priority of Mk be true. For the most likely date for Acts is 62 AD, as suggested by the mention of Paul's two years' residence in Rome, and Luke's Gospel is earlier than the Acts. It may well have been written at Caesarea about 60 AD; that again throws Mk back into the fifties.

The great objection to an early date is the amount of the facts given in the destruction of Jerusalem. Abbott and others have marshaled numerous other objections, but the weight—most of them indeed—seems pre-puerile. The real crux is that to accept an earlier date than 70 AD is to admit prophetic prophecy. Yet to deny that, e.g. for a believer in Christ, is an unwarranted pre-judgment, and even so far to reduce it as to deny its prophetic character is to charge Luke—a most fastidiously honest historian—with ascribing to Jesus statements which He never made.

The apparent date Mt is not earlier than 70 is due to the same feeling. But the problem here is complicated by the usual inconsistency of the assumption regard as proof positive that it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Others (e.g. Ahlcrath) think that it absolutely for certain cannot date much later than 70 AD, and consider 75 AD as a limit. But is it not possible that by φησὶν, εὐθέως (not ἀπαντάτως, παραχρήματε), Christ, speaking as a prophet, may have meant no more than that the next great event comparable with the epochal overthrow of Judaism would be His own return and that the Divine purpose marches straight on from the one to the other? The NT nowhere says that the second advent would take place within that generation. See below under "b"... The NT nowhere says that the second advent would take place within that generation. See below under "b"...

VIII. Historicity.—Older rationalists, like Paulus, not denying Mark's authorship, regarded the miraculous elements as misconceptions of actual events. Strauss, regarding these as mythical, was compelled to postulate a 2d-cent. date. When, however, the date was pushed back to the neighborhood of 70 AD, the historicity was felt to be largely established. But recently the theory of "pragmatic values" has been developed; Bacon thus states it: "The key to all genuinely scientific appreciation of Bib. narrative...is the recognition of motive. The motive...is never strictly historical but...aesthetic and...apologetic...The evangelic tradition consists of so and so many anecdotes, told and retold for the purpose of explaining or defending beliefs and practices of the contemporary church" (Modern Comm., Beginnings of Gospel Story, 9). Historicism works out the result that Mk is charged again and again with historical and other blunders. This view, like Baur's tendency-theory, has elements of truth. One is that the vocabulary of a later day may be a necessary condition of the present explanation, but not in any sense the evidence against the historical reality of the accounts passed on from mouth to mouth. The other is that each author has his purpose, but that simply determines his selection and arrangement of material; it neither creates nor misrepresents it if the author be honest and well informed. The word "selection" is advisedly chosen. The evangelists did not lack material. Each of the Twelve had personal knowledge beyond the context of Q or of Mk. These represent the central core—the one the ethical, the other the evangelic side of it—but their material is material that is scattered in all directions. Luke's introduction and John's explicit declaration attest that fact. And neither John nor Luke throws the slightest suspicion on the reliability of the material they did not use. There is no sufficient reason for charging them with misstating the facts to make a point. Bacon seems to trust any other ancient writers or even his own imagination rather than the evangelists. The test becomes altogether too subjective. Yet since Christianity is a historical revelation, perversion of history may become perversion of most vital religious teaching. In the last analysis, the critic undertakes to decide just what Jesus could or could not have done or said. The utter uncertainty of the result is seen by a comparison of Schmiedel and Bacon. The former is sure that the cry "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me" is one of the very few genuine sayings of Jesus; Bacon is equally sure that Jesus could not have uttered it. To compare Mark with "immoral crudity" because in 10:45 he reports Jesus as saying that He came "to give his life a ransom..." Thus on two most vital matters he charges the evangelists with error because they run counter to his own religious opinions.

Plummer's remark is just (Comm. on Mt, xxiii): "To decide a priori that Deity cannot become incarnate, or that incarnate Deity must exhibit such and such characteristics, is neither true philosophy nor scientific criticism. The NT ("Ml" in Bible for Home and School, 26): 'The closer we get to the historic Jesus the surer we feel that He lived and wrought as He is reported in the Synoptic Gospels.' The evangelists had opportunities to know the facts such as we have not. The whole method of their training was such as to secure accuracy. They support each other. They have given us sketches of unparalleled beauty, vigor and power, and have portrayed for us a Person moving among sufficient reality. The NT, sufficiently understood, is the outstanding miracle. If we cannot trust the facts, there is little hope of ever getting at the facts at all.

IX. Purpose and Plan.—Mark's purpose was to write down the Gospel as Peter had presented it to Romans, so say the Fathers, at least, 1. The external and internal evidence supports them. Gospel for In any additions made by himself he Romans had the same persons in mind. That the Gospel was for Gentiles can be seen (a) from the tr of the Aram. expressions in 3:17 (Boanerges), 5:41 (Talitha cumi), 7:11 (Corban), 10:46 (Bartimaeus), 14:36 (Abba), 15:22 (Golgotha); (b) in the explanation of Jewish customs in 14:12 and 15:42; (c) from the fact that the Law is not mentioned and the OT is only once quoted in Mark's own narrative; (d) the gentile sections, esp. in chs 6-8.

That it was for Romans is seen in (a) the explanation of a Gr term by a Lat in 12:42; (b) the preponderance of works of power, the emphasis on authority (2:10), patience and heroic endurance (10:17 ff); (c) 10:12 which forbids a practice that was not Jewish but Rom. Those who believe it was written at Rome find further links in the mention of Rufus (15:21; cf Rom 16:13) and the resemblance between 7:1-23 and Rom 14. The Rom centurion's remark (16:39) is the Q.E.D. of the author, and bears the same relation to Mark's purpose as Jas 20:31 to John's.

But one cannot escape the feeling that we have
in this Gospel the antitype of the Servant of Jehovah. A. B. Davidson (OT Theol., 368) tells us that there are two great figures around which Isaiah’s thoughts gather—the King and the Servant. The former rises “to the unsurpassable height of ‘God with us,’ ‘mighty God,’ teaching that in Him God shall be wholly present with His people; the Servant is the other. The former is depicted in Mt, who also identifies Him with the Servant (12:18 ff); the latter by Mk who identifies Him with the Messianic King (11:10; 14:62). Davidson summarizes the description of the Servant: “(1) He is God’s chosen; (2) He has a mission to establish judgment on the earth. . . . The word is His instrument and the Lord is in the Word, or rather He Himself is the impersonation of it; (3) His endowment is the Spirit and an invincible faith; (4) There is in Him a marvelous combination of greatness and lowliness; (5) There are inevitable sufferings—bearing the penalty of others’ sins; (6) He thus redeems Israel and brings light to the Gentiles. (7) Israel’s repentance and restoration precede that bringing of blessing.” It is not strange that this Servant-conception—this remarkable blend of strength and submission, achieving victory through apparent defeat—should appeal to Peter. He was himself an ardent, who believed man who knew both defeat and victory. Moreover, he himself had hired servants (Mk 1:20), and now for years had been a servant of Christ (cf Acts 4:29). That it did appeal to him and became familiar to the early Christians can be seen from Acts 3:13 and 4:30. In his First Ep. he has 17 references to Isaiah, 9 of which belong to the second part. Temporarily Mark seems to have been like Peter. And his experience in a wealthy home where servants were kept (1:30), and as himself aspiring to be an apostle in Christian service, fitted him both to appreciate and record the character and doings of the perfect servant—the Servant of Jehovah. For Rom Christians that historic figure would have a peculiar fascination.

The plan of the Gospel seems to have been influenced by this conception. Christ’s kingdom was apprehended by the Twelve at a comparatively early date. It was the Gospel not until after the resurrection, when He opened to them the Scriptures that they saw Him as the Suffering Servant of Isa 53. That gave Peter his gospel as we have already seen, and at the same time the general lines of its presentation: to put it more specifically, a sketch of the Servant in Acts 10. That sketch is filled in for us by Mark. So we have the following analysis:

**Title:** 1

1. The Baptist preparing the way: 1:2-8; cf Isa 40:3 f.
3. His greatness—the Galilean Ministry: 1:14—8:30; cf Isa 43:4-5 (1).
   (2) Outside the synagogue: parable teaching of the multitude, choice and training of the Twelve and their Great Commission: 3:7 f—8:30.
   (2) On the way to Jerusalem and the cross—through Galilee (6:30—50); Peræa (10:1—45); Judaea (10:46—52).
   (3) The word: triumphal entry into Jerus (11:1—11).
   (4) In Jerus and vicinity—opposed by the leaders (11:12—13:44); foretelling their doom (13:3); passion week (13:41—14:42); betrayed, condemned, crucified and buried in a rich man’s tomb (15)
5. His victory—the resurrection: Ch 16; cf Isa 53:10—12. What follows in Isa is taken up in Acts, for it is the first part of which Peter or Mark may have been Luke’s main source.

**plain that the material is sometimes grouped according to subject-matter.**

This Servant-conception may also be the real explanation of some of the striking features of this Gospel, e.g., the absence of a genealogy and any record of His early life; the frequent use of the word "straightway," the son's not knowing the day (13:32); and the abrupt ending at 16:8 (see III).

**X. Leading Doctrines.**—The main one, naturally, is the Person of Christ. The thesis is that He is equal with God. Son of Messiah, Author (Source)

1. **Person** of the Gospel. The first part of the book closes with the disciples' confession of Messiahship; the second, with the supreme demonstration that He is Son of God. Introductory to each is the Father's declaration of Him as His Beloved Son (1:11; 9:7). That the sonship is unique is indicated in 12:6 and 13:32. At the same time He is the Son of Man—true man (4:38; 8:5; 14:34); ideal man as absolutely obedient to God (10:40; 14:36), and Head of humanity (2:10.28), their rightful Messiah or King (1:1; 14:62)—yet Servant of all (10:44 f); David's Son and David's Lord (12:37). The unique Sonship is the final explanation of all else, His power, His knowledge, His saving work. Thus, in the passage of Mk 10:39; 14:27; 13), superiority to all men, whether friends (1:7; 9:3 f) or foes (12:34), and to superhuman beings, whatever good (13:32) or evil (1:32; 3:27).


As to salvation, the Son is God's final messenger (12:6); He gives His life a ransom instead of many (10:45); His bloodshed is thus the blood of the covenant (14:24); that involves for Him death in the fullest sense, including rupture of fellowship with God (15:34). From the outset He knew what was before Him—only that, He explained (5:11; cf 2:20); but the horror of it is burdensome, He, esp. from the transfiguration onward (10:32; 14:33—36); that was the Divine provision for salvation: He gave His life (10:45). The human condition is repentance and faith (10:30; 5:36; 6:5; 9:23; 16:16), though He bestows lesser blessings apart from personal faith (1:23—26 5:1—20; 6:35—43). The power of faith, within the will of God, is limitless (11:25); faith leads to doing the will of God, and only such as do His will are Christ's true kindred (3:35). Salvation is possible for Gentiles also as Jew (7:24—30).

The eschatology of this Gospel is found chiefly in 8:34—9:1 and 13. In 9:1 we have a prediction of the overthrow of Jerus which is here given as a type and proof of His final coming for judgment and reward which He had in mind in the preceding verses. Ch 13 is a development of this—the destruction of Jerus being meant in vs 5:28 and 28—31, the final coming in vs 24—27 and 32. The distinction is clearly marked by the pronouns ἄρσα, ταύτα, and εἰκόνα, εἰκόνας, in vs 30 and 32 (cf Mt 24:34.35). In each passage (9:1; 13:30) the fall of Jerus is definitely fixed as toward the close of that generation; the time of the fall is 5:28; 7:18; cf the Father (13:32). Between Christ’s earthly life and the Second Coming He is seated at the right hand of God (12:36; 16:19). The resurrection which He predicted for Himself (8:31; 9:31; 10
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MARKET, mär'ket. MARKETPLACE, mär'ket-pla, MART, märt (מַרְכֶּס, ma'ærôkh, מַרְכֶּס, sôbar; ἄγορα, ágora): (1) Ma'ërôkh, from a root meaning "trading" and hence goods exchanged, and so "merchandise" in RV, "market" in AV, occurs only tr'd in "Crown Theol., Lib.," Luke the Physician, 1907: means a "trading emporium," hence mart, and merchandise. It occurs only in Isa 23 3 (see Merchandise). (2) Sôbar means a "trading emporium," hence mart, and merchandise. It occurs only in Isa 23 3 (see Merchandise). (3) Ágora, from root meaning "to collect," means a "town meeting-place," "resort of the people," so a place where the public gravity met to exchange goods and wares. No doubt, the central place soon filling up, the people thronged the adjoining streets, and so in time each street
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MARKET.
going to Market.

player with whom he might bargain for his services, usually by the day (Mt 20:1-16); (3) a place where the proud pretender could parade in long robes and get public recognition, "salutations in the market-places," e.g. the scribes and Pharisees against whom Jesus emphatically warns His disciples (Mt 23:3-7; Mk 12:38; Lk 11:43; 20:46); (4) a place where the sick were brought for treatment, the poor man's sanatorium, a municipal hospital; Jesus "who went about doing good" often found His opportunity there (Mt 6:50); (5) a place of preliminary hearing in trials, where the accused might be brought before rulers who were present at the time, e.g. Paul and Silas at Philippi (Acts 16:19); (6) a place for religious and probably political or philosophical discussion (gossip also), a forum, a free-speech throne; no doubt often used by the early apostles not only as a place of proclaiming some truth of the new religion but also a place of advertisement for a coming synagogue service, e.g. Paul in Athens (Acts 17:17).

Wed 16 12 (AV) has "They counted ... our time here a market for gain," RV "a gainful fair," m "a keeping of festival," Gr παργυρισμος, παραγυρισμος, "an assembly of all." Such assemblies offered particular opportunities for business dealings.

MARKET, SHEEP. See SHEEP MARKET.

MARMOTH, mær`moth, már`moth (B. Μαρμωθ, Marmothi, A. Mārpaḥ, Marmaḥi): "The priest of the son of Uriea" (to whom were committed the silver and gold for the temple by the returning exiles (1 Esd 8:62)="Meremoth" in [♀ Ezra 8:33.


MARRIAGE, ma`ri`j. Introductory

Scope and Viewpoint of the Present Article
1. Marriage among the Hebrews
2. Betrothal the First Formal Part
3. Wedding Ceremonies
4. Jesus' Sanction of the Institution
5. His Teaching concerning Divorce

LITERATURE

It would be interesting to study marriage biologically and sociologically, to get the far and near historical and social background of it as an institution, esp. as it existed among the ancient Jews, and as it figures in the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the NT. For Moses the institutions, marriage, and the family which is the outcome of marriage, must be judged, not by its status at any particular time, but in the light of its history. Such a study of it would raise a host of related historic questions, e.g. What was its origin? What part has it played in the evolution and civilization of the race? What social functions has it performed? What is its sequel? Can the services it has rendered to civilization and progress be performed or accorded in any other way? This, indeed, would call for us to go back even farther—to try to discover the psychology of the institution and its history, the beliefs from which it has sprung and by which it has survived so long, as well worth while and amply justified by much of the thinking of our time; for, as one of the three social institutions that support the most challenged form and fabric of modern civilization, marriage, private property and the state, its continued existence, in present form at least, is a matter of serious discussion and its abolition, along with the other two, is confidently prophesied. Moses Marriage, as at present understood, is an arrangement most closely associated with the existing social status and stands or falls with it (Bebel, Socialism and Sex, 196, Reeves, London; "The Cooperative Commonwealth in Its Outline, Greenland, 234). But such a study is entirely outside of and beyond the purpose of this article.

Neither the Bible in general, nor Jesus in particular, treats of the family from the point of view of the historian or the sociologist, but solely from that of the teacher of religion; and in that short, their point of view is theological, rather than sociological. Moses and the prophets, no less than Jesus and His apostles, accepted marriage as an existing institution which gave rise to certain practical, ethical questions, and they dealt with it accordingly. There is nothing in the record of the teachings of Jesus and of His apostles to indicate that they gave to marriage any new social content, custom or sanction. They simply accepted it as it existed in the conventionaler civilizations of the Jews of their day and used it and the customs connected with it for ethical or illustrative purposes. One exception is to be made to this general statement, viz. that Jesus granted that because of the exigencies of the social development of His time it had somewhat modified it to the extent of permitting and regulating divorce, clearly indicating, however, at the same time, that He regarded such modification as out of harmony with the institution as at first given to mankind. According to the original Divine purpose it was monogamous, and any form of polygamy, and apparently of divorce, was excluded by the Divine idea and purpose. The treatment of the subject here, therefore, will be limited as follows: Marriage among the Ancient Hebrews and Other Semites; Betrothal as the First Formal Part of the Transaction; Wedding Ceremonies Connected with Marriage, esp. as Reflected in the NT; and Jesus' Sanction and Use of the Institution, Teaching concerning Divorce, etc.

With the Hebrews marriage life was the normal life. Any exception called for apology and explanation. "Any Jew who has not 1. Marriage a wife is no man" (Talmud). It was among the most esteemed among the Jews, and sexual maturity comes much earlier indeed in the East than with us in the West—in what we call childhood. The ancient Hebrews, in common
with all Orientals, regarded the family as the social unit. In this their view of it coincides with that of modern sociologists. Of the three great events in the family life, birth, marriage and death, marriage was regarded as the most important. It was a step that led to the gravest tribal and family consequences. In case of a daughter, if she should prove unsatisfactory to her husband, she would likely be returned to the ancestral home, discarded and discredited, and there would be almost inevitably a feeling of injustice engendered on one side, and a sense of mutual irritation between the families (Jgs 14 20; 1 S 15 19). If she failed to pass muster with her mother-in-law she would just as certainly have to go, and the results would be much the same (cf customs in China). It was a matter affecting the whole circle of relatives, and posei

ibly tribal amity as well. It was natural and deemed necessary, therefore, that the selection of the wife and the arrangement of all contractual and financial matters connected with it should be decided upon by the parents or guardians of the couple involved. Though the consent of the parties was sometimes sought (Gen 24 8) and romantic attachments were not unknown (Gen 29 20; 34 3; Jgs 14 1; 1 S 18 20), the girl or woman in the case was not currently thought of as having a personal existence at her own disposal. She was simply a passive unit in the family under the protection and supreme control of father or brothers. In marriage, she was practically the chattel, the purchased possession and personal property of her husband, who was her ba'al or master (Hos 2 16), she herself being b'alah (Isa 62 4). The control, however, was not always absolute (Gen 26 34; Ex 2 21).

The bargaining instinct, so dominant among Orientals then as now, played a large part in the transaction. In idea the family was a little kingdom of which the father was the king, or absolute ruler. There are many indications, not only that the family was the unit from which national coherence was derived, but that this unit was perpetuated through the supremacy of the oldest male. Thus society became patriarchal, and this is the key of the ancient history of the family and the nation. Through the expansion of the family group was evolved in turn the clan, the tribe, the nation, and the authority of the father became in turn that of the chief, the ruler, and the king. The Oriental cannot conceive, indeed, of any band, or clan, or company without a "father," even though there be no kith or kinship involved in the matter. The "father," too, was God's representative, and as such he was simply carrying out God's purpose, for instance, in selecting a bride for his son, or giving the bride to be married to the son of another. This is as true of the far East as of the near East today. Accordingly, as a rule, the young people simply acquiesced, without question or complaint, in what was thus done for them, accepting it as though God had done it directly. Accordingly, too, the family and tribal loyalty overshadowed love-making and patriotism, in the larger sense. Out of this idea of the solidarity and selectness of the tribe and family springs the overmastering desire of the Oriental for progeny, and for the conservation of the family or the tribe at any cost. Hence the feuds, bloody and bitter, the passion between this family or tribe and another that has in any way violated this sacred law.

Traces of what is known as beena marriage are found in the OT, e.g. that of Jacob, where Laban claims Jacob's wives and children as his own (Gen 31 31-44), and that of Moes (Ex 2 21; 4 18). This is that form of marriage esteemed a part of the transaction of wife's tribe, the children belonging to her tribe and descent being reckoned on her side (cf W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 94). In Samson's case we seem to have an instance of what is known among Arabs as gada marriage (from gada, here being the customary gada-k (Jgs 14; 15 1; 16 4). There is no hint that he meant to take his wife home. It is differentiated from prostitution in that it is attached to it and the children are recognized as legitimate by the tribe. Such marriages make it easier to understand the existence of the matriarchate, or the custom of reckoning the descent of children and property through the mothers. The influence of polygamy would follow in the same direction, subdividing the family into smaller groups connected with the several mothers. But however, no clear evidence in the OT of polyandry (a plurality of husbands), though the Levirate marriage is regarded by some as a survival of it. In other words, polygamy among the Hebrews seems to have been confined to polygyny (a plurality of wives). It is easy to trace the causes: (1) desire for a numerous offspring ("May his tribe increase"); (2) barrenness of first wife (as in Abraham's case); (3) advantages conferred by partial alliances (e.g. Solomon); (4) the custom of making wives of captives taken in war (cp Ps 45 3-9); (Gen 44). A similar custom prevails in China and Japan, and in cases becomes very oppressive. The marriage may have been intended by the parents from the infant, but this formality of betrothal is not entered on till the marriage is considered reasonably certain and measurably near. A prolonged interval between betrothal and marriage was deemed undesirable on many accounts, though often an interval was
needed that the groom might render the stipulated service or pay the price—say a year or two, or, as in the case of Jacob, it might be seven years. The betrothed parties were legally in the position of a married couple, and unfaithfulness was "adultery" (Dt 22:23; Mt 1:19).

Polygamy is likely to become prevalent only where conditions are abnormal, as where there is a disproportion between the sexes, as in tribal life in a state of war. In settled conditions it is possible only to those able to provide "dowry" and support for each and all of their wives.

The fact of polygamy in OT times is abundantly witnessed by Abraham, Jacob, the judges, David, Solomon, etc. It was prevalent in Issachar (1 Ch 7:4); among the middle class (1 S 1:1). But it is impossible, even in the OT, as in our own time, to divorce the Divine ideal (Gen 2:24), and its original is traced to a deliberate departure from that ideal by Lamech, the Cainite (Gen 4:19). Kings are warned against it (Dt 17:17; cf Gen 29:31; 30). Noah, Isaac and Joseph had each only one wife, and hence pictures of domestic happiness are always connected with monogamy (Gen 2:24; Ps 128; Prov 31; cf Sir 25:1; 26:13). Marriage is applied figuratively, too, to the union between God and Israel, implying monogamy as a marriage supper: then followed, generally, the ideal. Of precedent, it was long before polygamy fell into disuse. Both Joseph and his father had nine wives at one time (Jos, Ant. XVII, 1, 2). Justin Martyr (Dialog, 134, 141) reproaches Jews of his day with having "four or even five "marriages" whenever they felt like it" (cf Talm). It was not definitely and formally forbidden anywhere as early as 1000 AD. It exists still among Jews in Moslem lands. Side by side with this practice all along has been the ideal principle (Gen 2:18) re: loving and mutually honoring. The legal theory that married man was the "lord" of the wife (Gen 3:16; Tenth Commandment) was also recognized by practice by the wife's affection of the husband and the personality of the wife.

The difference between a concubine and a wife was largely due to the wife's birth and higher position and the fact that she was usually backed by relatives ready to defend her. It would not be wise therefore to make a concubine without the wife's consent (Gen 16:16).

There is a disappointing uncertainty as to the exact ceremonies or proceedings connected with marriage in Bible times. We have to paint our picture from passing allusions in the books, and from what we know of Jewish and Arab customs.

In cases it would seem that there was nothing beyond betrothal, or the festivities following it (see Gen 24:2). Later, in the case of a virgin, an interval of not less than one year came to be observed.

The first ceremony, the *wedding procession*, apparently a relic of marriage by capture (cf Jgs 5:30; Ps 45:15), was the first part of the proceedings. The "bridesmaids" (Jgs 3:29) went, usually by night, to fetch the bride and her attendants to the home of the groom (Mt 9:15; Jn 3:29). The joyousness of it all is witnessed by the proverbial "voice of the bridegroom" and the cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh!" (Jer 7:34; Rev 19:25). The procession was preferably by night, chiefly, we may infer, that those busy in the day might attend and that, in accordance with the oriental love of scenic effects, the weirdly, few, of flowers, lights and torches might play an engaging and kindling part. The procession was then followed, generally, in the home of the groom. Today in Syria, as Dr. Mackie, of Beirut, says, when both parties live in the same town, the reception may take place in either home; but the older tradition points to the house of the groom before it went scattered away. It is the bringing home of an already accredited bride to her covenanted husband. She is escorted by a company of attendants of her own sex and by male relatives and friends conveying on mules or by porters, various presents for the new home. As the marriage usually takes place in the evening, the house is given up for the day to the women who are busy robing the bride and making ready for the evening hospitality. The bridgegroom is shown at the head of a retinue of friends, where men and women congregate in the evening for the purpose of escorting him home. When he indicates that it is time to go, all rise up, and candles and torches are supplied to those who are to form the procession, and they move off. It is a very picturesque sight to see such a procession moving along winding way in the stillness of the starry night, while, if it be in town or city, on each side of the narrow street, from the flat house-top or balcony, crowds look down, and the women take up the peculiar cry of wedding joy that tells those far and near that the pageant has started. This cry is taken up all along the route, and gives warning to those who are waiting with the bride that it is time to arise and light up the approach, and welcome the bridgegroom with honor. As at the house where the bridgegroom receives his friends before starting some come late, and speeches of congratulation have to be made, and poems have to be recited or sung in praise of the groom, and to the honor of his family, it is often near midnight when the procession begins. Meanwhile, as the night wears on, and the duties of robing the bride and adorning the house are all done, a period of relaxing and drowsy waiting sets in, when, in the NT parable, both the wise and the foolish virgins were overawed by the time their case the distant cry on the street brought the warning to prepare for the reception, and then came the discovery of the exhausted oil.

Of the bridgegroom's retinue only a limited number would enter, their chief duty being that of escort. They might call next day to offer congratulations. An Arab wedding rhyme says:

"To the bridgegroom's door went the torch-lit array, And then like goats they scattered to their prey. With their dispersion, according to custom, the doors would be closed, leaving within the relatives and invited guests; and so, when the belated virgins of the parable hastened back, they too found themselves involuntarily shut out by the etiquette of the occasion. The opportunity of service was past, and they were no longer needed.

At the home all things would be "made ready," if possible on a liberal scale. Jn 2 gives a picture of a wedding feast where the resources were strained to the breaking point. Hospitality was here esp. a sacred duty, and, of course, greatly ministered to the joy of the occasion. An oriental proverb is significant of the store set by it:

"He who does not invite me to his marriage Will not have me to his funeral."

To decline the invitation to a marriage was a gross insult (Mt 22).

It was unusual in Galilee to have a "ruler of the feast" as in Judaea (Jn 2). There was no formal religious ceremony connected with the Heb marriage as with us—there is not a hint of such a thing in the Bible. The marriage was consummated by entrance into the "chamber," i.e. the nuptial chamber (Heb heather), in which stood the bridal bed with a canopy (kappath), being originally the wife's tent (Gen 24:67; Jgs 4:17). In all lands of the dispersion the name is still applied to the embroidered canopy under which the contracting parties stand or sit during the festivities. In Arab. Syr. and Heb the bridgegroom is said to "go in" to the bride.

A general survey of ancient marriage laws and customs shows that those of the Hebrews are not a peculiar creation apart from those of other peoples. A remarkable affinity to those of other branches of the Sem races esp., may be noted, and striking parallels with CT, or even CV, e.g. to betrothal, dowry, adultery and divorce. But modern researches have emphasized the relative purity of OT sexual morality. This, in as other respects, the Jews had a message for the world. In fact we should not expect to find among them the Christian standard. Under the new dispensation
the keynote is struck by Our Lord's action. The significance of His attending the marriage feast at Cana and performing His first miracle there can hardly be exaggerated. The act corresponds, too, with His teaching on the subject. He, no less than Paul, abjured the holiness of the estate and the heinousness of all sins against it.

The most characteristic use of marriage and the family by Our Lord is that in which He describes the kingdom of God as a social order 4. Jesus' Institution and their relation to each other like that between brothers. This social ideal, which presents itself vividly and continuously to His mind, is summed up in this phrase, "king-}

dom of God," which occurs more than a hundred times in the Synoptic Gospels. The passages in which it occurs form the interior climax of His message to men. It is a new and noble Judaism, taking the form of a political restoration, that He proclaims, and no "far-off Divine event" to be realized only in some glorious apocalyptic consummation; but a kingdom of God "within you," the chief element of its communion with God, the loving relation of "children" to a "Father," a present possession of all who embrace the one, to be fully realized, and yet present; invisible, and yet becoming more and more visible as a new social order, a conscious brotherhood with one common, heavenly Father, proclaimed in every stage of His teaching in simple human life and varying form in unanswerable certainty of its completion—this is the "kingdom" that Jesus has made the inalienable possession of the Christian consciousness. His entire theology may be described as a transfiguration of the social question, 149 f.; Holtzmann, NT Theology, I, 200; Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 62; B. Weiss, Bib. Theol. of the NT, I, 72, ET, 1882.

Beyond this Jesus frequently used figures drawn from marriage to illustrate His teaching concerning the coming of the kingdom, as Paul did concerning Christ and the church. There is no suggestion of reflection upon the OT teaching about marriage in His teaching except at one point, the modification of it so as to allow polygamy and divorce. Everywhere He accepts and deals with it as sacral and of Divine origin (Mt 19, 9 et), but He treats it as transient, that is of the "flesh" and for this life only.

A question of profound interest remains to be treated: Did Jesus allow under any circumstances the remarriage of a divorced person during the lifetime of the partner to the marriage? Or did He allow absolute divorce for any cause whatsoever? Upon the answer to that question in every age depend momentous issues, social and civic, as well as religious. The facts bearing on the question are confessedly enshrined in the NT, and so the inquiry may be limited to its records. Accord-}

ging to the best scholarship the documents of the NT, emanating from the disciples of Jesus in the second half of the 1st century AD, the question is, what did the writers understand Jesus to teach on this subject? If we look to the Gospels of Mark and Luke and the Epistles of Paul, there could be but one answer given: Christ did not allow absolute divorce for any cause (see Mk 10 2 f.; Lk 16 18; Mk 10 12; 1 Cor 7 10). The OP permission was a concession. He teaches, to a low moral state and standard, and opposed to the ideal of marriage given in Gen (5 24).

"The position of women in that day was far from enviable. They could be women in the most perfect, saintly, and saintly of a Man, 181 f.) Two sayings attributed to Christ and recorded by the writer or editor of the First Gospel (Mt 5 32: 19) seem directly to condemn His teaching as recorded in Mk and Lk. Here He "said to them, "You can obtain for 'fornication' (καὶ ἐὰν πνοίησην, et μὴ ἐπὶ πνευμάτων, "save for fornication"), an exception which finds no place in the parallel (cf. 1 Cor 7 11, 1 Cor 5 1). Divorce to a Jew carried with it the right of remarriage, and the words 'children' are used for 'adultery' (Mt 5 32) show that Jesus assumed that the divorced woman would marry again. Hence if He allowed divorce, He also allowed remarriage. A careful examination of the whole passage in Mt has led many scholars to believe that the whole passage, its interpolation due to the Jewish-Christian compiler or editor through whose hands the materials passed. Others think it betrays traces of having been rewritten from Mk or from a source common to both Mt and Mk, and combined with a semi-Jewish tradition, in short, that it is due to literary revision and compilation. The writer or compiler attempted to combine the original sayings of Jesus and His own interpretation. Believing that Our Lord had not come to set aside the authority of the rabbis, He refused to be bound by the meticulous moral code, but instead set up as a higher standard, a freer and freer, teaching of His own, and a freer, more merciful, interpretation of the Mosaic law's most striking features, and in this way not only give protection to widows and orphans, but also free the Christian from the tyrannical restrictions of the Jewish Law. Once the liberty of the spirit was established, the spirit could then apply itself to the richness of Jewish teaching, made possible by the liberation from the letter and its form-preservation.

Marriage
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Geo. B. EAGER

MARROW, mar'o (תַּנָּא, המר: hêleb, הָרֵם, shîkhîyāh, תַּנָּא, דָּם, "to make fat," "to grease"; περιλαγμένος, mrelisha); Marrow is the nourisher and strengthener of the bones. It is called "fat" in the bones: "The marrow [מַרְאוֹן] of his bones is moistened" (Job 21 24). The fear of Jeh "will be health to thy navel, and marrow [שִׁקְיָה, m refesh, Heb moistening] to thy bones" (Prov 3 5). Thus the expression is used figuratively of the things which alone can satisfy the soul: "My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow [שִׁקְיָה, falt] and fatness" (Ps 63 5); "In this mountain will Jeh of hosts make unto all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees well refined" (Isa 25 6).

In the Ep. to the He the writer speaks of the word of God, which is "living, active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and mar-

H. L. LUBING

MARSENA, mär'ā-sēⁿa, mär'-ē-sēⁿa (M argsna), mar-

nāgra; derivation unknown but probably of Pers origin (Est 1 14): One of the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king's face, and sat first in the kingdom.
MARSH, mär'shäl: Not found in AV, but in RV the word represents two Heb words: (1) יָפֹר, yôphûr (Jgs 5 14), т р they that handle the marshal's stall. A difficulty arises because the usual meaning of yôphûr is "scriber" or "writer" (so AV). The revisers follow LXX and Gr authority which favor "marshal" as against "scribe." The office of marshal was to help the general to maintain discipline (of 1 Macc 5 42). (2) יָפֹר, yôphûr (Jer 51 27), a loan-word whose meaning is not clear. Lenormant thinks it akin to a Bab-Assyr word meaning "tablet." The translation "marshal" is based on this word. Accordingly, RV renders Nah 3 17 "thy scribes," though the Syr has "thy warriors," as does the Tg in Jer. We must await further light on both words. Geo. B. Eager

MART, märt. See MARKET.

MARTHA, mär'tha (Mârâ, Martha, "mistress," being a transliteration of the fem. form of תָּמָר, tamar, "Lords!"): Martha belonged to Bethany, and was the sister of Lazarus and Mary (Jn 11 1 f). From the fact that the house into which Jesus was received belonged to Martha, and that she generally took the lead in action, it is inferred that she was the elder sister. Martha was one of those who gave hospitality to Jesus during His public ministry. Thus, in the course of those wanderings which began when "he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (Lk 9 51), he "entered into a certain village"—its name is not stated—and "a certain woman named Martha received him into her house" (Lk 10 38). Martha, whose sense of responsibility as hostess weighed heavily upon her, was "cumbered about much serving," and her indignation was aroused at the lack of assistance given to her by her sister. Her words, "Lord, dost thou not care?" imply a certain reproach in that she felt He showed a want of sympathy with her efforts and was the cause of Mary's remissness. But, in tones of gentle reproof, reminded her that for Him not the preparation of an elaborate meal but the hearing of His Word was the "one thing needful" (Lk 10 39-42).

Martha is first mentioned by St. John—the only other Gospel writer who refers to Martha—in his account of the raising of Lazarus from the dead at Bethany (Jn 11 1-44). The narrative indicates, however, that Jesus was already on terms of the closest friendship with her and her household (cf vs 5). In the incident which St. John here records, Martha again displayed her more practical nature by going out to meet Jesus, while Mary sat in the house (ver 20). But she was not ungrateful to her brother for her love and her support (ver 19), in her faith in Jesus (vs 21 f) and in her belief in the final resurrection (ver 24). The power of Him, whom she termed the "Teacher," to restore Lazarus to life even upon earth was beyond her understanding. To the words of Jesus concerning this she gave, however, a verbal assent, and went and informed Mary, "The Teacher is here, and calleth thee" (vs 27 f). Yet she remained inwardly unconvinced, and remonstrated when Jesus ordered the stone before the grave to be removed (ver 39). Jesus then recalled His previous words to her remembrance (ver 40), and vindicated them by restoring her brother to life (vs 41-44). After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus then made His last recorded visit to Bethany, and there He stayed a short stay in Ephraim (ver 54) He returned to Bethany (Jn 12 1). While He supped there, Martha once more served, and Lazarus was also present (Jn 12 2). It was on this occasion that Mary anointed the feet of Jesus with an "alabaster box full of spikenard" (Jn 12 3-8). According to Mt 26 6-13; Mk 14 3-9, the anointing took place in the house of the leper, and it has hence been concluded by some that Martha was the wife or widow of Simon. The anointing described in Lk 7 38-50 happened in the house of Simon a Pharisee. But in none of the synoptist accounts is Martha mentioned. For the relationship of these anointings with each other, see MARY, IV. As, according to St. John, the abode of the sisters was in Bethany, a further difficulty of a topographical nature is raised by those who hold that St. Luke implies, from the Galilean setting of Lk 10 38-41, that the sisters lived in Galilee. But the information supplied by St. Luke, upon which he infers that Joseph "lived in Bethany" (Lk 2 72), is based on evidence of a later date. Accordingly, RV renders Nah 3 17 "thy scribes," though the Syr has "thy warriors," as does the Tg in Jer. We must await further light on both words.

C. M. Knox

MARTYR, mär'tér (μαρτύρος, martûros, Aeolic μαρτυρ, martür, "witness," so τρ in numerous passages, both as of one bearing testimony, and also as of one who is a spectator of anything (see Wm). In AV rendered "martyr" in Acts 22 20, "thy martyr Stephen"; and Rev 2 13, "Antipas my faithful martyr"; also 17 6, "the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," where alone ARV retains "martyr." These passages are therefore also in that sense, but in the broader sense of "martyr" for such witnesses as were faithful even unto death, its uniform modern use.
MARVEL, măr'vĕl, MARVELOUS, măr’vel-ŭs (θαυμάστω, tämah, θαυμᾷ, pâl’ să; θαυμάζω, thaumâzō, thaumástos, thaumásta): “To marvel” is the tr of tämah, “to wonder” (Gen 43:33; Ps 48:5, RV “were amazed”; Exod 8:8); of thaumázō, “to admire” (Mt 8:10,27; Mk 5:20; Jn 3:7; Acts 2:7; Rev 17:7 AV, etc); “marvel” (subst.) occurs in the pl. as tr of pâl’, “to distinguish,” fig., “to make wonderful” (Ex 34:10. “I will do marvels, such as have not been wrought” [Heb “created”]); and of thaumástos (thauma), “admirable” (2 Cor 11:14).

“Marvelous” is the tr of pâl’; “marvelous works” (1 Ch 16:12.14. Ps 9:1); “marvelous things” (Job 6:9.; 10:16. Ps 31:21; 118:23; Isa 29:14; Dn 11:36; Zec 8:6, 64); “marvelously,” pâl’ (Job 37:7; Hab 1:5 lit.”tâmah,” regard and wonder marvelously”, lit. “marvel, marvelously”); thaumástoς, admirable, is tr “marvellous” (Mt 27:42; 1 Pet 2:9; Rev 15:1.3, etc).

In Apoc we have “marvel” (Eccles 11:13; 47:17; 2 Macc 1:22; 7:12); “marvelleth” (Eccles 40:7; 43:16); “marvy” (Wisdom 10:17; 19:8, etc, mostly thaumástos and compouds).

RV has “wonder” for “marvel” (Rev 17:7); “the marvellous,” “wonderful” things” (Gen 9:20); “marvelled” for “wondered” (Lk 8:25; 11:14); “marvelled at” for “wondered at” (Thess 1:10); “marveling” for “wondered” (Lk 9:43); “marvellous” for “wondrous” (1 Ch 16:9; Ps 105:2); “marvellous things” for “and wondered” (Job 9:10); “marvelously” (Ps 139:14); for “marvelled” (Mt 9:8), “were afraid,” and (Mk 12:17) marvelled greatly (different texts). W. L. WALKER

MARY, mā’rē, mār’ē (Μαρία, Maria, Mârapû, Mariânû, Gr form of Heb מָרִי, mîrî):

I. DEFINITION AND QUESTIONS OF IDENTIFICATION

The Name Mary in the NT

II. MARY, THE VIRGIN

1. Mary in the Infancy Narratives
2. Mary at Cana
3. Mary and the Career of Jesus
4. Mary at the Cross
5. Mary in the Christian Community
6. Mary in Ecclesiastical Doctrine and Tradition

(1) Legend
(2) Dogma
(a) Dogma of Our Sinlessness
(b) Dogma of Mary’s Perpetual Virginity
(c) Doctrine of Mary’s Glorification

(3) Conclusion

III. MARY MAGDALENE

1. The Story of the Suffering Woman
2. Mary Not a Nervous Wreck

IV. MARY OF BETANY

1. Attack upon Luke’s Narrative
2. Evidence of Luke Taken Alone
3. Character of Mary
4. Character of Mary

V. MARY, THE MOTHER OF JAMES AND JOHN

VI. MARY, THE MOTHER OF JOHN MARK

I. Definition and Questions of Identification.—A Heb fem. proper name of two persons in the OT (see Ex 15:20; Nu 12:1; Mic 6:4; 1 Ch 4:17) and of a number not certainly determined in the NT. The prevalence of the name, with no great amount of certainty, to the popularity of Marianne, the last representative of the Hasmonian family, who was the second wife of Herod I.

(1) The name Mary occurs in 51 passages of the NT to which the following group of articles is confined (see MIRIAM). Collating all these references we have the following apparent notes of identification: (a) Mary, the mother of Jesus; (b) Mary (daughter); (c) Mary, the mother of James; (d) Mary, the mother of Joseph; (e) Mary, the wife of Clopas; (f) Mary of Bethany; (g) Mary, the mother of Mark; (h) Mary of Rome; (i) the “other” Mary.

(2) The comparison of Mt 27:56; 28:1 with Mk 15:47 seems clearly to identify the “other” Mary with Mary the mother of Joseph.

(3) Mk 15:40 identifies Mary the mother of James and Mary the mother of Joseph (cf 15:47) (see Allen’s note on Mt 27:56). At this point a special problem of identification arises. Mary, the wife of Clopas, is mentioned as being present at the cross with Mary the mother of Jesus, the latter’s sister and Mary of Magdala (Jn 19:25). In the context of the group at the cross, Mary, the mother of James, is mentioned (Mt 27:56; Mk 15:40). Elsewhere, James is regularly designated “son of Alphaeus” (Mt 10:3; Mk 3:18; Lk 6:15). Since it can hardly be doubted that James, the apostle, and James the Less, the son of Mary, are one and the same person, the conclusion seems inevitable that Mary, the mother of James, is also the wife of Alphaeus. Here we might stop and leave the wife of Clopas unidentified, but the fact that the name Alphaeus (Ἀλφαῖος, Alphaiōs) is the Gr transliteration of the Aram. אַלְפָּי, halpay, together with the unlikelihood that anyone important enough to be mentioned by John would be omitted by the synoptists and that another Mary, in addition to the three definitely mentioned, could be present and not be mentioned, points to the conclusion that the wife of Clopas is the same person as the wife of Alphaeus (see ALPHAeus). Along with this reasonable conclusion has grown, as an excésence, another for which there is no basis whatever; viz., that the wife of Clopas was not the mother of Jesus. This would make the apostle James the cousin of Jesus, and, by an extension of the idea, would identify James, the apostle, with James, the “Lord’s brother.” The available evidence is clearly against both these inferences (see Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3; Gal 1:19).

(4) One other possible identification is offered for our consideration. Zahn, in an exceedingly interesting note (NT, II, 514), identifies Mary of Rome (Rom 16:6) with the “other” Mary of Mt. We need not enter into a discussion of the point, as the identification of a woman of whom we have no details given is of little more than academic interest.

We are left free, however, by the probabilities of the case to confine our attention to the principal individuals who bear the name of Mary. We shall discuss Mary, the mother of Jesus; Mary of Magdala; Mary of Bethany; Mary, the mother of James and Joseph; Mary, the mother of Mark.

II. MARY, THE VIRGIN.—The biography of the mother of Jesus is gathered around the formulae and episodes which serve to exhibit her leading characteristics in clear light. Two causes have operated to distort and make unclear the very clear and vivid image of Mary left for us in the Gospels. Roman Catholic dogmatic and sentimental exaggeration has well-nigh removed Mary from history (see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION). On the other hand, reaction and overemphasis upon certain features of the Gospel narrative have led some to credit Mary with a negative attitude toward Our Lord and His claims, which she assuredly never occupied. It is very important that we should follow the narrative with unprejudiced eyes and give due weight to each successive episode.

Mary appears in the following passages: the Infancy narratives, Mt 1 and 2; Lk 1 and 2; the wedding at Cana of Galilee, Jn 2:1-11; the episode of Mt 12:46; Mk 3:21.31 ff; the incident at the cross, Jn 19:25 ff; the scene in the upper chamber, Acts 1:14.

(1) It is to be noted, first of all, that Mary and her experiences form the narrative core of both Infancy documents. This is contrary to 1. Mary in to the ordinary opinion, but is un- the Infancy questionably true. She is obviously the object of special interest to Luke (see Ramya, Was Christ of Bethlehem? 76 f), and there are not wanting indi-
cations that Luke’s story came from Mary herself. But, while Matthew’s account does not exhibit his interest in Mary quite so readily, that he was interested in the pathetic story of the Lord’s mother is evident.

Luke tells the story of Mary’s inward and deeply personal experiences, her call (1:26f), her maidenly fears (1:39-35), her loyal submission (1:38), her outburst of sacred and unselfish joy (1:39-55). From this anticipatory narrative he passes at once to the Messianic fulfilment.

Matthew tells the story of the outward and, so to say, public experiences of Mary which follow hard upon the former and are in striking contrast with them: the shame and suspicion which fell upon her (1:18); her bitter humiliation (1:19), her ultimate vindication (1:20f). Here the two narratives supplement each other by furnishing different details but, as in other instances, converge upon the central fact—the central fact here being Mary herself, her character, her thoughts, her experiences. The point to be emphasized above all others is that we have real biography, although in fragments; that in that same person appears the indubitable reality of actual characterization, in both parts of the story. This is sufficient guaranty of historicity; for no two imaginary portraits ever agreed unless one copied the other—which is evidently not the case here. Moreover, Mark is a truly human narrative in which the remarkable character of the events which took place in her life only serves to bring into sharper relief the simple, humble, natural qualities of the subject of them.

(2) One can hardly fail to be impressed by studying Mary’s character, with her quietness of spirit; her meditative inwardsness of disposition; her admirable self-control; her devout and gracious gift of sacred silence. The canticle (Lk 1:46-55), which at least Luke’s conception of her nature, indicates that she is not accustomed to dwell much upon herself (4 lines only call particular attention to herself), and that her mind is saturated with the spirit and phraseology of the OT. The intensely high quality of her piety thus expressed accounts for much that appears anomalous in her subsequent career as depicted in the Gospels.

The first episode which demands our attention is the wedding at Cana of Galilee (Jn 2:1-11).

The relationship between Jesus and His mother hand in hand through the chapter. It is to be noted that the idea of wanton interference on the part of Mary and of sharp rebuke on the part of Jesus is to be decisively rejected. The key to the meaning of this episode is to be found in 4 simple items: (1) in a crisis of need, Mary turns naturally to Jesus as to the one from whom help is to be expected; (2) she is entirely undisturbed by His reply, whatever its meaning may be; (3) she prepares the way for the miracle by her authoritative directions to the servants; (4) Jesus does actually relieve the situation by an exercise of power. Whether she turned to Jesus with distinctly Messianic expectation, or whether Jesus intended to convey a mild rebuke for her eagerness, it is not necessary for us to inquire, as it is not possible for us to determine. It is enough that her spontaneous appeal to her Son did not result in disappointment, since, in response to her suggestion or, at least, in human reaction to it, He “manifested” the glory. The incident confirms the Infancy narrative in which Mary’s quiet and forceful personality is exhibited.

In Mt 12:46 (Mk 3:31-35), we are told that, when His mother and His brethren came seeking Him, Jesus in the well-known remark concerning His true relatives in the sense intended to convey a severe rebuke to His own household for an action which involved both unbelief and presumptuous interference in His great life-work. The explanation of this incident, which involves so many important implications as have become connected with it in the popular mind, is to be found in Mark’s account. He interrupts his narrative of the arrival of the relatives (which begins in ver 21) by the account of the accusation made by the scribes from Jesus that the power of Jesus over demons was due to Beelzebub. This goes a long way toward explaining the anxiety felt by the relatives of Jesus, since the unanswerable problems were under the immediate concern of Him no chance to rest and seemed to threaten His health, was matched, contrariwise, by the bitter, malignant opposition of the authorities, who would believe any malicious absurdity rather than that His power came from God. The vital point is that the attempt of Mary and her household to get possession of the person of Jesus, in order to induce Him to go into retirement for a time, was not due to capricious and interfering unbelief, but to loving anxiety. The words of Jesus have the unqualified ring of conscious authority and express the determination of one who wills the control of his own life— but it is a serious mistake to read into them any faintest accent of satire. It has been well said by Horace Bushnell that Jesus “did not say that Jesus would scarcely make use of the family symbolism to designate the sacred relationships of the kingdom of heaven, while, at the same time, He was depreciating the value and importance of the very relationships which had formed the basis of His analogy. The real atmosphere of the incident is very different from this.

To be sure that many have misinterpreted the above incident we need only turn to the exquisitely tender scene at the cross recorded by Matthew.

4. Mary at the Cross (19:25 ff). This scene, equally beautiful, whatever one considers the relationship which it discloses as existing between Jesus and His mother, or between Jesus and His well-beloved disciple, removes all possible ambiguity which might attach to the preceding incidents, and reveals the true spirit of the Master’s home. Jesus could never have spoken as He did from the cross unless He had consistently maintained the position and performed the duties of an eldest son. The tone has almost eclipsed other tone could never have been what it is had there not been a steadfast tie of tender love and mutual understanding between Jesus and His mother. Jesus would hand over His sacred charge to the trustworthy keeping of another, because He had faithfully maintained it Himself.

The final passage which we need to consider (Acts 1:14) is esp. important, because in it we discover Mary and her household at home in the midst of the Christian community, engaged with them in prayer. It is also clear that Mary herself and the family, who seemed to be very completely under her influence, whatever may have been their earlier misgivings, never broke with the circle of disciples, and persistently kept within the range of experiences which led at last to full-orbed Christian faith. This makes it sufficiently evident, on the one hand, that the household members were of the official class among the Jews; and, on the other, that the story of Jesus passed through the same cycle of experiences which punctuated the careers of the whole body of disciples on the way to faith. The bearing of this simple but significant fact upon the historical trustworthiness of the body of incidents just passed in review is evident.
The sum of the matter concerning Mary seems to be this: The mother of Jesus was a typical Jewish believer of the best sort. She was a deeply medi-
tative, but by no means a daring or original thinker. Her actions and words did not, and perhaps could not prepare her for the role of mother of Jesus which involved so much that was new and unexpected. But her heart was true, and from the beginning to the day of Pentecost, she pondered in her heart the many puzzling experiences until the light of truth broke in. The story of her life and of her relationship to Jesus is consistent throughout and touched with manifold unconscious traits of truth. Such a narrative could not have been feigned or faked.

6. Mary in Ecclesiastical Doctrine and Tradition

The doctrine of Mary's glorification as the object of worship and her function as intercessor: With no effort to be polemical toward Roman Catholicism, it is evident that the contrary, with every desire to be sympathetic, it is very difficult to be patient with the particularities which are evident in the writings of Roman Catholic dogmatic writers in the discussion of this group of doctrines.

(c) The doctrine of Mary's glorification as the object of worship and her function as intercessor: With no effort to be polemical toward Roman Catholicism, it is evident that the contrary, with every desire to be sympathetic, it is very difficult to be patient with the particularities which are evident in the writings of Roman Catholic dogmatic writers in the discussion of this group of doctrines.

(3) Take, for example, the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy of Mary's status in heaven is intended. As a matter of fact, Mary, in any literal sense, is not preferred to all other mothers. Mary's motherhood along with that of the mother of Moses is very likely the basis of the figure, but the woman of the vision is the incarnation of Mary, the mother and the body of her Lord (see Milligan, Expositor's Bible, "Revelation," 1900).

Three other arguments are most frequently used to justify the place accorded to Mary in the Liturgy.

(iii) Christ's perpetual humanity leads to His perpetual Sonship to Mary. This argument, if it carries any weight at all, in this connection, implies that the glorified Lord Jesus is still subject to mother. It is, however, clear from the Gospels that the subjection to His parents which continued after the incident in the Temple (Lk 2:51) was gently but firmly laid aside at the outset of the public ministry (see above, II, 2, 8); in all that period, up to 28 out of 50 references to Mary, Mary's position is one of dependence, not of authority.

(iii) Christ's perpetual humanity leads to His perpetual Sonship to Mary. This argument, if it carries any weight at all, in this connection, implies that the glorified Lord Jesus is still subject to mother. It is, however, clear from the Gospels that the subjection to His parents which continued after the incident in the Temple (Lk 2:51) was gently but firmly laid aside at the outset of the public ministry (see above, II, 2, 8); in all that period, up to 28 out of 50 references to Mary, Mary's position is one of dependence, not of authority.

(iv) Since Mary cared for the body of Christ when He was on earth, naturally His spiritual body would be of special care to high ecclesiastics in the Church, and in later ages in Asia, Mary was, is, and must remain, a part of that body (see Acts 1:14). Unless she is sustained in her body by the special grace of the Holy Spirit, her care for the church cannot involve her universal presence in it and her accessibility to the prayers of her fellow-believers.

To a non-Romanist, the most suggestive fact in the whole controversy is that the statements can be apologetic in support of the ecclesiastical attitude toward Mary, do not, in the least degree, justify the tone of exaggereated admiration and worship, so often found in the devotionary literature of the subject (see Doedens, Modern Romanism Examined, 23 f.).

(3) Conclusion.-Our conclusion on the whole question is that the lit. of Liturgy belongs, historically, to unauthorized speculation; and psychologically, to the natural history of asceticism and clerical celibacy.

III. Mary Magdalen (Maria Magdalenæ, Maria Magdalenæ of "Magdala").—A devoted follower of Jesus who entered the circle of the taught during the Galilean ministry and became prominent in the last days. The noun "Magdala," from which the adjective "Magdalenæ" is formed, does not occur in the Gospels (the word in Mt. 15:39, is, of course, "Magdalenæ"). The meaning of this obscure reference is well supported by the expression "Magdala" in "Luke, 21:25:" "Magdala is only the Gr form of "maggâdâl" or watch-tower, one of the many places of the name in Pal" (Tristram, Bible Places, 280); and is probably represented by the squoidal group of hovels which now bears the name of Mejdil near the center of the western shore of the lake.

As she was the first to bear witness to the resurrection of Jesus, it is important that we should get a clear view of her position and character.

1. Mary not acter. The idea that she was impertinent, drawn from the life of the street, Woman of the Unabridged Encyclopedia, 1997, is undoubtedly arose, in the first instance, from a misconception of the nature of the Galilean ministry. It is altogether impossible identification of her with the woman who was a sinner of the preceding section of the Gospel. It is not to be forgotten that the malicious demon-possession, according to NT ideas (see Demon, Demonology, NT), the implications of evil temper and malignant disposition popularly associated with "having a devil." The possessed was, by Our Lord and the disciples, looked upon as diseased, the victim of an alien and evil power, not an accomplice of it. Had this always been understood and kept in mind, the un-
fortunate identification of Mary with the career of public prostitution would have been much less easy.

According to NT usage, in such cases the name would have been withheld (cf Lk 7:37; Jn 8:3). At the same time the statement that 7 demons had been cast out of Mary means either that the malady was of exceptional severity, possibly involving several relapses (cf Lk 11:26), or that the mode of her divided and haunted consciousness (cf Mk 5:9) suggested the use of the number 7. Even so, she was a healed invalid, not a rescued social delinquent.

The identification of Mary with the sinful woman is, of course, impossible for one who follows carefully the course of the narrative with an eye to the transitions. The woman of ch 7 is carefully covered with the concealing cloak of namelessness. Undoubtedly known by name to the intimate circle of first disciples, it is extremely doubtful whether she was so known to Luke. Her history is definitely closed at ver 50.

The name of Mary is found at the beginning of a totally new section of the Gospel (see Plummer's analysis, op. cit., xxvii), where the name of Mary is introduced with a single mark of identification, apart from her former residence, which points away from the preceding narrative and suggests some other origin. If the preceding account of the anointing were Mary's introduction into the circle of Christ's followers, she could not be identified by the phrase of Lk. Jesus did not cast a demon out of the sinful woman of ch 7, and Mary of Magdala is not represented as having anointed the Lord's feet. The two statements cannot be fitted together.

Mary has been misrepresented in another way, scarcely less serious. She was one of the very first witnesses to the resurrection, and her testimony is of sufficient importance to make it worthy for those who antagonize the narrative to discredit her. This is done, on the basis of her mysterious malady, by making her a para-noiac who was in the habit of "seeing things." Renan is the chief offender in this particular, but others have followed his example.

(2) There is more than this a priori consideration against such an interpretation of Mary. She was the first at the tomb (Mt 28:1; Mk 16:1; Lk 24:10). But she was also the last at the cross—she and her companions (Mt 27:51; Mk 15:40). A glance at the whole brief narrative of her life in the Gospels will interpret this combination of statements. Mary first appears near the beginning of the narrative of the Galilean ministry as one of a group consisting of "many" (Lk 8:3), among them Joanna, wife of Chzzas, Herod's steward, who followed with the Twelve and ministered to them of their substance. Mary then disappears from the text to reappear as one of the self-appointed watchers of the cross, thereafter to join the company of witnesses to the resurrection. The significance of these simple statements for the understanding of Mary's character and position among the followers of Jesus is not far to seek. She came into the circle of believers, marked out from the rest by an exceptional experience of the Lord's healing power. Henceforth, to the very end, with unwavering devotion, with intense and eager, undaunted courage even in the face of dangers which broke the courage of the chosen Twelve, she followed and served her Lord. It is impossible that such singleness of purpose, such strength of will, and, above all, such courage in danger, should have been exhibited by a weak, hysterical, neurotic incurable. The action of these women of whom Mary was one, in serving their Master's need while in life, and in administering the last rites to His body in death, is characteristic of woman at her best.

IV. Mary of Bethany.—Another devoted follower of Jesus. She was a resident of Bethany (Bēthânia, Býthânia), and a member of the family consisting of a much-beloved brother, Lazarus, and another sister, Martha, who made a home for Jesus within their own circle whenever He was in the neighborhood.

The one descriptive reference, aside from the above, connected with Mary, has caused no end of perplexity. John (11:2) states that it was this Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick. This reference would be entirely satisfied by the narrative of Jn 12:1-8, and no difficulty would be suggesstive with it. If the preceding account of the anointing were a reference to Mary, she could not be identified by the phrase of Lk. Jesus did not cast a demon out of the sinful woman of ch 7, and Mary of Magdala is not represented as having anointed the Lord's feet. The two statements cannot be fitted together.

Mary has been misrepresented in another way, scarcely less serious. She was one of the very first witnesses to the resurrection, and her testimony is of sufficient importance to make it worthy for those who antagonize the narrative to discredit her. This is done, on the basis of her mysterious malady, by making her a para-noiac who was in the habit of "seeing things." Renan is the chief offender in this particular, but others have followed his example.

(2) There is more than this a priori consideration against such an interpretation of Mary. She was the first at the tomb (Mt 28:1; Mk 16:1; Lk 24:10). But she was also the last at the cross—she and her companions (Mt 27:51; Mk 15:40). A glance at the whole brief narrative of her life in the Gospels will interpret this combination of statements. Mary first appears near the beginning of the narrative of the Galilean ministry as one of a group consisting of "many" (Lk 8:3), among them Joanna, wife of Chzzas, Herod's steward, who followed with the Twelve and ministered to them of their substance. Mary then disappears from the text to reappear as one of the self-appointed watchers of the cross, thereafter to join the company of witnesses to the resurrection. The significance of these simple statements for the understanding of Mary's character and position among the followers of Jesus is not far to seek. She came into the circle of believers, marked out from the rest by an exceptional experience of the Lord's healing power. Henceforth, to the very end, with unwavering devotion, with intense and eager, undaunted courage even in the face of dangers which broke the courage of the chosen Twelve, she followed and served her Lord. It is impossible that such singleness of purpose, such strength of will, and, above all, such courage in danger, should have been exhibited by a weak, hysterical, neurotic incurable. The action of these women of whom Mary was one, in serving their Master's need while in life, and in administering the last rites to His body in death, is characteristic of woman at her best.
the first time in Lk 10 38-42 in a way which clearly indicates that the family of Bethany is there mentioned for the first time (a "certain [v, or r] woman named for an alabaster vessel, and she anointed the feet of the Lord and wiped His feet with her hair."

2. Evidence of Luke

The new name of Luke indicates the introduction of a new group of names (cf Jn 11 1).

(1) The second approach of Luke designates Mary or the sinner with the sinful

woman of ch 7 (cf Mt 26 6-13; Mk 14 3-9; Lk 7 36-50; Jn 12 1-8).

Our next task is to note carefully the relationship between the narratives of Mark, Matthew and John on the one hand and the account of Luke on the other.

3. Evidence by Comparison

We may effectively analyze the narratives unfolding in the following steps: (1) notes of time and place; (2) circumstances and scene of the incident; (3) description of the person who did the anointing; (4) complaints of her action, by whom and for what; (5) the action of the incident which constitutes Our Lord's defense of it; (6) incidental features of the narrative.

Under (1) notice that all three evangelists place the incident near the close of the ministry and at Bethany. Under (2) it is important to observe that Matthew and Mark place the incident in the presence of the crowd while John states vaguely that a feast was made for His friend. Under (3) we observe that Matthew and Mark say "a certain woman..." and simulate Mary designates Mary. According to John, who has his own disciples in place, according to Mark, some of those present found fault; while according to John, the Pharisees and the scribes found fault.

(4) the ground or complaint is the alleged wastefulness of the action. (5) again, according to all three, Our Lord defended the use made of the ointment by a mysterious reference to an anointing of His Lordship by the "sinner" or that His disease had manifested itself subsequent to the feast. Of these alternatives the former is the more natural (see Gou, ICC, Tischendorf, Mark, 25). The latter is the more probable, and by this occasion he coupled together with the specific mention of Lazarus as a guest, would suggest that the feast was given by people, in and about Bethany, who had especial reason to be grateful to Jesus for the exercise of His healing power.

It is beyond reasonable doubt that the narratives of Matthew, Matthew and Mark John refer to the same incident. The amount of convergence and the coherence of it, in itself an indication among the pecuniary statements. The only discrepancies of even secondary importance are a matter of a few days in the time (Gould says i and the detail as to the anointing of head or feet. It is conceivable that the circumstances may be identical.

(6) The Simon in whose house the incident is said to have taken place by Matthew and Mark designate "the.upper". This must mean either that he had previously visited or that his disease had manifested itself subsequent to the feast. Of these alternatives the former is the more natural (see Gou, ICC, Tischendorf, Mark, 25). The latter is the more probable, and by this occasion he coupled together with the specific mention of Lazarus as a guest, would suggest that the feast was given by people, in and about Bethany, who had especial reason to be grateful to Jesus for the exercise of His healing power.

4. Character of Mary

(1) At the outset of Mary it is worth mentioning that we have in the matter of these two sisters a most interesting and instructive point of contact between the synoptics and John's writings.

The underlying unity and harmony of the two are evident here as elsewhere. In Lk 10 38-42 we are afforded a view of Mary and Martha photographic in its clear revelation of them both. Martha is engaged in household affairs, while Mary is sitting at the feet of Jesus, absorbed in listening. This, of course, might mean that Mary was idle and listless, leaving the burden of responsibility for the care of guests upon her sister, a conscientious sister. Most housewives are inclined to think that Martha has been hardly dealt with. The story points to the contrary. It will be noticed that Mary makes no defence of herself and that the Master makes no criticism of Martha until the criticizes Martha's activity in a sense of any such identification. (2) The immediate surroundings are different. Simon: the leper and Simon "the Pharisee" can hardly be one person. No man could have borne both of these designations. In addition to this, it is difficult to believe that a Pharisee of Simon's temper would have entertained Jesus when once he had been proscribed by the authorities. Simon's attitude was a very natural one at the beginning of Christ's ministry, but the combination of hostility and questioning was necessarily a temporary mood. (3) The description of the same woman as sinner in the sense of Lk 7 in one Gospel, simply as a woman in two others the woman who anointed Jesus, as a mark in the third is not within the range of probability, esp. as this is no hint in John's attempt at explanation on the part of any of the writers. At any rate, prima facie, this item in Luke's description is seriously at variance with the narratives of Matthew and Mark. When he is supposed to refer to the same event, in the matter of the completeness of the Luke's account there is no complaint of the woman's action suggested. There is no hint that anybody thought of the fact that she had committed a great sin of precious material. The only complaint is Simon's, and that is directed against the Lord Himself, because He forgave her by Himself, assured that she did not swindle the woman because He did not know her character, which is the question of Our Lord's Messiahship, concerning which Simon was debating; otherwise one suspects he had little interest in the episode. This fact is, as we shall see, determinative for the understanding of the incident and puts it apart from all other similar accounts.

(2) The lesson drawn from the act by Our Lord was in each incident different. The sinful woman was commended for her faith and unhesitating and spontaneous expression of love based upon gratitude for deliverance and forgiveness. Mary was commended for an act which had a mysterious and sacramental character and was evidently a sign of her death, near at hand.

This brings us to the point where we may consider the one serious difficulty, that alleged by Mayors and others, against the hypothesis of two anointings, namely, that a repetition of an act like this, which attached would not be likely to occur. The answer to this argument is that the difficulty which arises is due to a misunderstanding of the incident. In the point of central reference the two episodes are worlds apart.

The act of anointing in the case of Mary is primary. Anointing was one of those general and prevalent acts of social courtesies which might mean much or little, this or that, and might be rated a score of times in a year with a different meaning each time. The matter of primary importance in every such case would be the purpose and motive of the anointing. By this consideration alone we may safely discount the possibility of two incidents. In the former case, the motive was to express the love of a forgiven penitent. In the latter, the motive was gratitude for something quite different, a beloved brother back from the grave, and, may we not say (in view of Jn 12 7), grief and foreboding? That Mary's feeling was expressed in the same way outwardly, as that of the sinful woman of the early ministry does not change the Martha story. If the act was different and that consequently, the condemnation she received, being for a different thing, was differently explicit; according to Mark, some of those present found fault; while according to John, the Pharisees and the scribes found fault.

In summation of our examination we are justified in saying that the account of Mary is primarily an account of Mary's anointing. In this Mary was a model of devotion and humility, and the praise bestowed upon her quite as natural and deserved. With this fictitious and embarrassing identification out of the way, we are now free to consider briefly the career and estimate the
hibits an intensity of feeling of which Martha gives no sign. It is significant that, while Mary says just what she has had on her mind, the way of saying it and her manner as a whole so shades the Lord's composure that He is unable to answer her directly but addresses His inquiry to the company in general (ver 34). (3) Then we come to the events of the next chapter. The supper is given in Bethany. Martha serves. Of course she serves. She always serves when there is opportunity. Waiting on guests, plate in hand, was the innocent delight of her life. One cannot fail to see that, in a simple incidental incident, as when Mary told the apostle to let them alone (Jn 11:41) and her and Jesus were both calm, the story of Mary (Lk 10:38-42) is sketched again in lifelikeness. It is the same Martha engaged in the same task. But what of Mary in this incident? She is shown in an unprecedented rôle, strange to an oriental woman and esp. to one so retiring in disposition as Mary. Her action not only thrust her into a public place alone, but brought her under outspoken criticism. But after all, this is just what we come to expect from these deep, intense, silent natures. The Mary who sat at Jesus' feet in listening silence while Martha bustled about the house, who remained at home while Martha went out to meet Him, is the very one to hurl herself at His feet in a storm and passion of tears when she does meet Him and to break out in a self-sacrificing public act of devotion, strangely impelled to her modest disposition, however native to her deep emotion.

Martha was a good and useful woman. No one would deny that, least of all the Master who loved her. But, she lived on the surface of things, and her affections and her pious alike found adequate and satisfying expression at all times in the ordinary kindly offices of hospitality and domestic service. Not so Mary. Her disposition was inward, silent, brooding, with a latent capacity for stress and the forthwith, unconventional expression of feelings, slowly gathering intensity through days of thought and repression. Mary would never be altogether at home in the world of affairs. Hers was a rare spirit, doomed often to loneliness and misunderstanding except at the hands of rarely discerning spirits, such as she happily met in the person of her Lord.

V. Mary, the Mother of James and Jospeh.—Until it is necessary merely to recall and set in order the few facts concerning this Mary given in the Gospels (see Mt 27:55-56; 61; Mk 15:40; 16:1; Lk 24:10; cf Lk 23:49-56).

In Mt 27:55-56 (cf Mk 15:40), we are told that at the time of the crucifixion there was a group of women observing the event from a distance. These women are said to have followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering to Him and to the disciples. Among these were Mary Magdalene (see III, above); Mary, mother of James and Joseph; and the unnamed mother of Zebedee's children. By reference to Lk 8:23, where this group is first introduced, it appears that, as a whole, it was composed of those who had been healed of infirmities of one kind or another. Whether this description applies individually to Mary or not we cannot be sure, but it is altogether probable. At any rate, it is certain that Mary was one who persistently followed with the disciples and ministered of her substance to aid and comfort the Lord in His work for others. The course of the narrative seems to imply that Mary's sons accompanied their mother on this ministering journey and that one of them became an apostle. It is interesting to note that two mothers with their sons joined the company of the disciples and that three of the four became members of the apostolic company. Another item in these only too fragmentary references is that this Mary, along with her of Magdala and the others of this group, was of sufficient wealth and position to be marked among the followers of Jesus according to his particular way. The mention of Chas'ah's wife (Lk 8:3) is an indication of the unusual standing of this company of faithful women.

The other notices of Mary show her lingering late at the cross (Mk 15:40); a spectator at the burial (Mk 15:47); and among the first to bear spices to the tomb. This is the whole of this woman's biography extant, but perhaps it is enough. We are told practically nothing, directly, concerning her; but, incidentally, she is known to be generous, faithful, loving of Lk 2:19-20. Mary. She came in some way to the tomb to anoint the body of her dead Lord; she went away in joy to proclaim Him alive forevermore. A privilege to be coveted by the greatest was thus awarded to simple faith and trusting love.

VI. Mary, the Mother of John Mark.—This woman is mentioned but once in the NT (Acts 12:12), but in a connection to arouse intense interest. Since she was the mother of Mark, she was also, in all probability, the aunt of Barnabas. The aunt of one member and the mother of another of the earliest apostolic group is a woman of importance.

The statement in Acts, so far as it concerns Mary, is brief but suggestive. Professor Ramsay (see St. Paul the Traveller, etc, 385) holds that the authority for this narrative was not Peter but Mark, the son of the house. This, if true, adds interest to the story as we have it. In the first place, the fact that Peter went thither directly upon his escape from prison argues that Mary's house was a well-known center of Christian life and worship. The additional fact that coming unannounced and casually the apostle found a considerable body of believers assembled points in the same direction. That "many" were gathered in the house at the same time indicates that the house was of considerable size. It also appears that Rhoda was only one of the maids, arguing a household of more than ordinary size. There is a tradition of doubtless authenticity, that Mary's house was the scene of a still more sacred gathering in the upper room on the night of the betrayal. We conclude that Mary was a wealthy widow of Jesus, who, upon becoming a disciple of Christ, with her son, gave herself with whole-souled devotion to Christian service, making her large and well-appointed house a place of meeting for the proscribed and homeless Christian, the apostle whose benefactor and patron she thus became.

Louis Matthews Sweet

MARY, THE PASSING OF. See Apocryphal Gospels.

MASALOTH, mas'a-loth. See Mesaloth.

MASCIL, mas'kil. See Psalms.

MASH (מַשָּׁה, mash): Named in Gen 10:23 as one of the sons of Aram. In the p. passages in 1 Ch 1:17 the name is given as "Meshech" (meshekh), and the LXX (Mosoch) supports this form in both passages. "Meshech," however, is a Japhetic name (Gen 10:2), and "Mash" would seem to be the original reading. It is possibly to be identified with the Mos Maius of classical writers (Strabo, etc), on the northern boundary of Mesopotamia.

MASHAL, mā'shal (מָשָׁל, māšāl, 1 Ch 6:74). See Mishal.

MASIAS, mas'ías (A, Macias, Masias, B, Macias, Meias): The head of one of the families of Solomon's servants (1 Esd 5:34); it has no equivalent in the L Ex 2:55 ff; RV-M "Miasias."
MASMAN, mas‘man. See MAASMAS.

MASON, mas‘ū n: The tr of 4 Heb words: (1) קֶבֶר יְבֵנֶר, kārash ‘ebhen, “graver of stone” (2 S 5 11); (2) (3) רֶמֶשׁ, gādhar (2 K 12 12), רֶפֶשׁ יְבֵנֶר, hāreš, kīr (1 Ch 14 1), “maker of a wall [or hedge]”; (4) מַעֵל, hālōlah, “a hewer or digger [of stone]” (1 Ch 22 2; Ex 3 7). Lebanon still supplies the greater number of skilled masons to Pal and Syria (see 2 S 5 11), those of Shewir being in special repute. See CRAFTS, II, 8; also ARCHITECTURE; BUILDING; GEBA; HOUSE.

MASPHA, mas‘afā (1 Mc 3 46, RV “Mizpeth”). See Mizpeth, 4.

MAREKHAH, ma‘rēkā, mas‘ē ka (מַרְקָה, Marqah; Μαρκάκα, Markaka): A place mentioned in the list of ancient rulers of Edom (Gen 36 31), “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.” Marsekah was the royal city of Samlah, son of Hadad (ver 36; 1 Ch 1 47). The name may mean “place of choice vines,” but there is nothing to show in what locality it must be sought.

MASSA, mas‘a (םָסָא, massa‘), “burden”: Descendant of Abraham through Ishmael (Gen 25 14; 1 Ch 1 30). His people may be the Masani of Pottery, having Eastern Arabia near Babylon as their habitat. The marginal reading of the heading to Prov 31 mentions Lemuel as king of Massa. If that reading is accepted, it would seem that a tribe and probably a place were named from Ishmael’s descendant. The reading is doubtful, however, for wherever the phrase recurs in Prov 30 1 (RV) it appears to be a gloss.

MASSACRE, mas‘a-kēr. OF THE INNOCENTS. See INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF.

MASSAH AND MERIBAH, mas‘a, mer-i-bā (מַסָּה יְבֵנֶר, massāh ‘ērenbāh, “proving and striving”); παραμυθόν καὶ λοϊδόρην, peirasmōn kai lodōretes): These names occur together as applied to one place only in Ex 17 7; they stand, however, in parallelism to Dt 32 5; Ps 95 8. In all other cases they are kept distinct, as belonging to two separate narratives. The conjunction here may be due to conflation of the sources. Of course, it is not impossible that, for the reason stated, the double name, although ancient (see note on Dt 32 5; 9 22) the place is referred to as Massah. This scene is laid in Ex 17 1 at Rephidim (q.v.) and in ver 6 at Horeb (q.v.). It is near the beginning of the desert wanderings. In 1. First Instance and complaint. Moses, appealing to God, is told what to do. He takes with him the elders of Israel, and smites with his rod the rock on which the Lord stands in Horeb, whereupon water gushes forth, and the people drink. Here Moses alone is God’s agent. There is no hint of blame attaching to him. He called the place Massah and Meribah, because of the striving of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord (ver 7). In some way not indicated, here and at Meribah, God put the Levites to proof (Dt 32 5). The second narrative describes what took place at Kadesh (i.e. “Kadesh-barnaa”) when the desert wanderings were nearly over (Nu 20 2. Second Instance famous spring for some reason had ceased. In their distress the people became impatient and petulant. At the door of the tent of meeting Moses and Aaron received the Lord’s instructions. In his speech of remonstrance to the people Moses seemed to glorify himself and his brother; and instead of speaking to the rock as God had commanded, he struck it twice with his rod. The flow of water was at once restored; but Moses and Aaron were heavily punished because they did not sanctify God in the eyes of the children of Israel. The “Waters of Meribah” was the name given to this scene of strife. The incident is referred to in Nu 20 24, and Dt 32 51 (merithāb kādēsh, AV “Meribah-Kadesh,” RV “Meribah of Kadesh”). In Ps 81 7 God appears as having tested Israel here. The sin of Israel and the ensuing calamity to Moses are alluded to in Ps 106 32.

The place appears in Ezk 47 10; 45 23, as on the southern border of the land of Israel, in the former as “Meriboth-kadesh,” in the latter as “Meriboth-kadesh” (Meriboth=pl. Meribath= “const. sing.”) where the position indicated is that of ‘Ain Kādāt, “Kadesh-barnea.”

In Dt 32 2, by a slight emendation of the text we might read merithāb kōdēsh for meribēth kōdēsh. This gives a preferable sense.

W. EWING

MASSIAS, ma‘śās (A, Maseías, Massias, B, Μασσίας, Massias): One of those who put away their “strange wives” (1 Eed 9 22) = “Masseiah” of Ex 10 22.

MAST. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); 3.

MASTER, ma‘ster (מָסָר, masá‘ar, “master”); ἀρχιτάξτης, architastēs, ἀρχιτάξτης, architastēs, “master of the house” (Ex 22 8; Jn 19 22 23); “the master of his house” (Isa 1 8). We have it also in tr “masters of the high household” (Ecc 12 11). See ASSEMBLIES, MASTERS OF: Cf Eccles 32 1, “master of a feast,” RV “ruler”; Jn 2 9, “ruler of the feast”; rabh (Dnl 3 1, 3; 6, “shipmaster”); rabh, Aram., “great,” “mighty,” “elder” (Dnl 4 9; 6 11, “master of the magicians”), also sar, “head,” or “chief” (Ex 11 1 “tsakkamasters”); 1 Ch 15 27, “master of the song,” RV “the carrying of the ark, Heb the lifting up”); “to call,” “to awake,” is also rendered “master” in AV, “The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar,” m “him that waketh and him that answereth,” RV as AVm (Mal 2 12).

The vb. “to master” does not occur in the OT, but we have in Apos (Wis 13 18) “mastering thy power” (dēpōzōn sēchōs), RV “being sovereign over [thy] strength.”

In the NT dēpōtēs answers to ἀρχιτάξτης as master” (1 Tim 6 1 2; 2 Tim 2 21), rendered also as “Lord” (Lk 2 29, etc); kurios, is “Master,” “Lord,” “Sir,” used very frequently of God or of Christ (Mt 1 20 22 24), tr “Master” (Mt 6 24; 15 27; AV Mk 13 35; Rom 14 4, etc); kathgōthēs, “a leader,” is tr “Master” (Mt 23 8[AV], 10; didaskalos, a title very often applied to Our Lord in the Gospels, is “Teacher,” tr “Teacher” in AV Mt 8 19; Lk 3 12, etc; RV “Teacher”; also Jn 3 2 10; Jas 3 1, “be not many masters,” RV “teachers”; rabh, rabbī (“Rabbī”) (a transliterated Heb term signifying “my Teacher”) is also in several instances applied to Jesus, AV “Master” (Mt 26 25 49; Mk
MATTANAH, mat'na-na (俫anna, mattānāh; B, Məḇəšāḇəḵ, Məḇəšāḇən; A, Məḇəšāḇəḵ, Məḇəšāḇən): A station of the Israelites which seems to have lain between Beer and Nahalal (Nu 21:18 f.). The name means "gift," and might not inappropriately be applied to "the desert a gift" (Budde translates "Out of the desert a gift"); see EXPOS T, VI, 482. Some would therefore identify it with Beer. This is improbable. There is now no clue to the place, but it must have lain S.W. of the Dead Sea.

MATTANIAH, mat-a-ni'a (lässigâ, mattaŋaḏâ, "gift of Jeh; ":
(1) King Zedekiah's original name, but changed by Nebuchadnezzar when he made him king over Judah instead of his nephew Jehoiachin (2 K 24:17).
(2) A descendant of Asaph (1 Ch 9:15), leader of the temple choir (Neh 11:17; 12:8). Mentioned among the "porters," keepers of "the storehouses of the gates" (12:25), and again in ver 35 as among the "priests' sons with trumpets."
(3) May be the same as (2), though in 2 Ch 20:14 he is mentioned as an ancestor of that Jazahiel whose inspired words in the midst of the congregation encouraged Jehoshaphat to withstand the invasion of Moab, Ammon and Seir (vs 14 ff).
(4-7) Four others who had foreign wives, (a) the Matthathias of 1 Esd 9:27 (Ezr 10:26); (b) the Otholias of 1 Esd 9:28 (Ezr 10:27); (c) the Matthathias of 1 Esd 9:31 (Ezr 10:30); (d) the fourth of these in 1 Esd 9:34 AV has had his name blended into that of Mattenai, and the two appear as the composite name Mammitanemus (Ezr 10:37). He is a son of Bani.
(8) A Levite, father of Zaccur, ancestor of Hanan the under-treasurer of the Levitical offerings under Nehemiah (Neh 13:13).
(9) One of the sons of Heman the singer, whose office it was to blow the horns in the temple-service as David had appointed it (1 Ch 25:4.5). He was head of the 9th division of the 12 Levites (1 Ch 25:16), who were proficient in the Songs of Jeh (1 Ch 25:7).
(10) One of the sons of Asaph who helped Hezekiah in the fulfillment of his vow to cleanse the house of the Lord (2 Ch 29:13).

HENRY WALLACE

MATTATHA, mat'a-tha (Mattathâ, Mattathâ): Son of Nathan the son of David in the genealogy of Jesus (Lk 3:31).

MATTATHAH, mat'a-tha: RV MATTATHAH (q.v.).

MATTATHIAS, mat-a-thi'as (Matthâías, Matthâías, Matthathias). The persons of this name in the Apoc are:
(1) Mattathai the father of the Maccabees. See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.
(2) One of the 7 who stood on Ezra's right hand as he read the law (1 Esd 8:43)="Mattithiah" of Neh 8:4.
(3) The son—probably the youngest (of 1 Macc 16:2)—of Simon the Maccabean, treacherously murdered along with his father and his brother Judas by his brother-in-law Ptolemy, son of Abubus in the stronghold of Dok near Jericho in the 177th Seleucid—155-152 BC (1 Macc 16:14).
(4) Son of Abalam, one of the two "captains of the forces" who in the campaign against Demetrius in the plain of Hazor gallantly supported Judas, enabling the latter to turn an impending defeat into a great victory (1 Macc 11:70).
(5) One of the three envoys sent by Nicanor to treat with Judas in 161 BC (2 Macc 14:19). No
names of envoys are given in the account of 1 Mac 7 27 ff.

(6) One of the sons of Asen who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esd 9 33) = AV "Matthaios" = "Mattathah" of Ex 10 26.

In addition to these two of this name are mentioned in the NT:

(7) Lk 3 25, "son of Amos." S. ANGELES

MATTATHAH, mat'a-ta (יוֹדַד, mattathah): RV for "Mattathah" in AV (Ex 10 33). The same as "Mattathias" of 1 Esd 9 33, AV "Matthaios" (q.v.).

MATTENAI, mat'en-nai (יוֹדַד, mattanai, "liberal"): (1) Two who married foreign wives, one a son of Hashum (Ex 10 33; in 1 Esd 9 33 "Altanneus"); the other a son of Bani (Ex 10 37).

(3) A priest in the days of Joakim son of Jeshua (Neh 12 19), representing the house of Jiorab.

MATTER, mat'ër: This word being a very general term may express various ideas. RV therefore frequently changes the reading of AV in order to state more definitely the meaning of the context (cf. EX 1 S 16 18; 1 K 8 50; 2 S 11 19; Est 3 4; Ps 35 20; 64 5; Prov 16 20; 18 13).

Arama. occurring in the two forms Mattaios, Mathaios, and Mathaios, Mathaios, is a Gr reproduction of the Aram. Mattathah, i.e., "gift of Jeh," and equivalent to Theodore. Before his call to the apostolic office, according to Mt 9 9, his name was Levi. The identity of Matthew and Levi is practically beyond all doubt, as is evident from the predicate in Mt 10 3; and from a comparison of Mk 2 14; Lk 5 27 with Mt 9 9. St. Mark calls him "the son of Alphaeus" (Mk 2 14), although this cannot have been the Alphaeus who was the father of James the Less; for if this James and Matthew had been brothers this fact would doubtless have been mentioned, as is the case with Peter and Andrew, and also with the sons of Zebedee. Whether Jesus, as He did in the case of several others of His disciples, gave him the additional name of Matthew is a matter of which we are not informed. As he was a customs officer (τελωνας, ha telowna, Mt 9 9; Lk 5 27) in Capernaum, in Galilee, Antipas, Matthew was not exactly a Roman official, but was in the service of the tetrarch of Galilee, or possibly a subordinate officer, belonging to the class called portileores, serving under the publican, or superior officials who farmed the Roman taxes. As such he must have had some education, and doubtless in addition to the native Aram. must have been acquainted with the Gr. His ready acceptance of the call of Jesus shows that he must have belonged to that group of publicans and sinners, which in Galilee and elsewhere looked longingly to Jesus (Mt 11 19; Lk 7 34; 15 1). Just at what period of Christ's ministry he was called does not appear with certainty, but evidently not at once, as on the day when he was called (Mt 9 9, 11 14, 18; Mk 6 37). Peter, James and John are already trustworthy disciples of Jesus. Unlike the first six among the apostles, Matthew did not enter the group from among the pupils of John the Baptist. These are practically all the data furnished by the NT on the person of Matthew, and which is most likely that extra-Bib. sources is chiefly the product of imagination and in part based on the mistaken name of Matthew for Matthias (of Zahn, Introto to the NT, ch IV, n.3). Tradition states that he preached for 15 years in Par and that after his return to foreign nations, the Ethiopians, Macedonians, Syrians, Parthians and Medes being mentioned. He is said to have died a natural death either in Ethiopia or in Macedonia. The stories of the Roman Catholic church that he died the martyr death on September 21 and of the Gr church that this occurred on November 10 are without any historical basis. Clem. Alex. (Strom., iv.9) gives the explicit denial of Heracleon that Matthew suffered martyrdom.

G. H. SCHORNE

MATTHEW, THE GOSPEL OF (σεβασμὸς κατὰ Μαθα’θαον, euvaggelion kata Matthaios [or Matthaiov, Mathaios]):

1. Name of Gospel—Unity and Integrity
2. Canonicity and Authorship
3. Relation of Gr and Aram. Gospels
4. Contents, Character and Purpose
5. Problems of Literary Relation
6. Date of Gospel

LITERATURE

The "Gospel according to Matthew," i.e. the Gospel according to the account of Matthew, stands, according to traditional, but not ent., universally, arrangement, first Gospel—among the canonical Gospels. The unity and Gospel, as will be seen below, was Integrity unanimously ascribed by the testimony of the ancient church to the apostle Matthew, though the title does not of itself necessarily imply immediate authorship. The unity and integrity of the Gospel were never in ancient times called in question. Chs 1, 2, particularly—the story of the virgin birth and childhood of Jesus—are proved by the consentient testimony of MSS, VSS, and patristic references, to have been an integral part of the Gospel from the beginning (see VIRGIN BIRTH). The omission of this section from the heretical Gospel of the Ebionites, which appears to have had some relation to our Gospel, is without significance.

The theory of successive redactions of Mt, starting with an Aram. Gospel, elaborated by Eichhorn and March (1801), and the related theories of inceptive editions of the Gospel put forth by the Tübingen school (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, etc.), and by Bland (Bliek supposes a primitive Gr Gospel), lacks historical, literary, and patristic evidence, and are refuted by the fact that MSS and VSS know only the ultimate redaction. It is credible that
the churches should quietly accept redaction after redaction, and not a word be said, or a vestige remain, of any of them?

1. Canonicity.—The apostolic origin and canonical rank of the Gospel of Mt were accepted without a doubt by the early church. Origen, in his beginning parts of the HE, VI. 21, could speak of it as the first of "the four Gospels, which alone are received without dispute by the church of God under heaven" (in Euseb., HE, VI. 25). The use of the Gospel can be traced in the Evangelion of Tertullian; most distinctly in Barnabas, who quotes Mt 23:14 in the formula, "It is written" (5). Though not mentioned by name, it was a chief source from which Justin took his data for the life and words of Jesus (cf. Westcott, Canon, 91 ff), and apostolic origin is implied in its forming part of "the Memoirs of the Apostles," "which are called Gospels," read weekly in the assemblies of the Christians (Ap. 166, etc). Its identity with our Mt is confirmed by the undisputed presence of that Gospel in the Diatessaron of Tatian, Justin's disciple. The testimony of Papias is considered below. The hesitating acceptance of the Gospel is further decisively shown by the testimonies and use made of it in the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and by its inclusion in the Muratorian Canon, the Itala, Pesh, etc. See CANON OF NT; GOSPELS.

2. Authorship.—The questions that cluster around the First Gospel have largely to do with the much-discussed and variously disputed statement concerning it found in Euseb. (HE, VI. 23), and from the much older work of Papias, entitled Interpretation of the Words of the Lord. Papias is the first who mentions Matthew by name as the author of the Gospel. His words are "Matthew composes a discourse [kerygma, logos, "words, "oracles"] in Aramaic tongue, and everyone interpreted them as he was able." Papias cannot here be referring to a book of Matthew in which only the discourses or sayings of Jesus had been preserved, but which had not any, or only meager accounts of His deeds, which imaginary document is in so many critical circles regarded as the basis of the present Gospel, for Papias himself uses the expression τὰ λόγια, τὸ λόγον, and his account of the oral preaching of Mt, "of the things said or done by Christ" (Euseb., HE, III. 24; particularly T. Zahn, Intro to NT, sec. 54, and Lightfoot, Supernatural Religion, 170 ff). Eusebius further reports that after Matthew had first labored among his Jewish compatriots, he went to other nations, and as a substitute for his oral preaching, he left to the former a Gospel written in their own dialect (III. 24). The testimony of Papias to Matthew as the author of the First Gospel is confirmed by Irenaeus (iii.3.1) and by Origen (in Euseb., HE, V. 10), and may be accepted as representing a uniform 2d-century tradition. Always, however, it is coupled with the statement that the Gospel was originally written in the Heb dialect. Hence arises the difficult question of the relation of the canonical Gr Gospel, with which alone, apparently, the fathers were acquainted, to this alleged original apostolic work.

One thing which seems certain is that whatever this Heb (Aramaic) document may have been, it was not an original form from which the present Mt arose, but either by the apostle himself, or by somebody else, as was maintained by Bengel, Thiersch, etc. and, more recently, the Gr Mt throughout bears the impress of being not a tr at all, but as having been originally written in Gr, and as being less Hebraistic in the form of thought than some other NT writings, e.g. the Apocalypse. It is generally not difficult to discover when a Gr book of this period is a tr from the Heb or Aram. That our Mt was written originally in Gr appears, among other things, from the way in which it makes use of the OT, sometimes following the LXX, sometimes going back to the Heb. Particularly in the case of Mt, this regard are 12:18-21 and 13:14-15, in which the rendering of the Alexandrian tr would have served the purposes of the evangelist, but he yet follows more closely the original text, although he adopts the LXX version of Mark better than the Heb (cf. Keil's Comm. on Mt, loc. cit.).

The external evidences to which appeal is made in favor of the use of an original Heb or Aram. Mt in the primitive church are more than elusive. Busbeius (HE, V. 10) mentions as a report (ἀνερέα, ἀληθετῇ) that Pantaenus, about the year 170 AD, found among the Jewish Christians, probably of South Arabia, a Gospel of Mt in Heb, left there by Bartholomew; and Jerome, while in the Syrian Horeon, had occasion to examine such a work, which he found in use among the Apostles, or in the Nazarenes, current among the Nazarenes and Ebionites (De Vir. Illustr., iii; Contra Pelag., iii.2; Comm. on Mt 12:15, etc; see GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE NAB). For this reason the references of Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius to the Heb Gospel of Mt are by many scholars regarded as referring to this Heb Gospel which the Jewish Christians employed, and which they thought to be the work of the evangelist (cf. more detailed RE, XI, 7, "Matthæi des Apostol. Evangelii Hebræi, oder the Hebrew Mt was to which Papias refers (assuming it to have had a real existence) must, with our present available means, remain an unsolved riddle, as also the possible connection between the Gr and Heb texts. Attempts like those of Zahn, in his Commentarius on Mt, to explain readings of the Gr text through an inaccurate understanding of the imaginary Heb origin are arbitrary and unreliable.

There remains, of course, the possibility that the apostle himself, or some disciple of the apostle (or Godet), produced a Gr recension of an earlier Aram. work.

The prevailing theory at present is that the Heb Matthewean document of Papias was a collection mainly of the discourses of Jesus which, in variant Gr translations, was used both by the author of the Gr Mt and by the evangelist Luke, thus explaining the common features in these two gospels. (W. C. Allen, however, in his Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on Mt, disputes Luke's use of this supposed common source, Intro, xiv. 6). The use of this supposed Matthewean source is thought to explain how the Gr Gospel came to be named after the apostle. It has already been remarked, however, that there is no good reason for supposing that the "Louda" of Papias was confined to discourses. See further on "sources." Below.

(1) Contents and character.—As respects contents, the Gospel of Mt can be divided into 3 chief parts: (1) preliminary, including the birth and early youth of the Lord (chs 1-2); (2) the life and ministry of Jesus in and Galilee (chs 3-18); (3) the activity of Jesus in Judaea and Jerusalem, followed by His passion, death, and resurrection (chs 19-28). In character, the Gospel, like those of the other evangelists, is only a chorismathic, a collection from the great mass of oral tradition concerning the doings and sayings of Christ current in apostolic and early Christian circles, chosen for the special purpose which the evangelist had in view. Accordingly, there is a great deal of material in Mt
in common with Mk and Lk, although not a little of this material, too, is individualistic in character, and of a nature to vex and perplex the harmonist, as e.g. Matthew's accounts of the temptation, of the demoniacs at Gadara, of the blind man at Jericho (4 1-5; 20 1-13) and of the sheep. There is much more also in this Gospel that is peculiar to it. Such are the following pericopes: chs 1, 2; 9 27-36; 10 15, 37-40; 11 28-30; 12 11.12.15—21.33-38—13 24—30.36-62; 14 28-31; 16 17-19; 17 24-27; 18 11-12; 19 10-12; 20 1-16; 21 10.14-16.28-32; 22 1-14; 23 8-22; 24 42-45; 27 3—10.62-66—28 11 ff. The principle of arrangement of the material is not chronological, but rather that of similarity of material. The addresses and parables of Jesus are reported consecutively, although they may have been spoken at different times, and material scattered in the other evangelists—esp. in Lk—is found combined in Mt. Instances are seen in the Sermon on the Mount (chs 5—7), the "mission address" (ch 10), the seven parables of the Kingdom of God (ch 13), the discourses and parables (ch 15) the woes against the Pharisees (ch 23), and the grand eschatological discourses (chs 24, 25) (cf with || in the other gospels, on the relation to which, see below).

(2) Purpose.—The special purpose which the writer had in view in his Gospel is nowhere expressed, as is done, e.g., by the writer of the Fourth Gospel in Jn 20 30.31, concerning his book, but it can readily be gleaned from the general contents of the book, as also from specific passages. The traditional view that Matthew wrote primarily to prove that in Jesus of Nazareth is to be found the full-filment and realization of the Messianic predictions of the OT prophets and seers is beyond a doubt correct. The fact that the proof passages in Mt from the OT, in connection even with the minor details of Christ's career, such as His return from Egypt (2 15), is ample evidence of this fact, although the proof manner and proof value of some of these passages are exegetical cruces, as indeed is the whole way in which the OT is cited in the NT (see Quotations, NT).

The question as to whether the Gospel was written for Jewish Christians, or for Jews not yet converted, is of great importance, as was the case probably with the Ep. of Jas, was written at that transition period that when the Jewish and the Christian communions were not yet fully separated, and still worshipped together. The questions are as to the purposes of the Gospel are met with at the beginning and throughout the whole work; e.g. it is obvious in 1 1, where the proof is furnished that Jesus was the son of Abraham, in whom all families of the earth were to be blessed (Gen 12 3), and of David, who was to establish the kingdom of God forever (2 S 7). The genealogy of Lk, on the other hand (3 23 ff), with its cosmopolitan character and purpose, aiming to show that Jesus was the Redeemer of the whole world, leads to the conclusion that he was the ancestor of all mankind. Further, as the genealogy of Mt is evidently that of Joseph, the foster and legal father of Jesus, and not that of Mary, as is the case in Lk, the purpose to meet the demands of the Jewish reader is transparent. The full account in Mt of the Sermon on the Mount, which does not, as is sometimes said, contain a "new program of the kingdom of God"—indeed does not contain the fundamental principles of the Gospel at all—but is the deeper and truly Bib. interpretation of the Law over against the superficial interpretation of the current Pharissim, which led the advocates of the latter in all honesty to declare, "What lack I yet?" given with the design of driving the auditors to the gospel of grace and faith proclaimed by Christ (of Gal 3 24)—all this is only intelligible when we remember that the book was written for Jewish readers. Again the γεραποτα, γεραποτα—i.e. the fulfilment of OT Scripture, a matter which for the Jew was everything, but for the Gentile was of little concern. In Mt, too, there is much more also in this Gospel that is peculiar to it. Such are the following pericopes: chs 1, 2; 9 27-36; 10 15, 37-40; 11 28-30; 12 11.12.15—21.33-38—13 24—30.36-62; 14 28-31; 16 17-19; 17 24-27; 18 11-12; 19 10-12; 20 1-16; 21 10.14-16.28-32; 22 1-14; 23 8-22; 24 42-45; 27 3—10.62-66—28 11 ff. The principle of arrangement of the material is not chronological, but rather that of similarity of material. The addresses and parables of Jesus are reported consecutively, although they may have been spoken at different times, and material scattered in the other evangelists—esp. in Lk—is found combined in Mt. Instances are seen in the Sermon on the Mount (chs 5—7), the "mission address" (ch 10), the seven parables of the Kingdom of God (ch 13), the discourses and parables (ch 15) the woes against the Pharisees (ch 23), and the grand eschatological discourses (chs 24, 25) (cf with || in the other gospels, on the relation to which, see below).

(2) Purpose.—The special purpose which the writer had in view in his Gospel is nowhere expressed, as is done, e.g., by the writer of the Fourth Gospel in Jn 20 30.31, concerning his book, but it can readily be gleaned from the general contents of the book, as also from specific passages. The traditional view that Matthew wrote primarily to prove that in Jesus of Nazareth is to be found the full-filment and realization of the Messianic predictions of the OT prophets and seers is beyond a doubt correct. The fact that the proof passages in Mt from the OT, in connection even with the minor details of Christ's career, such as His return from Egypt (2 15), is ample evidence of this fact, although the proof manner and proof value of some of these passages are exegetical cruces, as indeed is the whole way in which the OT is cited in the NT (see Quotations, NT).

The question as to whether the Gospel was written for Jewish Christians, or for Jews not yet converted, is of great importance, as was the case probably with the Ep. of Jas, was written at that transition period that when the Jewish and the Christian communions were not yet fully separated, and still worshipped together. The questions are as to the purposes of the Gospel are met with at the beginning and throughout the whole work; e.g. it is obvious in 1 1, where the proof is furnished that Jesus was the son of Abraham, in whom all families of the earth were to be blessed (Gen 12 3), and of David, who was to establish the kingdom of God forever (2 S 7). The genealogy of Lk, on the other hand (3 23 ff), with its cosmopolitan character and purpose, aiming to show that Jesus was the Redeemer of the whole world, leads to the conclusion that he was the ancestor of all mankind. Further, as the genealogy of Mt is evidently that of Joseph, the foster and legal father of Jesus, and not that of Mary, as is the case in Lk, the purpose to meet the demands of the Jewish reader is transparent. The full account in Mt of the Sermon on the Mount, which does not, as is sometimes said, contain a "new program of the kingdom of God"—indeed does not contain the fundamental principles of the Gospel at all—but is the deeper and truly Bib. interpretation of the Law over against the superficial interpretation of the current Pharissim, which led the advocates of the latter in all honesty to declare, "What lack I yet?" given with the design of driving the auditors to the gospel of grace and faith proclaimed by Christ (of
Matthias
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Mk, in its existing or some earlier form, and the problematical original Mt (Q), constitute the basis of our common Gospel.

In proof of this, it is pointed out that nearly the whole of the narrative-matter of Mk is taken up into Mt, as also into Lk, while the large sections, chiefly discourses, common to Mt and Lk are, as already said, a point to a source of that character which both used. Then, it is asked when the teaching was preserved in detail, and explanation is sought of the variations in phrasing, order, sometimes in conception, in the respective gospels.

Despite the prestige which this theory has attained, the true solution is probably a simpler one. Matthew no doubt secured the bulk of his data from his own experience and from oral tradition, and as the former existed in fixed forms, due to catechetical instruction, in the early church, it is possible to explain the similarities of Mt with the other two synoptics on this ground alone, without resorting to any literary dependence, either of Mt on the other two, or of these, or either of them, on Mt. The whole problem is purely speculative and subjective and under present conditions justifies a cui bono? as far as the vast literature which it has called into existence is concerned.

According to early and practically universal tradition Mt wrote his Gospel before the other three, and the place assigned to it in
6. Date of NT literature favors the acceptance of Gospel of this tradition. Irenæus reports that it was written when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome (ii.1), and Euseb. states that this was done when Matthew left Pal and went to preach to others (HE, III, 24). Clement of Alexandria is responsible for the statement that the presbyters who succeeded each other from the beginning declared that "the gospels containing the genealogies [Mt and Lk] were written first" (Euseb., HE, VI, 14). This is, of course, fatal to the current theory of dependence on Mk, and is in consequence rejected. At any rate, there is the best reason for holding that the book must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD (cf. 24. 15. The most likely date for the Gr Gospel is in the 7th Christian decade. Zahn claims that Matthew wrote his Aram. Gospel in Pal in 62 AD, while the Gr text dates from 85 AD, but this latter date is not probable.

LITERATURE.—Intro to the Comm. on Mt (Meyer, Alford, Allen [ICC], Broadus [Philadelphia, 1887], McCaul, in Luthken Commentary [New York, 1895], etc.); works on Intro to the NT (J. G. Ramsay); arts. in Biblica Deits. Eisgr., Public. may be consulted. See also F. C. Burkitt, Gospel History and its Transmission; Weishaupt, Das Evangelium according to Matthew and Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien; Sir J. C. Hawkins, Horse Synoptics: Westcott, Intro to the Study of the Gospels; Lightfoot, Essays on Supernatural Religion, V. Papias of Hierapolis (this last specially on the sense of Logia). See also the works cited in Mark, Gospel of.

G. H. SCHODDE

MATTHEW, ma-thi'as (Mabthás, Matthías, or Maßías, Mathías; Mabh, Mattityah, "given of Jehovah"). Matthias was the one upon whom the lot fell when he, along with Joseph Barsabas, was put forward to fill up the place in the apostleship left vacant by Judas Iscariot (Acts 1:15-26). This election was held at Jerusalem, and the meeting was presided over by St. Peter. The conditions demanded of the candidates were that they should "have been with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us," and that the one chosen should be a witness with Peter and John and James of his resurrection (Acts 1:21,22). The mode of procedure was by lot, and with prayer was the election made (cf Acts 1:24).

Hilgenfeld identifies Matthias with Nathanael (of Nathanael). He was traditionally the author of the "Gospel of Matthias," a heretical work referred to by Origen (Hom. in Lk. 1), by Eusebius (HE, III, 25, 6) and by Hieronymus (Proem in Matth.). No trace of it is left. The gnostic Basilides (c. 133 AD) and his son Isidor claimed to ground their doctrine in the "Gospel of Basilides" on the teaching Matthias received directly from the Saviour (Hippol., vii.20) (cf Hennecque, Neustamentliche Apokryphen, 167). Various parts of the apocryphal "Contendings of the Apostles" deal with the imprisonment and blinding of Matthias by the Ethiopian cannibals, and his rescue by Nathanael (cf. Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 163, 164, 267-88; see also Andrew). According to the Martyrdom of St. Matthias (Budge, II, 289-94) he was sent to Damascus, and died at Phalæon, a city of Judæa. Other sources mention Justinus as the place of Matthias' ministry and burial.

C. M. KERR

MATTHIAH, mat-i-thi'a (Matthew), Mattityah, or "Matt'éthiáh, "gift of Jehesh").

(1) The Matthish of Neh 4:4 (1st spell) was one of those who stood over Ezra's right hand while he read the law (cf 1 Esd 9:32). He was the individual set over "things that were baked in pана " (1 Ch 9:31).

(2) One of those appointed by David to minister before the ark, and to "celebrate and to thank and praise Jeh, the God of Israel" (1 Ch 16:43).

(3) One of those who had foreign wives (Ex 10:43). In 1 Esd 9:35, "Mashitas,"

(4) One of the Levites who ministered before the ark with harps (1 Ch 15:18-21; 25:3-21, 2d spelling).

HENRY WALLACE

MATTOCK, mat'ok: The tr of 3 Heb words: (1) יָדוֹק, mahărēshāh, probably "a pickaxe" (1 S 18:20; cf ver 21 m); (2) רֶפֶשׁ, hereh, "sword," "axe," "toel" (2 Ch 34:6 AV, "with their mattocks," AVm "mauls, RV "in their ruins," RV "with their axes"); (3) מַפִיק, maphēq, "a hoe," "rake," "chopping instrument" (Isa 7:25). Vines were usually grown on terraces on the hills of Pal, and then the mattock was in constant use. The usual mattock is a pick with one end broad, the other pointed.

MAUL, mōl (מַפִיק, mōphēq, lit. "a breaker," "a club," "mace," "mattock"): A smashing weapon like the oriental war-club or the clubs always carried by the shepherds of Lebanon (Prov 25:18; cf Jer 51:20).

MAUZZIM, mōz'ēm, mots'ēm (מַפְזַיִם, māzzi'ēm, "places of strength," "fortresses"): Many conjuncts as to the meaning of this word and its context (Dnl 11:38; cf vs 19.39) have been made. The LXX (uncertainly), Theodotion, and the Gr Gospels render it as a proper name. Theodoret adopted Theodotion's reading and explained it as "Antichrist!" Grotius thought it a corruption of Αἰτία, Aitzos, the Phoen war-god, while Calvin saw in it the "god of wealth!" Perhaps the buzz of conjectures about the phrase is owing to the fact that in the next passage responsible, this is preceded by Ἐλθώ, meaning God. The context of the passage seems clearly to make the words refer to Antiochus Epiphanes, and on this account some have thought that the god Mars—who corresponds to the antichrist—was here referred to. All this is, however, little better than guesswork, and the RV tr, by setting the mind upon the general idea that the monarch referred to would trust in mere force, gives us, at any rate, the general
Maw, mō (םֹ, kōbhāh [ṣ̂, kōbhāh, Nu 25 8; ἱ, kōrēs; LXX ἑνυστρόν, ἑνυστρόν]: The first word means the maw or stomach of ruminants. It is derived from a root designating "hollowed out." It is mentioned alongside of the shoulder and the two cheeks of ox and sheep, which are the priest's share of any sacrifice brought by Israelites (Dt 18 3). LXX, where ἑνυστρόν corresponds to Attic ἑνυστρόν, denotes the fourth stomach or abomasum, which was considered as a delicacy, and was almost a national dish of the Athenians, just as tripe is of the Londoners. The parallel form kōbhāh is used for the body of a woman, which is being transfused by a sperm thrust in Nu 25 8. The last word ἑρή is found in a metaphorical sense: "[Nebuchadnezzar] hath, like a monster, swallowed me up, he hath filled his maw with my delicacies" (Jer 51 34).

Mazzitias, maz-i'ıes (A, Maazōs, Mazzitias, B, Zviras, Zeitiis): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 35), identical with Mattithiah (Est 10 43).

Mazzaloth, maz'a-loth (The Planets). See Astronomy, 9.

Mazzaroth, maz'a-roth: The 12 constellations of the Zodiac. See Astronomy, II, 12.

Mazzebah, mas'e'ba, mase'ba. See Pillar.

Meadow, med’ō: (1) רָעֵד, ārāh, "the meadows [AV "paper reeds"] by the Nile" (Isa 19 7; ῥᾶρα, ma'arēh-qābah'; AV "meadows of Gibeath," RV "Maarch-geba," RVm "the meadow of Geba, or Gibeath" (Jgs 20 33); from רָעַד, ārāh, "to be naked"; of Arab. عَرَأ, ariya, "to be naked," ārā'd, "a bare tract of land." Ārāh and ma'arēh signify tracts bare of trees. (2) נַחַל, ădāh, in Pharaoh's dream of therine, AV "meadow," RV "reed grass" (Gen 41 21, 18). Ādāh is found also in Job 8 11, AV and RV "flag," RVm "reed-grass." According to Gesenius, ădāh is an Egyp word denoting the vegeartion of marshy ground. (3) עֵרָבָן, ăbēl k'rānim, "Abel-cheramin;" RVm "The meadow of vineyards," AV "the plain [AVm "Abel"] of the vineyards" (Jgs 11 33); "Abel-beth-maacah" (1 K 16 20; 2 K 16 29; cf 2 S 20 14.15.18); "Abel-shittim" (Nu 33 49; cf 25 1; Josh 2 1; 3 1; Jgs 7 22; Joel 3 18; Mic 6 5); "Abel-meholah" (Jgs 7 22; 1 K 4 12; 19 16); "Abel-maim" (2 Ch 16 4); "Abel-mizraim" (Gen 50 11); "stone," AV "Abel," RVm "Abel," that is "meadow" (1 S 6 18); cf Arab. عَلِيّ, "abal, "green grass," and عَلْبَات, "abalat, "unhealthy marshy ground," from عَلَة, wabāl, "to rain." Alfred Ely Day

Meal, mē'ā (נֵין, mē'āh, "hundred"). See Hammah.

Meal Offering. See Sacrifice.

Meals, mēl, MEAL-TIME: Bread materials, bread-making and baking in the Orient are dealt with under Bread (q.v.). For food-stuffs in use among the Hebrews in Bible times more specifically see Food. This article aims to be complementary, dealing esp. with the methods of preparing and serving food and times of meals among the ancient Hebrews.

The Book of Jgs gives a fair picture of the early formative period of the Heb people and their ways of living. It is a picture of semi-savagery—of the life and customs of free desert tribes. In I S we note a distinct step forward, but the domestic and cultural life is still low and crude. When they are settled in Pal and come in contact with the most cultured people of the day, the case is different. Most that raised these Sem invaders above the dull, crude existence of fellahin, in point of civilisation, was due to the people for whom the land was named (Macalister, Hist of Civilization in Pal.). From that time on various foreign influences played their several parts in modification of Heb life and customs. A sharp contrast illustrative of the primitive beginnings and the growth of luxury in Israel in the preparation and use of foods may be seen by a comparison of 2 S 17 28 f with 1 K 4 22 f.

1. Methods of Preparing Food:—The most primitive way of using the cereals was to pluck the fresh ears (Lev 23 14; 2 K 4 42), remove the husk by rubbing (cf Dt 23 25 and Mt 12 1), and eat the grain raw. A practice common to all periods, observed by fellahin today, was to parch or roast the ears and eat them unground. Later it became customary to grind the grain into flour, at first by the rudimentary method of pestle and mortar (Nu 11 8; cf Prov 27 22), later by the hand-mill (Ex 11 5; Job 31 10; cf Mt 24 41), still later in mills worked by the ass or other animal (Mt 18 6), lit. "a mill-
Lentils, several kinds of beans, and a profusion of vegetables, wild and cultivated, were prepared and eaten in various ways. The lentils were sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24). Another simple way of preparing the grain was to soak it in water, then boil it slightly, and after draining and crushing it, to serve it as the dish called "groats" is served among western peoples.

Soaking the dough preparatory to baking was done doubtless, as it is now in the East, by pressing it between hands or by passing it from hand to hand; except that in Egypt, as the monuments show, it was put in "basket" and trodden with the feet, as goats "grate." (This is done in Paris bakeries to this day.) See Bread; Food.
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2. Vegetables

They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24). And sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24). And sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24). And sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24). And sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (cf. Gen 29 24).

3. Meat

Roasting was much in vogue, indeed it was probably the oldest of all methods of preparing such food. At first raw meat was laid upon hot stones from which the embers had been removed, as in the case of the "cake baked on the hot stones" (1 K 19 6 RVm; cf. Hos 7 5, "a cake not turned"), and sometimes without a covering of ashes or "coals." The fish that the disciples found prepared for them by the Sea of Galilee (Jn 21 9) was, in exception to this rule, cooked on the live coals themselves. A more advanced mode of roasting was by means of a spit (cf. Gen 29 24), and sometimes around, see Foon). Boiling was also common (see Gen 25 29; Ex 12 9, etc., ARV; EV more frequently "seething," "soaked," "sodden," as it is in the more primitive parts of Syria today. The pots in which the food was done were of earthenware or bronze (Lev 6 28). When the meat was boiled in more water than was required for the ordinary "stew" the result was the "broth" (Je 6 19 f), and the meat and the broth might then be served separately.

The usual way, however, was to cut the meat into pieces, larger or smaller as the case might demand (1 S 2 17; Ezek 24 3 f; cf. Micah's metaphor, 3 3), and put these pieces into the cooking-pot with water sufficient only for a stew. Vegetables and rice were generally added, though crushed wheat sometimes took the place of the rice, as in the case of the "savory meat" which Rebekah prepared for her husband from the "two kics of the goats" (Gen 27 9). The seeds of certain leguminous plants were also often prepared by boiling (Gen 25 29; 2 K 4 38). The Heb housewives, we may be sure, were in such matters in no way behind their modern kindswomen of the desert, of whom Doughty tells: "The Arab housewives make savory messes of any grain, seething it and putting thereto only a little salt and some [clarified] butter."

Olive oil was extensively and variously used by the ancient Hebrews, as by most eastern peoples then, as it is now. (a) Oriental cooking diverses here more than at any other point from that of the northern and western peoples, oil serving many of the purposes of butter and lard among ourselves. (b) Oil was used in cooking vegetables as we use bacon and other animal fats, and in cooking fish and eggs, also in the finer sorts of baking. See Bread; Food; Oil. (c) They even mixed oil with the flour, shaped it into cakes and then baked it (Lev 2 4). The "little oil" of the poor widow of Zerophath was clearly not intended for the lamp, but to bake her pitiful "handful of meal" (1 K 17 12). (d) Again the cake of unmixed flour might be baked till almost done, then smeared with oil, sprinkled with anise seed, and brought by further baking to a glossy brown. A species of thin flat cakes of this kind are "the wafers anointed with oil" of Ex 29 2, etc. (e) Oil and honey constituted, as now in the East, a mixture used as we use butter and honey, and are found also mixed in the making of sweet cakes (Ezk 16 13). The taste of the manna is said in Ex 16 31 to be like that of "wafters made with honey," and in Nu 11 8 to be like "the taste of cakes baked with oil" (RVm).

II. Meals, Meal-Time, etc.—(1) It was customary among the ancient Hebrews, as among their contemporaries in the East in classical lands, to have but two meals a day. The "morning meal" or "early snack," as it is called in the Talm, taken with some relish like olives, oil or melted butter, might be used by peasants, fishermen, or even artisans, to "break their fast," and serve as a temporary substitute to it in the NT in 21 12,15, but this was not a true meal. It was rather ἄρατος πρωίνος, αρίστο κρόνος (Robinson, BRP, II, 18), though some think it the ἄρατος, αρίστον, of the NT (Eichersheim, LTJM, II, 205, n. 3; cf. Plummer, ICC, on Lk 11 37). To "eat a meal," i.e. a full meal, in the morning was a matter for grave reproach (Eccl 10 16), as early drinking was unusual and a sign of degradation (cf. Acts 2 15).

(2) The first meal (of "meal-time," lit. "the time of eating," Ruth 2 14; Gen 43 16), according to general usage, was taken at or about noon when the climate and immemorial custom demanded a rest from labor. Peter's intended meal at Joppa, interrupted by the appearance of Cornelius, was at "the sixth hour," i.e. 12 M. It corresponded somewhat to our modern "luncheon," but the hour varied according to rank and occupation (Shabbath 10a). The Bedouin take it about 9 or 10 o'clock (Burchardt, Notes, I, 60). It is described somewhat fully by Lane in Modern Egyptians. To abstain from this meal was accounted "fasting" (Jgs 20 26; 1 S 14 24). Drummond (Tropical Africa) says his Negro bearers began the day's work without food.

(3) The second and main meal (NT, δείπνον, δείνομον) was taken about the set of sun, or a little before or after, when the day's work was over and
the laborers "came in from the field" (Lk 17 7; 24 29 f). This is the "supper time," the "great supper" of Lk 14 16, the important meal of the day, when the whole family was together for the evening (Bureckhardt, Notes, I, 69). It was the time of the feeding of the multitudes by Jesus (Mk 6 35; Mt 14 15; Lk 9 12), of the eating of the Passover, and of the partaking of the Lord's Supper. According to Jewish law, and for special reasons, the chief meal was at midday—"at the sixth hour" according to Jos (Vita, 54; cf Gen 43 16-25; 2 S 24 15 LXX). It was Jeç's promise to Israel that they should have "bread" in the morning and "flesh" in the evening (Ex 16 12), incidenty evidence of one way in which the evening meal differed from that at noon. At this family meal ordinarily there was but one common dish for all, into which all "dipped the sop" (see Mt 26 23; Mk 14 20), so that when the food, cooked in this common stew, was set before the household, the member of the household who had prepared it had no further work to do, a fact which helps to explain Jesus' words to Martha, "One dish alone is needful" (Lk 10 42; Hastings DCG, s.v. "Meals").

(4) Sabbath banqueting became quite customary among the Jews (see examples by Lightfoot, Hor. Heb et Talm on Lk 14 1; cf Edersheim, LJTJM, II, 52, 437; Farrar, Life of Christ, II, 119, n.). Indeed it was carried to such an excess that it became proverbial for luxury. But the principle which lay at the root of the custom was the honor of the Sabbath (Lightfoot, op. cit., III, 149), which may explain Jesus' countenance and use of the custom (cf Lk 7 36; 11 37; 14 7-14), and the fact that the last Sabbath He spent on earth before His passion He was the chief guest at such a festive meal (Jn 12 2). It is certain that He made use of such occasions to teach lessons of charity and religion, in one case even when His host was inclined to indulge in discourteous criticism (Lk 7 39; 11 38,45 f; cf Jn 12 7 f). He seems to have withheld His formal disapproval of what might be wrong in tendency in such feasts because of the latent possibilities for good He saw in them, and so often used them wisely and well. It was on one of these occasions that a fellow-guest in His enthusiasm broke out in the exclamation, "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" (Lk 14 15), referring evidently to the popular Jewish idea that the Messianic kingdom was to be ushered in with a banquet, and that feasting was to be a chief part of its glories (cf Isa 25 6; Lk 13 29). See BANQUET.

III. Customs at Meals.—In the earliest times the Hebrews took their meals sitting, or more probably squatting, on the ground like the Bedawi and fellahin of today (see Gen 37 25, etc.), with the legs gathered tailor-fashion (PEFS, 1905, 124). The use of seats naturally followed upon the change from nomadic to agricultural life, after the conquest of Canaan. Saul and his messmates sat upon "seats" (1 S 20 25), as did Solomon and his court (1 K 10 5; cf 13 20, etc.). With the growth of wealth and luxury under the monarchy, the custom of reclining at meals gradually became the fashion. In Amos' day it was regarded as an aristocratic innovation (Am 3 12; 6 4), but two centuries later Ezekiel speaks of "a stately bed" or "couch" (cf Est 1 6 RV) with "a table prepared before it" (Ezek 23 41), as if it was not so novel. By the end of the 6th cent. BC it was apparently universal, even among the very poor (Jth 12 15; Tob 2 1). Accordingly, "sitting at meat" in the NT (EV) is everywhere replaced by "reclining" (RVm), though women and children still sat. They leaned on the left elbow (Sir 41 19), eating with the right hand (see Lord's Supper). The various words used in the Gospels to denote the bodily attitude at meals, as well as the circumstances described, all imply that the Syrian custom of reclining on a couch, followed by Greeks and Romans, was in vogue (Edersheim, I, 207). Luke uses one word for it which occurs nowhere else in the NT (καταλαθημεν, καταλιθημεν, 7 36; 14 8; 24 30; and καταλαθομεν, καθαλυθεμεν, 9 14,15), which Hobart says is the medical term for laying patients or causing them to lie in bed (Medical Language of Luke, 69). For costumes and customs at more elaborate feasts see BANQUET; DRESS. For details in the "minor morals" of the dinner table, see the classical passages (Sir 31 12-18; 33 3-12),

### Reclining on Couches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>medius lectus</th>
<th>mensa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timus lectus</td>
<td>summus lectus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table and Couches with Seats Numbered in Order of Rank.*

in which Jesus ben-Sira has expanded the counsel given in Prov 23 1 f; cf Kennedy in 1-vol HDB, s.v. "Meals."

**LITERATURE.—**Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah; O. Hoffmann, Eine Untersuchung zum Leben Jesu, ET, 200; B. Weiss, The Life of Christ, II, 129, n. 2; Plummer, ICC, "Luke." 159 f; Farrar, Life of Christ; HDB, DCG, 1-vol HDB; EB; Jew Enc. etc.

**Geo. B. Edgar**

**MEAN, mēn:** The noun "meaning" (Dan 8 15 AV, RV "I sought to understand"; and 1 Cor 14 11) is synonymous with "signification," but in 1 Mac 16 4 AV it expresses "purpose" (RV "I am minded to land"). The noun "mean" in Heb always occurs in the pl., and is generally used in the sense of "agency," "instrument" (cf 1 K 10 29, etc). RV very frequently changes AV: Wisd 8 18, "because of her." 2 Thess 2 3, "in any wise"); Lk 8 36, "how"; Prov 6 20, "on account of"); Rev 13 14, "by reason of" (cf also 2 Thess 3 16; Jn 9 21). He 9 15 (AV "that by means of death") tr* lit. "that a death having taken place," from γινώμαι, γινόμαι, "to become," "to happen," Acts 18 21 AV, "I must by all means keep this feast," is omitted in RV in harmony with several curvatures, the Vulg, and some other VSS.

The adj. "mean" is used in the sense of "common," "humble" ('ני, 'adelphia, "man");
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Meani

Medes

of Isa. 2 9; 5 15; 31 8 omits “mean”). It is also used in the sense of “obscene” (Prov 22 20, תַּשָּׁהְק, “obscene”; בָּקָשׁו, בָּקָשׁו, lit. “without a mark,” “unknown,” Acts 21 39). “Mean” is found in expressions like “in the meanwhile” (AV 1 K 18 45, RV “little while”; Jn 4 31; Rom 2 15, RV “one with another”); “in the mean time” (1 Cor 11 41 AV; Lk 12 1); and “in the mean season” AV (1 Macc 11 14; 16 15). The adverb “meanly” is found (2 Macc 15 38) in the sense of “moderately.”

The vb. “mean” expresses purpose (Isa 3 15; 10 7; Gen 50 20, etc.). In some cases RV renders lit. tr. Acts 27 2, “was about to sail” (AV “meaning to sail”); cf. Acts 21 13; 2 Cor 8 13. In other instances the idea of “to mean” is “to signify,” “to denote” (1 S 4 6; Gen 21 29; Mt 9 13, etc.). Lk 15 26 tr. lit. “what these things might be.” In Ex 12 28 the sense of “mean ye” is “to have in mind.”

A. L. BREESE

MEANI, me-h’nl: AV—RV “Meani” (1 Esd 5 31).

MEARAH, mē-kē’rah (מֶּכֶּרֶא, mēʾarōh; omitted in LXX): A town or district mentioned only in Joel 13 4, as belonging to the Zidonians. The name as it stands means “cave.” If that is correct it may be represented by the modern village Mogheriyeh, “little cave,” not far from Sidon. Perhaps however, we should find in the word the name of a Sidonian city, or the prep. me, that has suffered change in transcription. LXX reads “from Gaza”; but Gaza is obviously too far to the S.

MEASURE, mezh’hur, MEASURES: Several different words in the Heb and Gr are rendered by “measure” in AV. Acts Job 11 2;Jer 13 23 it stands for הָלִיל, medh, mēddah, and it is the usual rendering of the vb. תָּמִדְד, māḏadh, “to measure,” i.e. “stretch out,” “extend,” “spread.” It is often used to render the words representing particular measures, such as ephah (Dt 25 14.15; Prov 20 10; Mic 6 10); or kor (1 K 4 22; 5 12 [5 2 and 5 25 Heb text]; 2 Ch 2 10 [Heb text 2 9]; 27 5; Ezr 7 27); or seah (Gen 13 6; 1 S 25 18; 1 K 18 32; 2 K 7 1 16.18); or χρυσός, χρυσός, “cubit” (Lk 16 6). For these terms see WEIGHTS and MEASURES. It also renders equivalent, “measure of length” (Ex 26 2); תַּמִידָה, mēʾerōh, a liquid measure (Lev 19 35; 1 Ch 25 29; Ezek 4 14 16); עַמִי, mīḥāy, “judgment” (Jer 50 11; 46 48); יָפְנֵי, yoʾē dāh, a word of uncertain meaning, perhaps derived from seah (Isa 27 5); וֹקֶה, skālah, “threefold, large measure” (Ps 80 5 [Heb text ver 6]; Isa 40 12); דָּק, ḏākēn, and דַּקָה, ḏākēn, “weight” and that which is weighed, taken as measure (Ezk 45 11). In Isa 5 14 it stands for הָלִיל, “limit.” In the NT, besides being the usual rendering of the vb. μέτρον, métron, and of the noun μέτρον, métron, it is used for χορδή, χορδή, a dry measure containing about a quart (Rev 6 6).

H. PORTER

MEASURING LINE (טֶלֶת, ṭelēṯ, תַּנֵא, tannōh): The usual meaning is simply line, rope or cord, as in Isa 28 10.13, but the line was used for measurement, as is evident from such passages as 1 K 7 23; Job 38 5; Jer 31 39. Whether the line for measuring had a definite length or not we have no means of knowing. In Isa 44 13 it refers to the line used by the carpenter in marking the timber on which he is working, and in Zec 1 16 it refers to the builder’s line.

MEASURING REED (תיּנָא, tannōh, תַּנְנָא see “known”); kālāmos, kalamos): Used in Ezek 40 5 ff; 42 16; 45 1; Rev 11 1; 21 15.16. The length of the reed used in Zech 3:8; 10:2; 11:3, etc. can be variable. The average reed cubit and a palm, i.e. the large cubit of 7 palms, or about 10 ft. See CUSS. Originally it was an actual reed used for measurements of considerable length, but came at last to be used for a measure of definite length, as indicated by the reference in Ezek (cf. “pole” in Eng. measures).

MEAT, mēt (בְּרֵס, brēs, בְּרֵסָה, brēsaḥ, brōsia): In AV used for food in general, e.g. “I had my meat of herbs” (2 Esd 12 51); “his disciples were gone away into the city to buy meat” (RV “food”) (Jn 4 8). The Eng. word signifies whatever is eaten, whether of flesh or other food.

MEAT OFFERING. See SACRIFICE.

MEBUANNI, mē-būn’ni, mē-būn’ni (מְבוּנָנָי, mēbūnannay, “well-built”): One of David’s “braves” (2 S 23 27). In 2 S 21 18 he is named “Sibbechai” (RV “Sibbceai”), and is there mentioned as the slayer of a Phil. giant. The RV spelling occurs in 1 Ch 11 29, the AV “Sibbcheai” in 20 4 (cf. 2 S 23 18); and in 1 Ch 27 11 the RV spelling recurs, where this person is mentioned as captain of the 8th course of the 12 monthly courses that served the king in rota. Scribal error, and the similarity in Heb spelling of the two forms accounts for the difference in spelling. RV consistently tries to keep this right.

HENRY WALLACE

MECHERATHITE, mē-kē’raṭh-īt (מְכֶרֶאָתִי, mēkērāṭhi, “dweller in Mecherah”): Possibly this is a misunderstanding of “Maachathite” (AV). It is the description given by Hipher, one of David’s valiant men (1 Ch 11 36).

In the parallel list of 2 S 23, esp. ver 34, the “Maachathite” is mentioned without name in the place in the list given to Hipher in 1 Ch 11 36. The variations do not destroy the conviction that the list is virtually the same.

MECONAH, mē-kō’na (מְכּוֹנָה, mēkonah; Mēxōn, Machnō, Machnā): A town apparently in the neighborhood of Ziklag, named only in Neh 11 28, as reoccupied by the men of Judah after the Captivity. It is not identified.

MEDAB, med’a-ba: The Gr form of “Medeba” in 1 Macc 9 36.

MEDAD, mē-dād (מְדָד, mēdād, “affectionate”): One of the 70 elders on whom the spirit of the Lord came in the days of Moses enabling them to prophesy. Medad and one other, Eldad, began to prophesy in the camp, away from the other elders who had assembled at the door of the tabernacle to hear God’s message. Joshua suggested that Eldad and Medad be stopped, but Moses interceded on their behalf, saying, “Would that all Jeh’s people were prophets!” (Nu 11 26–29). The subject-matter of their prophesy has been variously supplied by tradition. Cf. the Pal Tafs ad loc., the apocalyptic Book of Eldad and Medad, and Baal ha-turim (ad loc.).

ELLA DAVIS ISAACS

MEDAN, mē-dān (מֶדָן, mēdan, “strife”): One of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25 2; 1 Ch 1 32). The tribe and its place remain unidentified, and the conjecture that the name may

Figuratively it signifies destruction, or a portion of something marked off by line for destruction, as in 2 K 21 18; or for judgment, as in Isa 28 17.
MEDEBA, med'e-ba (מְדֶבָּה; אֲמָדָּה); Med physician (Gen 10:2; 2 K 17:6; 18:11; 1 Ch 1:5; Ezr 6:2; Est 1:3.14.18.19; 10:2; Is 13:17; 21:2; Jer 25:25; 51:11.28; Dan 5:28; 6:1.9.13.16; 8:20; 9:1; 11:1). Mentioned as Japhetites in Gen 10:2, i.e., Aryans, and according to some, they first called themselves the "Haramitarians" (Herod. vii.62), in Avestic Airy = Stkt. Arya, "noble." They were closely allied in descent, language and religion with the Persians, and in secular history preceded their appearance by some centuries. Like most Aryan nations they were at first divided into small village communities each with its own chiefs (called in Assyrian hazawt by Assur-bani-pal of Herod. i.96). Shalmaneser II mentions them (Nimrod Obelisk, i.21) about 840 BC. They then inhabited the modern Airbatjan (Media Atropatene). Ram- mishapzeit son of Assyr (Rawlinson, WAI, ii.51) and paid him tribute that he (810-781 BC) had conquered "the land of the Medes and the land of Parsua" (Persis), as well as other countries. This probably meant only a plundering expedition, as far as Media was concerned. So also Assur-nirari I (Soon, 11, 22) in 749-748 BC overran Median Nani and Media, Tiglat-piiles IV (in Bab called Pulu, the "Pul" of 2 K 15:19) and Sargon also overran parts of Media. Sargon in 716 BC conquered Kisheshin, Khar- khar and other parts of the country. Some of the Medes were so by him transplanted to "the cities of the Medes" (2 K 17:6; 18:11; the LXX reading "the ' pensions (or Pul, 2 K 15:19) "mountains" of the Medes here) after the fall of Samaria in 722 BC. It was perhaps owing to the need of being able to resist Assyria that about 720 BC the Medes (in part at least) united into a kingdom under Deoks, according to Herodotus (i.95). Sargon mentions him by the name Dayanukel, Jehu history, that he himself captured this prince (715 BC) and conquered his territory two years later. After his release, probably Deoks fortified Ecbatana (modern Ellipi) and made it his capital. It has been held by some that Herodotus confounds the Medes here with the Manda (or Urmian-Manda, "Isatian of the Medes") of the inscriptions; but these were probably Aryan tribes, possibly of Scythian origin, and the names Mada and Mandi may be, after all, identical. Her-haddon in his 25th year (679-678 BC) and Assur- bani-pal warred with certain Median tribes, whose power was now growing formidable. They (or the Manda) had conquered Persia and formed a great confederacy. Under Kyaxares (Uvakhatara - Deoks' grandson, according to Herodo- tus), they besieged Nineveh, but Assur-bani-pal, with the assistance of the Ashguza (7, the Ashkenaz of Gen 10:5), another Aryan tribe, repelled them. At the end of the Assyrian empire came, however, in 606 BC, when the Mandas, who had captured their king, Triba- tukte, Mamiti-arsu, lord of the city of the Medes, Kaerat of the Armenian district of Kar-kas, the Kimmers (Gimirra = Gomer) under Teaspah (Tiglath-Piles, Chasapish), the Minni (Mamiti, cf Jer 51:27), and the Babylonians under Nabu-pal-user, stormed and destroyed Nineveh, as Nabu-nahid informs us. The last king of Assyria, Sin-sar- ikun (Sarakan), perished with his people.

Herodotus says that Deoks was succeeded by Phraer- tes (Frataxies) his son, Phraortes by his son Kyaxares; and the latter in turn left his kingdom to his son Astyages whose daughter Mandane married Cyaxares, father of the great Cyrus. Yet there was no Median empire (as he describes them), or at least it did not embrace all the Aryan tribes of Western Asia, as we see from the inscriptions that in 606 BC, and even later, many of them were under kings and princes of their own (cf Jer 25:2; 51:11). Herodotus tells us they were divided into six tribes, of whom the Magi were one (Herod. 1.101). Kyaxares was ruled for 5 years (606-580 BC) with the Lydians, the struggle being ended in May, 565, by the total eclipse of the sun foretold by Thales (Herod. 1.74).

The alliance between the Medes and the Babylonians ended with Nebuchadnezzar's reign. His successor Nabu-nahid (555 BC) says that in that year the Medes under Astyages (Ishuwogu) entered Mesopotamia and besieged Haran. Soon after, however, that dynasty was overthrown; for Cyrus the Persian, whom Nabu-nahid the first time he mentions him styles Astyages' "youthful
slaves" (aššur, sîra), but who was even then king of Anshan (Anzan), attacked and in 549 BC captured Astyages, plundered Ecbatana, and became king of the Medes. Though of Pers descent, Cyrus did not, apparently, begin to reign in Persia till 546 BC. Henceforth there was no Median empire distinguished from the Pers (nor is any such mentioned in Dn, in spite of modern fancies). As the Medes were further advanced in civilization and preceded the Persians in sovereignty, the Gr historian generally called the whole nation "the Medes" long after Cyrus' time. Only much later are the Persians spoken of as the predominant partners. Hence it is a sign of early date that Daniel (6 20) speaks of "Media and Persia," whereas later the Book of Est reverses the order ("Persia and Media," Est 1 3.14.18.19; 10 2), as in the inscriptions of Darius at Behistun.

Under Darius I, Phraortes (Fravartish) rebelled, claiming the throne of Media as a descendant of Kyaxares. His cause was so powerfully supported among the Medes that the rebellion was not suppressed till after a fierce struggle. He was finally taken prisoner at Ragas (Ret, near Tehrân), brutally mutilated, and finally impaled at Ecbatana. After that Median history merges into that of Persia. The history of the Jews in Media is referred to in Dn and Est. 1 Mac tells something of Media under the Syrian (S. 66) and Parthian dominion (14 1–5; cf Jos, Ant, XX, III). Medes are last mentioned in Acts 10 3. They are remarkable as the first leaders of the Aryan race in its struggle with the Semites for freedom and supremacy.

**W. ST. CLAIR TISSALL**

**MEDIA, mē’d-i-a (τῆς Μεδίας, mēdēia; Mēdia, Mēdia):** Lay to the W. and S.W. of the Caspian, and extended thence to the Zagros Mountains on the W. On the N. in later times it was bounded by the rivers Araxes and Cyrus, which separated it from Persia. Its eastern boundaries were formed by Hyrcania and the Great Salt Desert (now called the Kavār), and it was bounded on the S. by Susiana. In earlier times its limits were somewhat indefinite. It included Atropatene (Armenian Atropataen, the name, "Fire-guarding," showing devotion to the worship of Fire) to the N., and Media Magna to the S., the former being the present Arazbātān. Near the Caspian the country is low, damp and unhealthy, but inland most of it is high and mountainous, Mt. Démâvând in the Alburz range reaching 18,600 ft. Atropatene was famous for the fertility of its valleys and table-lands, except toward the N. Media Magna is high; it has fruitful tracts along the course of the streams, but suffers much from want of water, though this was doubtless more abundant in antiquity. It contained the Nisaean Plain, famous for its breed of horses. The chief cities of ancient Media were Ecbatana, Gazaca, and Ragae. The Orontes range near Ecbatana is the present Abaran. Lake Spāta is now known as Urmū (Urmah).

**W. ST. CLAIR TISSALL**

**MEDIAN, mē’di-an. See DARIUS; MEDES; MEDIA.**
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**LITERATURE.**

1. **Introductory.**—(1) "Mediation" in its broadest sense may be defined as the act of intervening between parties at variance for the purpose of reconciling them, or between parties not necessarily hostile for the purpose of leading them into an agreement or covenant. There is no reference to the method by which God and man are reconciled through the instrumentality of some intervening person, act or process, and esp. through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. The term itself does not occur in Bib. literature. (2) The term "mediator" (= middleman, agent of mediation) is nowhere found in OT or Apoc (EV), but the corresponding Gr word μεσίτης, mostētas, occurs once in LXX (Job 9 33 AV, "Neither is there any daysman betwixt us," where "daysman" stands for Heb mökāḇēḇ, "arbiter," ARV, ERV, "umpire" (see Daysman), LXX has ὁ μεσίτης ἡμῶν, "our mediator," as a paraphrase for Heb bāḇēnā, "betwixt us"). Even in the NT, mostētas, "mediator," occurs only 6t, viz Gal 3 19 20 (of Moses), and 1 Tim 2 5; Heb 6 8, 15; 12 24 (of Christ).

Though the actual terms are thus very rare, the principle of mediation is one of great significance in Bib. theology, as well as in the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy. It corresponds to a profound human mediation in the sense of a secret or needful intermediary expression in some form or other in man's relations.

It is an attempt to solve the problem raised by (1) the idea of the infinite distance which separates God from man and the universe, and (2) the deeply felt want of bringing them into a harmonious relation. The conception of mediation will differ, therefore, according to whether the distance to be surmounted is understood ethically or metaphysically. If it be thought of in an ethical or religious sense, that is, if the emphasis be laid on the fact of human sin as standing in the way of man's fellowship with God, then mediation will be the mode by which peaceful relations are established between sinful man and the absolutely righteous God. But if the antithesis of God and the world be conceived of metaphysically, i.e. be based on the ultimate nature of God and of the world conceived as essentially opposed to each other, then mediation will be the mode by which the transcendent God, without Himself coming into direct contact with the world, is able to produce effects in it through an intermediate agent (or agents). The latter conception (largely the result of an exaggerated Platonic dualism) exerted an important influence on later Jewish thought, and even on Christian theology, and will come briefly under our consideration. But in the
main we shall be concerned with the former view, as more in harmony with the development of Bib.
theology which culminates in the NT doctrine of
atonement. Mediation between God and man as
presented in Scripture is represented respectively by the functions of the
prophet, the priest, and the theocratic king. Here
and there in the OT these tend to meet, as in Mel-
chizedek the priest-king, and in the Suffering
Servant of the LXX, who unites the priestly
function of sacrifice with the prophetic function
of revealing the Divine will. But on the whole,
these aspects of mediation in the OT run along lines
which have no meeting-point in one person adequate
to do all the jobs. In the NT they intersect in the
person and work of Jesus Christ, who realizes
in Himself the full meaning of the prophetic, priestly,
and kingly ideals.

II. Mediation in the OT.—We do not find in the
OT a fixed and final doctrine of mediation univer-
sally accepted as an axon of religious
Teaching toward such a doctrine, under the
growing sense of God’s exaltation and
of man’s frailty and sinfulness. Such
a passage as Gen 2:25 seems merely to con-
dict the idea of mediation. Still more striking are
the words of Job above referred to, “There is no
uumpire between us, that might lay his hand upon us
both,” i.e. to enforce his decision (Job 9:33),
when the LXX paraphrases, “Would that there
were a mediator and a preserver and a hearer
between us both.” The note of despair which char-
acterizes this passage shows that Job has no hope
that such an arbiter between him and God is forthcoming.
Yet the words give pathetic utter-
ance to the deep inarticulate cry of humanity for a
mediator. In this connection we should note the
protests of prophets and psalmists against an un-
ethical view of mediation by animal sacrifices (Mic
6:6-8; Ps 40:6-8, etc.), and their frequent direct
appeals to God for mercy without reference to any
mediation (Ps 25:7; 32:5; 103:8 ff, etc).

1. Mediatorial sacrifice.—In the patriarchal age,
before the official priest had been differentiated
from the rest of the community, the
function of offering sacrifices was dis-
charged by the head of the family or
Teaching: clan on behalf of his people, as by
Early
Noah (Gen 8:20), Abraham (Gen 12
Period 7:3; 16:3), Aaron (Gen 31:54; 33:20). So Job,
conceived by the writer as living in patriarchal
antiquity, is said to have offered sacrifices vicari-
ously for his sons (Job 1:5). Melchizedek, the
priest-king of Salem (Gen 14:18-20), is a figure of
considerable theological interest, insomuch as he
was taken by the author of Ps 110 as the forerunner
of the ideal theocratic king who was also priest,
and by the author of He as prototype of Christ’s
priesthood.

2. Intercessory prayer.—Intercession is in all
stages of thought an essential element in mediation.
We have striking examples of it in Gen 18:22-33;
Job 42:8-10.

3. The Mosaic covenant.—In Moses we have for
the first time a recognized national representative
who acted both as God’s spokesman to the people,
and the people’s spokesman before God. He alone
was allowed to “come near unto Jeh,” and to him
Jeh spake “face to face, as a man speaketh unto his
friend” (Ex 33:11). He was the “mediator and
broker of the words of the people” to Him, as to
a sovereign who cannot be approached save by his
duly accredited minister (Ex 19:8). We have a
striking example of his intercessory mediation in the
episode of the golden calf, when he pleaded effectively
with God to turn from His wrath (Ex 32:12-14),
and even offered to “make atonement for” (kipper,
lit. “cover”) their sin by confessing their sin before
God, and being willing to be blotted out of God’s
book, so that no man might be spared (vs 30-32).
Here we have already the germ of the idea of
vicarious suffering for sin.

4. Intercessory mediation.—Samuel is by Jer-
emiah classed with Moses as the chief representative
of intercessory mediation (Jer 15:1). He is re-
ported as mediating by prayer between Israel and
God, and succeeding in warding off the punishment
of their sin (1 S 7 5-12). On such occasions, prayer was wont to be accompanied by confessions
of sins and by an offering to Jeh.

Samuel represents the transition from the ancient
seer or seer-sword to the prophetic order. The
prophet was regarded as the organ of
3. Prophetic Divine revelation, to consult whom
Mediation was equivalent to “inquiring of God”
(1 S 9:9)—a commissioner sent by
God (Isa 6:8) to proclaim His will by word and
action. In that capacity he was Jeh’s representa-
tive among men, and so could speak in a tone of
authority. Prophetic revelation is essential to the
idea of religion of the NT, which is dis-
tinguished from a mere philosophy or natural
religion. God is not merely a passive object of human
discovery, but one who actively and graciously
reveals Himself to His chosen people through the
medium of the authorized expressors of His mind
and will. Thus in the main the prophet stands for
the principle of mediation in its man-world aspect.
But the God-world aspect is not absent, for we find
the prophet mediating with God on behalf of men,
making intercession for them (Jer 14:19-22; Am
7 2f.5).

Mediation is in a peculiar sense the function of the
priest. In the main he stands for the principle in
its God-world aspect. Yet in the early

4. Priestly period the man-world aspect that
Mediation was most apparent; i.e. the priest
was at first regarded as the medium
through which Jeh delivered His oracles to men,
the human mouthpiece of supernatural revelation,
giving advice or laws by way of the sacred
lot. Before the time of the first literary
prophets, the association of the priests with the
ephor and the lot had receded into the background
(though the high priest theoretically retained the
right of interpriety (Gen 20:21, etc)),
and in the days of the Urim and Thummim, Ex 25:30; Lev 8:5; but
the power they lost with the oracle they gained at
the altar. First they acquired a preferential
status at the local sanctuaries; then, in the Deuter-
monic legislation, where sacrifice is limited to the
Jesus sanctuary, it is assumed that only Levite
priests can officiate. Finally, in the Levitical
system as set forth in the PC (which regulated Jewish
worship in the post-exilic times), the Aaronic
priests, now clearly distinguished from the Levites,
have the sole privilege of immediate access to God
in His sanctuary (Nu 4:19–20; 16:3-5). God’s
transcendence and holiness are now so emphasized
that between Him and the sin-stained people there
is almost an infinite chasm. Hence the people can
only enjoy His ideal right of drawing nigh unto God
and offering sacrifice to Him through the mediation
of the official priesthood. The mediatorship of
priests derived its authority, not from their moral
purity or personal worth, but from the ceremonial
purity which attached to their function; they are not
on the same level. A process of gradual
sanctity narrows down their number as the approach
is made to the Most Holy Place, which symbolizes
the presence chamber of Jeh. (1) Out of the sacred
nation as a whole, the priestly tribe of Levi is
elected and invested with a special sanctity to perform all the subordinate acts of service within the sanctuary (Ex 19 :10; 23:19). Within the sacred tribe, the members of the house of Aaron are set apart and invested with a still higher sanctity; they alone officiate at the altar in the Holy Place and expiate the guilt of the people by sacrifice and prayer, thus representing the people before God. Yet even they are only admitted to the proximate nearness of the Holy Place. (3) The gradation of the hierarchy is completed by the recognition of a single, supreme head of the priesthood—the high priest. He alone possessed the throne of Holies, being permitted to go into that alone once a year, on the Day of Atonement, when he makes propitiation not only for himself and the priesthood, but for the entire congregation. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is the highest exercise of priestly mediatorial. On that day, the whole community has access to Jeh through their representative, the high priest, and through him offer atonement for their sins. Moreover, the role of the high priest as mediator is symbolized by his wearing the breastplate bearing the names of the children of Israel, whenever he goes into the Holy Place (Ex 28:29).

Something must be said of the sacrificial system, through which alone the priest exercised his mediatorial functions. For his mediatorial influence with God was exercised, for instance, through intercessory prayer (intercession is not mentioned by P as a duty of the priest, though referred to by the prophets, Joel 2:17; Mal 3:6). It depended rather on an elaborate system of offerings, of which the priest was but an official agent. It was he who derived his authority from the system, rather than the system from him. The most characteristic features in the ritual of the PC are the sin offering (kattathk, Lev 4; 5; 6; 21) and the guilt offering ('ashams, Lev 5:7-14, 19), which seem peculiar to P. These are meant to restore the normal relation of the people or of individuals to God, a relation which sin has disturbed. Hence these sacrifices were only administered by the priest, are distinctly mediatorial or reconciliatory in character, i.e. they make atonement for or "cover" (kipper) the sin of the guilty community or individuals. This seems the case also, though in a less degree (Nu 8:19; 18:6), in the annual peace-offerings, which, though "not offered expressly, like the sin and guilt offerings, for the forgiveness of sin, nevertheless were regarded...as 'covering,' or neutralizing, the offerer's unworthiness to appear before God, and so, though in a less degree, than the sin and guilt offerings, as effecting propitiation" (Driver in HDB, IV, 132). We must beware, however, of reading the full NT doctrine of sin and propitiation into the sacrificial law. Two important points of difference may be noted: (1) The law does not provide atonement for all sins, but only for sins of ignorance or inadvertence, committed within the covenant. Deliberate sins fall outside the scope of priestly mediation. (2) While sin includes moral impurity, it must be admitted that the chief emphasis falls on ceremonial uncleanness, because it is only violation of physical sanctity that can be fully rectified by ritual ordinance. The law was essentially a civil code, and was not adequate to deal with inward sins. Thus the sacrificial system in itself is but a faint abumbration of the NT doctrine of Christ's high-priestly work, which has reference to sin in its widest and deepest meaning. Yet, in spite of these limitations, the priestly ritual was, as far as it went, an organized expression of the sin-consciousness, and prepared the way for the coming of a perfect Mediator.

On another plane than that of the priest is the mediation of the theocratic king. Jeh was ideally the sole king of Israel. But he governed the people mediately through His viceregent the theocratic king (1 Sam 8:1, 5). Within the sacred tribe, the members of the house of Aaron are set apart and invested with a still higher sanctity; they alone officiate at the altar in the Holy Place and expiate the guilt of the people by sacrifice and prayer, thus representing the people before God. Yet even they are only admitted to the proximate nearness of the Holy Place. (3) The gradation of the hierarchy is completed by the recognition of a single, supreme head of the priesthood—the high priest. He alone possessed the throne of Holies, being permitted to go into that alone once a year, on the Day of Atonement, when he makes propitiation not only for himself and the priesthood, but for the entire congregation. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is the highest exercise of priestly mediatorial. On that day, the whole community has access to Jeh through their representative, the high priest, and through him offer atonement for their sins. Moreover, the role of the high priest as mediator is symbolized by his wearing the breastplate bearing the names of the children of Israel, whenever he goes into the Holy Place (Ex 28:29).

Something must be said of the sacrificial system, through which alone the priest exercised his mediatorial functions. For his mediatorial influence with God was exercised, for instance, through intercessory prayer (intercession is not mentioned by P as a duty of the priest, though referred to by the prophets, Joel 2:17; Mal 3:6). It depended rather on an elaborate system of offerings, of which the priest was but an official agent. It was he who derived his authority from the system, rather than the system from him. The most characteristic features in the ritual of the PC are the sin offering (kattathk, Lev 4; 5; 6; 21) and the guilt offering ('ashams, Lev 5:7-14, 19), which seem peculiar to P. These are meant to restore the normal relation of the people or of individuals to God, a relation which sin has disturbed. Hence these sacrifices were only administered by the priest, are distinctly mediatorial or reconciliatory in character, i.e. they make atonement for or "cover" (kipper) the sin of the guilty community or individuals. This seems the case also, though in a less degree (Nu 8:19; 18:6), in the annual peace-offerings, which, though "not offered expressly, like the sin and guilt offerings, for the forgiveness of sin, nevertheless were regarded...as 'covering,' or neutralizing, the offerer's unworthiness to appear before God, and so, though in a less degree, than the sin and guilt offerings, as effecting propitiation" (Driver in HDB, IV, 132). We must beware, however, of reading the full NT doctrine of sin and propitiation into the sacrificial law. Two important points of difference may be noted: (1) The law does not provide atonement for all sins, but only for sins of ignorance or inadvertence, committed within the covenant. Deliberate sins fall outside the scope of priestly mediation. (2) While sin includes moral impurity, it must be admitted that the chief emphasis falls on ceremonial uncleanness, because it is only violation of physical sanctity that can be fully rectified by ritual ordinance. The law was essentially a civil code, and was not adequate to deal with inward sins. Thus the sacrificial system in itself is but a faint abumbration of the NT doctrine of Christ's high-priestly work, which has reference to sin in its widest and deepest meaning. Yet, in spite of these limitations, the priestly ritual was, as far as it went, an organized expression of the sin-consciousness, and prepared the way for the coming of a perfect Mediator. On another plane than that of the priest is the mediation of the theocratic king. Jeh was ideally

5. The Theocratic Messiah:

(1) Angelic mediation. Not until the advent of the angels connected with Mediation have theological significance. Previously, when God was anthropomorphically conceived as appearing periodically on
earth in visible form, the need of angelic mediation was not felt. The "angel" in early narrative (e.g. Gen 18 7–11) did not possess abiding personality distinct from God, but was God Himself temporarily manifested in human form. But the more God was conceived as "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity," the greater was the need for mediation between God and the world, and even between God and His servant the prophet. In post-exilic writers there is an increasing disposition to put up the gap between God and the prophet with superhuman beings. Thus Zechariah receives a Divine inspiration through angels; and similarly Daniel receives explanations of his dreams. We do not in the OT hear of angels interceding with God (God-ward mediation), but only as intermediaries of revelation and of the Divine will (man-ward mediation). Modern Jewish scholars deny that Judaistic angelology implied that God was transcendent in the sense of being remote and out of contact with the world. So, e.g., Montefiore (Hibben's Interpretation Book 423–91) maintains that "a natural disincarnation to bring the Godhead downward to human conditions," and that "for supernatural conversations angels formed a convenient substitute for God" (p. 490). The doctrine of angels indicates the influence on NT mediation, which moves on the plane of the ethical, rather than on the basis of the merely physical transcendency of God.

(2) Divine wisdom.—Of more importance as a principle in the NT theology of the NT is the doctrine of Wisdom, in which the Jews found "a middle term between the religion of Israel and the philosophy of Greece." In Prov 8 22–31 Wisdom is depicted as an individual energy, God's elect Son, His companion, and even His self-manifestation. But whose character is here purely ideal and poetical, and the ethical interest predominates over the metaphysical, yet we have in such a passage a clear proof of contact with Or thought (esp. Plotinus and Stoicism), and of the need of a mediator between God and the visible world. This mode of thought, linked to the Heb conception of the Divine Word as the efficient expression of God's thought and of His being (Ps 33 6; 107 20), has left its mark on Philo's Logos-doctrine and on the NT Christology. See Wisdom.

III. In semi- and non-canonical Jewish literature.—In the Apoc, where NT mediation is for the most part absent, we have one or two references to angelic intercession (10 12; 15 2; 40 6). The tradition of the agency of angels is in the promulgation of the law is preserved in the LXX of Dt 33 2 (not in the Heb original), but was greatly amplified in rabbinical literature (Jeb, Av T. xvi. 3). In Wied a bold advance is made toward the concept of Wisdom as a personal mediator of creation (esp. Ps 22–27). In later Judaism, the idea of the Word is further developed. The Targ impose the divine activity to the manusript or "Word" referred, where the OT speaks of the creative power of God and speaks of it as Israel's Intercessor before God and as Redeemer. This usage seems to arise out of a reluctance to bring God into immediate contact with the world; hence God's self-manifestation is represented as mediation by the Mediator. The tendency finds its fulfillment, however, not among the Jews, but among the Jews of Alexander, esp. in Philo's Logos-doctrine. Deeply influenced by the Platonic dualism, Philo thought of God as pure Spirit, incapable of direct contact with the world; and of the OT. The highest of these was the Divine Logos, the mediator between the inaccessibly holy and the manifest material universe. On the one hand, in relation to the world, the Logos is the Medium of revelation; on the other hand, in his God-ward activity, he is the representative of the world before God, its High Priest, Intercessor, and Prophet. Philo's Logos was probably nothing more than a highly philosophical abstraction vividly

Imaged in the mind. In spite of Philo's influence on early Christian thought, and even perhaps on some NT writers, his doctrine of mediation is not represented in the NT. The doctrine of NT mediation is derived from the central NT doctrine, which is concerned above all with the reconciliation of God and man in Christ and consequent grace, and not with the thiênation of the absolute and the finite world. The Mediator of Philo is an abstraction, speculative in thought; the Mediator of Christ is a historical person known to experience. See PHIL JUDAH.

IV. Mediation and Mediator in the NT.—The relatively independent lines of development which the conception of mediation has hitherto followed are: (1) The Synoptic Gospels. Christ's mediatorial work into that of prophet, priest and king (very common since Calvin, but now often discarded) offers a convenient method of treating the subject, though we must avoid making the division absolute, as if Christ's work fell apart into three separate and independent functions. The unity of the work of salvation is preserved by the fact that "no one of the offices fills up a moment of time alone, but the others are always cooperative," although Christ's mediatorial work puts now this, now that side in the foreground." The triple division is of special value, because it sets in a vivid light the continuity between the OT doctrine of Mediation and the NT Mediator (Esparzy, System of Christian Doctrine, ET, III, 385 f). These three aspects of Christ's mediatorialship can be distinguished in the Synoptics, although the formal distinction is the work of later analysis.

(1) Christ as Prophet.—It is in the character of Prophet that He mainly impressed the common mind, which was moved to inquire "Whence hath this man this wisdom?" and by His reply, "A prophet is not without honor," etc, He virtually accepts that "in every generation people search for Christ" (34 13). The NT development of Christ as the mediator of revelation; through Him alone can men come to know God as Father (Mt 11 27) and "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" (13 11). In all His teaching we feel that He speaks within the center of truth, and hence can teach with authority and not as the scribes (7 29), who approach the truth from without. His teaching is part of His redemptive work, and not something extraneous to it, for the sin from which He redeems includes ignorance and sin. (Ps 85 11; 118 22; 33 6; 107 20), has left its mark on Philo's Logos-doctrine and on the NT Christology. See Wisdom.
mediated to the heavy laden through Him (Mt. 11: 25-30). He claims authority on earth to forgive sins (Mt. 9: 6). The blood of the New Covenant, in accordance with the true pedagogical method by which He adapted His teaching to the progressive receptivity of His followers. But harscham as we must think of Him as subject to the ordinary laws of human psychology, His death must have been to Him a growth, matured partly by outward events, and partly by the development of His inner consciousness as the Suffering Messiah. In His later ministry, He frequently taught that He must suffer and die (Mt. 12 12-21; 15 30 f.; 13 28; 14 8 and passages; cf. Mk 10 38; Lk 12 49 f.). There are two important passages which expressly connect His death with His mediatorial work. The first is Mk 10 45; Mt 20 28, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." The context shows that it was while the thought of His approaching death filled His mind that Our Lord uttered these words (cf. Mk 10 33. 38). As the word in the exact meaning latron, there are two circles of ideas with which it may be associated. (a) It may mean a sacrificial offering, representing Heb kopher (lit. "covering," "propitiatory gift") which it translates several times in the LXX, (e.g. Ecclus. 35: 17). The exact meaning of latron in the LXX, latron in most cases stands for some form of the roots gatul, "to deliver," pahdah, "to redeem" (e.g. Lev 25: 51; Nu 3: 51). Hence Wendt explains it as the ransom as the price by which Jesus redeemed His disciples from their bondage to suffering and death (Teaching of Jesus, II, 226 f.). This analogy certainly suits the context better than that drawn from the Levitical ritual, for it brings out the contrast between the liberating work of Christ and the bondage of the "other men." We must not press the analogy in detail or seek here an answer to the question, who was the recipient of the ransom price (e.g. whether the devil, as many Fathers, notably Origen and Gregory of Nyssa; and later theologians, the "eternal law of righteousness," as Dale), the purpose of the passage is primarily practical, not speculative. It is certainly pressing the figurative language of Jesus too far to insist that the ransom price is the exact quantitative equivalent of the lives liberated, or of the penalty they had deserved regarded as a debt. This is too prossic and literalistic an interpretation of a passage which has its setting in the ethical rather than in the commercial realm, and which breathes a spirit deeply akin to that of Isa. 53, where suffering and service are, as here, combined.

The other passage in which Christ definitely connects His mediatorialship with His death is that which reports His words at the Last Supper (Mk 14: 22-24; Mt 26 26-28; Lk 22: 19 f.; cf. 1 Cor 11: 24 f.). The reported words are not identical in the several narratives. But even in their simplest form (in Mk), there is evidently a twofold allusion, to the paschal meal and to the blood. The latter is at the ratification of the covenant at Sinai (Ex 24: 8), and to Jeremiah's prophecy of a new David. There can be little doubt that the paschal feast, though it does not conform in detail to any of the Levitical sacrifices, was regarded as a sacrifice, as is indicated by the blood ceremonial (Ex 12: 21-27). The former, in view of the New Testament interpretation, is sacrificial; and, as we have seen, it is probable that all blood sacrifices, and not those of the sin and guilt offerings only, were associated with propitiatory power. Wendt denies that there is here any reference to sin and its forgiveness (Teachings of Jesus, II, 241 f.). It must be admitted that the words in Mt "unto remission of sins," which have no counterpart in the other reports, are probably an explanatory expansion of the words actually uttered. But the true interpretation of the meaning, as is attested by the fact that the new covenant of Jeremiah's prophecy was one of forgiveness and justification (Jer. 31: 34), and that Christ speaks of His blood as shed for others. And as the Passover signified deliverance from bondage to an earthly power (Egypt), so the Supper stands for forgiveness and deliverance from a spiritual power (sin). Clearly Christ here represents Himself as the Mediator of the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ, and which are, in fact, the climax of the whole narrative. The suffering and death of Christ, and that His Messiahspeak was realized in the crucifixion and the resurrection, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

(1) The early speeches in Acts reveal a primitive stage of the Messianic Kingdom (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). Thus Jesus defined it as an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against sin (Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, 11, 65-68). (2) It may mean ransom price, the purchase-money with which the emancipation of a slave is paid. (3) In the LXX, latron in most cases stands for some form of the roots gatl, "to deliver," pahdah, "to redeem" (e.g. Lev. 25: 51; Nu 3: 51). Hence Wendt explains it as the ransom as the price by which Jesus redeemed His disciples from their bondage to suffering and death (Teaching of Jesus, II, 226 f.). This analogy certainly suits the context better than that drawn from the Levitical ritual, for it brings out the contrast between the liberating work of Christ and the bondage of the "other men." We must not press the analogy in detail or seek here an answer to the question, who was the recipient of the ransom price (e.g. whether the devil, as many Fathers, notably Origen and Gregory of Nyssa; and later theologians, the "eternal law of righteousness," as Dale), the purpose of the passage is primarily practical, not speculative. It is certainly pressing the figurative language of Jesus too far to insist that the ransom price is the exact quantitative equivalent of the lives liberated, or of the penalty they had deserved regarded as a debt. This is too prosaic and literalistic an interpretation of a passage which has its setting in the ethical rather than in the commercial realm, and which breathes a spirit deeply akin to that of Isa. 53, where suffering and service are, as here, combined.

The other passage in which Christ definitely connects His mediatorialship with His death is that which reports His words at the Last Supper (Mk. 14: 22-24; Mt 26 26-28; Lk 22: 19 f.; cf. 1 Cor. 11: 24 f.). The reported words are not identical in the several narratives. But even in their simplest form (in Mk), there is evidently a twofold allusion, to the paschal meal and to the blood. The latter is at the ratification of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. 24: 8), and to Jeremiah's prophecy of a new David (31: 31-34). There can be little doubt that the paschal feast, though it does not conform in detail to any of the Levitical sacrifices, was regarded as a sacrifice, as is indicated by the blood ceremonial (Ex 12: 21-27). The former, in view of the New Testament interpretation, is sacrificial; and, as we have seen, it is probable that all blood sacrifices, and not those of the sin and guilt offerings only, were associated with propitiatory power. Wendt denies that there is here any reference to sin and its forgiveness (Teachings of Jesus, II, 241 f.). It must be admitted that the words in Mt "unto remission of sins," which have no counterpart in the other reports, are probably an explanatory expansion of the words actually uttered. But the true interpretation of the meaning, as is attested by the fact that the new covenant of Jeremiah's prophecy was one of forgiveness and justification (Jer. 31: 34), and that Christ speaks of His blood as shed for others. And as the Passover signified deliverance from bondage to an earthly power (Egypt), so the Supper stands for forgiveness and deliverance from a spiritual power (sin). Clearly Christ here represents Himself as the Mediator of the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ, and which are, in fact, the climax of the whole narrative. The suffering and death of Christ, and that His Messiahspeak was realized in the crucifixion and the resurrection, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

(1) The early speeches in Acts reveal a primitive stage of the Messianic Kingdom (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). Thus Jesus defined it as an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against sin (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). The Mediatorship of Jesus is the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ, and which are, in fact, the climax of the whole narrative. The suffering and death of Christ, and that His Messiahspeak was realized in the crucifixion and the resurrection, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

(1) The early speeches in Acts reveal a primitive stage of the Messianic Kingdom (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). Thus Jesus defined it as an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against sin (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). The Mediatorship of Jesus is the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

(2) The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ, and which are, in fact, the climax of the whole narrative. The suffering and death of Christ, and that His Messiahspeak was realized in the crucifixion and the resurrection, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

(1) The early speeches in Acts reveal a primitive stage of the Messianic Kingdom (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). Thus Jesus defined it as an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against sin (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). The Mediatorship of Jesus is the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

(2) The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ, and which are, in fact, the climax of the whole narrative. The suffering and death of Christ, and that His Messiahspeak was realized in the crucifixion and the resurrection, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

(1) The early speeches in Acts reveal a primitive stage of the Messianic Kingdom (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). Thus Jesus defined it as an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against sin (cf. Acts 3: 19-21). The Mediatorship of Jesus is the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

The Epistles of James and Jude.—In those esp. the doctrine of Christ's mediation does not occupy a prominent place. To James, Christianity is the culmination of Judaism. Christ's mediatorial functions are set forth more by way of presupposition than by explicit statement, and the whole weight is laid on the kingly and prophetic offices. The Messiahship of Jesus is assumed to such an extent that the title "Christ" has become part of the proper name, of the Lord Jesus (1: 1; 2: 1). Nothing definite is said of His function in salvation; it is God Himself who regenerates, but the medium of regeneration is the "word of truth," the implanted word (1: 18, 21), which
must refer to the word which Jesus had preached. This implies that Jesus as prophetetic teacher is the Mediator of salvation. Nothing is said of the death on the cross or its saving significance. The Ep. of Jude assumes the ordination of Christ, through whom God’s Saviourhood works, and whose mercy results in eternal life (vs 4.21.25).

(3) 1 Peter.—In 1 Pet we have the early apostolic teaching touched with Paulinism. The fact that salvation is mediated through the sufferings and death of Christ is now emphasized. "His mediatorial office has suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous (13.8). The suffering has significance both God-ward and man-ward. Relatively to God it is a sacrificial offering which opens up a way of access to Him; He suffered "that he might bring us to God" (13.18), and that through His representative priesthood the ideal "holy priesthood" of all God’s people might be realized, for it is through Jesus Christ that men’s "spiritual sacrifices" become "acceptable to God" (2.5). So the elect are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, i.e. brought into communion with God by His sacrifice (1.2). Relatively to man, it is a means of ransom or liberating man from the bondage of sin. "He himself offered himself without sin, pure and spotless (Heb 9.14)."

3. Epistles to Christ (1 Tim 2.5), and that of Paul in the only other passage where he uses the word, he applies it to Moses, in a sense which might seem to be inconsistent with the idea of Christ’s mediatorial office. This passage discusses the relation of law to promise. The law was “ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not . . . of one; but God is one” (Gal 3.19.20).

This passage has had to undergo about 300 different interpretations. There is no doubt that the “mediator” here is Christ (Orig., Augustine and most of the Fathers, Calvin) but whether Moses, or David, or God was a mediator, or a double mediator, is a matter of dispute. Modern exegesists agree that the reference is to Moses (of Lev 26 46, where LXX has “by the hand of Moses”; Philo calls Moses “mediator and reconciler.” De Vita. Moys. II.10), who, according to a rabbinical tradition, received the Law through the intermediation of angels (cf Acts 7 53; Heb 2 2). Nor is it likely that Paul meant the reader to realize the glory of the law and the solemnity of its ordination (Meyer). The present is the inferiority of the law to the evangelical promise to Abraham. Mediation implies at least two parties between whom it is carried on. The law was given by a double mediator, that of the angels and that of Moses, and was thus two removes from its Divine origin in relation to the promise God stood alone, i.e. set apart freely, unconditionally, independently, and for Himself alone; the promise is an agreement in principle between two, but the free gift of the one God (so Schleiermacher, Lightfoot, etc.). This is by no means a denial of the Divine origin of the law (Ritschl), for the mediation of angels and of Moses was Divinely authorized; but it does seem to make the method of mediation inferior to that of the direct communication of God’s gracious will to man. Paul is not, however, treating of the precise form of it in the abstract, but only of the form of it which implies a contract between two parties. Christ is not the Mediator in the same sense as Moses, for the free gift is from God; but of the forgiveness of sins which Christ mediates is by no means diminished by the fact of His mediation.

What, then, is Paul’s positive teaching on Christ’s Mediatorship?

1. The need of a Mediator arises out of the fact of sin. Sin interrupts the harmonious relation between God and man. It results in a state of mutual alienation. On the one hand, man is in a state of enmity to God (Rom 5 10; 5 7; Col 1.21). On the other hand, God is in no way righteously wrath in relation to the sinner (Rom 1 18; 5 9; Eph 5 6; Col 3.3). Hence the need of a mutual change of attitude, a removal of God’s displeasure against the sinner as well as of the sinner’s hostility to God. God stated: Christ has suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous (13.8). The suffering has significance both God-ward and man-ward. Relatively to God it is a sacrificial offering which opens up a way of access to Him; He suffered “that he might bring us to God” (13.18), and that through His representative priesthood the ideal “holy priesthood” of all God’s people might be realized, for it is through Jesus Christ that men’s “spiritual sacrifices” become “acceptable to God” (2.5). So the elect are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, i.e. brought into communion with God by His sacrifice (1.2). Relatively to man, it is a means of ransom or liberating man from the bondage of sin. "He himself offered himself without sin, pure and spotless (Heb 9.14)."

(b) His relation to God: Paul very frequently speaks of Christ as the “Son of God,” and that in a unique sense. Moreover, He was the “image of God” (2 Cor 4.4; Col 1.15) and subsisted originally “in the form of God” (Phil 2 6). He is set alongside with God over against idols (1 Cor 8 5.6), and is coordinated with God in the benefaction (2 Cor 13 14). Clearly Paul sets Him in the Divine sphere, a sphere which at the same time He is also a mediator to man. Yet he assigns Him a certain subordination, and even asserts that His medatorial kingship will come to an end, that God may be all in all (1 Cor 15 24.28). But this cessation of His function as Mediator of salvation, whereby His mediatorial sovereignty is by some means of reconciling and undertaking to accomplish it (2 Cor 5 19). Paul’s view of the death may be seen by considering some of his most characteristic expressions. (a) It is an act of reconciliation. This involves a change of attitude, not only in man, but in God, a relinquishing of the Divine wrath which for which there can be no restoration of peaceful relations (though this is disputed by many, e.g. Ritschl, Lightfoot, Westcott, Bessarablag), but not a change of nature or of intention, for the Divine wrath is only a mode of the eternal God’s treatment of the Father Himself who provides the means of reconciliation and undertakes to accomplish it (2 Cor 5 19); cf Col 1 20.21; Eph 2 16). It is an act of propitiation (Rom 3 25, ἰατρία, hilasterion, from ἰατάω, kula, “to ren-
der favorable” or “propositions”). Here there is a clear though tacit reference to a change of attitude on God’s part. He who was not formerly propitious to man was appeased through the death of Christ. Yet the propitiatory means are provided by God Himself, who takes the initiative in this sphere and renders Himself as the Mediator (Rom 3:21; Eph 1:7; Col 1:14; IV.4; 4:25; apodekthésis, from λυτρόν, “ransom”). It is not alone the fact of liberation (Westcott, Ritschel), but also the cost of liberation that is referred to. Hence Christians are said to be redeemed, “bought with a price” (Gal 3:13; 4:5; 1 Cor 6:20; 7:23; cf. 1 Pet 1:18 f.) yet the metaphor cannot be pressed to yield an answer to the question to whom the ransom was paid. All that can safely be said is that it expresses the tremendous cost of our salvation, viz., the self-surrendered life (“the blood”) of Christ. (d) Strong subordinatory language is sometimes used, notably in Gal 3:13 (“having become a curse for us”) and in 2 Cor 5:21 (“Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf”). But the sinless substitute is regarded as actually bearing the guilt of our sin (that would be a moral contradiction). His death was not penal substitution, but a substitute for penalty. It had the value to God of the punishment of sinners, in virtue of His oneness with the race. It was the recognition from within humanity of the sinfulness of sin, and expressed the Divine righteousness as fully as penalty would have done. The secret seems to be Christ’s sympathetic love by which He identified Himself with man’s sin and doom of death (Gal 4:4). The dynamics of His death and the exalted condition of which He is the Author were combined within the sphere of humanity, becoming atoning mediation in the Levitical ritual, which would be less congenial to His mind than the prophetic conception of the Suffering Servant. Yet He does seem to regard the death of Christ as the culmination of all that the sacrifices of the OT had imperfectly realized. Secondly, the subjective aspect of Christ’s work is emphasized quite as much as His objective. The dynamic work of atonement and self-surrendered by faith, becomes to the believer the principle of ethical transformation, so that he may become worthy of the Divine favor which He now enjoys. As a result of his subjective identification with Christ through faith, the objective state of privilege is changed into actual liberation from sin (Gal 2:20; 6:14; Rom 6:6; Col 3:3).

(4) The resurrection and exaltation of Christ are essential to His mediatorial work (1 Cor 15:17). It is not alone that the resurrection “proves that the death of Christ was not the death of a sinner, but the vicarious death of the sinless Mediator of salvation” (B. Weiss, in 436), but that salvation cannot be realized except through communion with the living, glorified Christ, without which the subjective identity of the believer with Christ by which redemption is personally appropriated would not be possible (Gal 2:20; Rom 6:4; Phil 3:10; Col 3:1). The exaltation also makes possible His continuous heavenly intercession on our behalf (Rom 8:34), which is the climax of His mediatorial activities.

(5) The cosmic aspect of Christ’s mediatorial—

In his later epistle (esp. Col and Eph), Paul lays stress on Christ’s mediatorial activity in creation and providence, through the gifts of the Spirit, which are found in the earlier epistles (1 Cor 6:6). He is resisting a kind of nascent gnostic dualism, according to which God could communicate with the world only through a hierarchy of intermediate powers. Against this he proclaims Christ as the one and only Mediator between God and the universe, having, on the one hand, a unique relation to God (“the image of the invisible God,” Col 1:15; in whom the fulness of God dwells; 1:19; 2:9), and, on the other hand, a unique relation to the world, who is invested with all God’s creative and redemptive activity, and, as such, is called “the Mediator” (1:18). Christ’s mediatorial activity also finds expression in the dualism, which Paul late reformed the break in the historical foundation of the universe (Col 1:20; Eph 1:10).

The main thesis of He is the absoluteness and finality of the gospel and its superiority over Judaism. The finality of Christianity depends on the fact that it has a perfect Mediator, who is the substance of the which the various Jewish forms of Hebrews mediation were types and shadows. He illustrates this by a series of contrasts between Christ and the mediators of the old system (by the application of principles and exegetical methods which reveal the influence of the author’s Jewish education and of Hellenistic thought).

(1) Christ is superior to the prophets as Mediator of revelation. The OT revelation was fragmentary and multifloral, while new God speaks, not through many agents, but through Christ and that one as Son. As Son He is the perfectly adequate expression of the Father. The author takes us at once to the high transcendental sphere of Christ’s relations to God and to the universe, in virtue of which He is God’s Mediator in creation, redemption, revelation, and redemption, (1-3). (2) He is superior to the angels, through whose mediation the law was given (1-14). (3) He is superior to Moses, the human agent in the giving of the law (3:6). (4) He is greater than Aaron, the high priest, the people’s representative before God. This leads to the central doctrine of the ep., the high-priesthood of Jesus. The following are the salient points in the elaborate treatment of this subject:

(1) Christ’s first, being by nature, high-priesthood is twofold: (a) His participation in all human experience (except sin), which guarantees His power of sympathy. Every high priest, as men’s representative before God, must be “taken from among men” (5:1). In the author’s view, the high priest lays great stress on the human nature and experiences of Christ (cf. 2.10.17; 4:15; 5:7). (b) His Divine appointment. Every priest must have a call from God. So Christ has been appointed priest, not indeed in the Aaronic line, but after the order of Melchizedek (5:1-10).

(2) The nature of His priesthood, its superiority to the Levitical priesthood.—The priests of the OT themselves needed atonement, for they were not sinless: Christ is holy, guileless, undefiled, and need not make atonement for His own sins. They were priests only for a time, and were many in number, for they were mortal; but He abideth forever, and His priesthood is eternal. They were dependent on the law of physical descent: He was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, whose priesthood did not depend on genealogy or pedigree, but who combined the functions of king with those of priest. In a word, their order was transient, temporary, shadowy; His belonged to the world of unchanging reality (ch.7).

(3) The realization of His high-priesthood.—A high priest implies a sacrifice; hence Christ must “have somewhat to offer” (8:3). In the Levitical system, the priest and the sacrifice are distinct from
each other. But Christ offered not an external gift, but Himself. Much stress is laid on Christ's voluntary obedience (6:8; 10:7), progressively attained through suffering, and culminating in the abject sacrifice of His life (10:18). His sacrifice harmonizes with the principle that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (9:22), although the principle is lifted from the physical to the spiritual realm. In working this out, the author makes use of analogies drawn from three parts of the Levitical ritual. (c) Christ's death was a sin offering. He has offered one final sacrifice for sins (10:12.18). As priest, he has made propitiation for the sins of the people" (2:17). He was "given for sinners, for all offered to bear the sins of many" (9:28). (b) The Sinaitic covenant (Ex 24:8) is made use of. Christ is "the mediator of a new [better] covenant" (8:6; 9:15; 12:24), i.e. the agent interposing between God and man in the establishment of a new relationship analogous to Moses in the old covenant. Even the first covenant was dedicated with blood, and so the blood of the Son of God was "the blood of the covenant" (10:29; cf Mk 14:24). On the directions in the word of the work of the covenant ("testament"), the author bases a twofold argument for the necessity of Christ's death (9:15f). (c) The ritual of the Day of Atonement furnishes another analogy. As the high priest once a year offered the victim most holy, so Christ has entered once for all the true spiritual sanctuary in heaven, and there He presents Himself to God as the Mediator able to make intercession for us with the Father (9:12.24-26; cf 7:25). He is the ministering priest in the true tabernacle, the immediate presence of God (6:2). Thus the ascension and session make possible the culminating of the mediatorial work of Christ in the eternal sacrifice and intercession within the veil. (4) The man-world efficacy of His mediatorialship.—The effect of Christ's death on man is described by the words "cleanse," "sanctify," "perfect" (9:14; 10:10.14.29; 13:12), words which have a ritualistic quite as much as an ethical sense, meaning the removal of the sense of guilt, dedication to God, and the securing of the privilege of full fellowship with Him. The ultimate blessing that comes to man through the work of Christ is the privilege of free, unrestricted access to God by the removal of the obstacle of guilt (4:16; 10:19f). (3) E. A. H. Gospel.—Aspects of Our Lord's teaching unassimilated by the other disciples, and therefore but meagerly touched on in the Synoptics, find prominence in the Johannine Epistles. Great emphasis is laid on the idea of salvation by revelation mediated through Jesus Christ. The historical revelation of God in the person and teaching of Jesus is the main subject of the Gospel. But in the Prologue we have the eternal background of the historical manifestation in the doctrine of the Logos, who, as Son in eternal fellowship with the Father, His mediator in creation, and the immanent principle of revelation in the world, is fitted to become God's Revealer in history (vs 11-18). His work on earth is to dispense light and life, knowledge of God and salvation. Through Him God gives to the world eternal life (3:16). He is the Water of Life (4:14; 7:57), the Bread of Life (6:48 ff), the Light of the World (8:12); it is by His light that salvation is mediated to men (6:52 f). He is the perfect revealer of God, hence the only means of access to the Father (14:6.9). It is on salvation by illumination and communion, rather than on salvation by reconciliation and atonement that chief stress is laid. Sacrifical or propitiatory language is not used of Christ's death. Yet emphasis is laid on the voluntary and vicarious character of His death. He lays down His life of Himself (16:18); "The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep" (10:11); "For the joy set before Him He endured the cross" (1:11). Christ's death was the supreme example of the law that self-sacrifice is necessary to the highest and most fruitful life (2:23 ff). In ch 17 we have a unique instance of Our Lord's intercessory prayer with the Father.

(2) The epistles.—In 1 Jn we find more explicit statements with regard to the connection between the death of Christ and sin. "The blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin (1:7): "He was manifested to take away sins" (3:5); "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father," i.e. a pleader who will mediate with God on our behalf, the ground of His intercessory efficacy being that He is the "propitiation for our sins" (2:2; 4:10, a term which links the Johannine doctrine to that of Paul, though 1 Jn represents Christ Himself, and not merely His death on the cross, as the propitiation). This latter term shows that an objective value is attached to the atonement, as in some way neutralizing or making amends with God, yet in such a way as not to contradict the principles of righteousness (cf "Jesus Christ the righteous," 2:1).

(3) The Apocalypse presents both aspects of Christ's mediatorialship, the first aspect associated with God in the government of the world and in judgment (3:21; 7:10; 16:1), holds the keys of death and Hades (1:18), is the Lord of lords and King of kings (17:14; 19:16), and is the Mediator of creation (21:14). On the other hand, by His sacrificial act He represents men before God. The most characteristic expression of this is the title "the Lamb" (29:4). By His blood the guilty are cleansed and made saints, purchased unto God (15:3; 7:14). The lamb is the symbol of the sacrificial love which is the heart of God's sovereignty (6:6). It is not clear whether the allusion in this title is to the paschal lamb or the Suffering Servant pictured as a lamb led to the slaughter (Isa 53:7), or to both. In any case it contains the idea of Christ's redemptive sacrifice, which is declared to be an essential part of God's eternal counsel (13:8, "the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world").

Conclusion.—Our inquiry will have shown how central and prominent is the idea of mediation throughout the Scriptures. We might even say it supplies the key to the unity of the Bible. In the OT the principle is given "in divers portions and in divers manners," but in the NT it converges in the doctrine of the person and work of the One final Mediator, the Son of God. Amid all the rich diversity of the various parts of the NT, there is one fundamental conception common to all, that of Christ as at once the Interpreter of God to men and the door of access for men to God. Especially is Christ's self-sacrifice presented as the effective cause of our salvation, as a means of removing the guilt and sin which stand as a barrier in the way of God's purpose concerning man and of man's fellowship with God. There is a tendency in some influential writers of today to speak disparagingly of the doctrine of the one Mediator, on the ground that it injures the direct relationship of man with God (e.g. R. Eucken, Truth of Religion, 583 ff). Here we can only inwardly sympathize. The whole idea of mediation is attested in universal Christian experience, and that, so far from standing in the way of our personal approach to God, it is a simple historical fact that apart from the work of Jesus we would not enjoy that free access to Him which is now our privilege.
MEDITATION, med-i-ta'shun (ἡμνία, ἑαυτῇ, ἐν τῷ καλῷ, σῶθα): “Meditation” is the tr of ἡμνία, from ἑαυτῇ, “to murmur,” “to have a low tone,” hence “to meditate!” (Ps 49 3); of ὕψιγκ, “sighing,” “moaning” (Ps 5 1; see ver 2); of ἐγγίζον, “the murmur” or dull sound of the harp, hence meditation (Ps 19 14, “Let . . . . the . . . . of my heart be acceptable unto thee”); of Προφήτης, “prophecy,” (Prov 10 34, “Let my meditation be sweet unto him!”); of σῶθα, a “bowing down,” “musing” (Ps 119 97,99; 2 Esd 10 5).

In the NT we have “to meditate” (Eccles 14 20, “Blessed is the man that shall meditate in wisdom,” RVm “most authorities read come to an end” [teleutōsai]; 39 1, “meditation” in the text of the A.V. and R.Vm, though there is lack of meditation is a great want in our modern religious life.

In the NT, we have “to meditate” (ποιηματικά, πρακτικά, “to take care beforehand”), Lk 21 14, and “meditate” (ποιηματικά, μεταλάβα, “to take care beforehand”); Acts 28 30; RV, “the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia” (Acts 28 30) is better rendered “the sea which is off Cilicia and Pamphylia” (RV).

In the NT, references to the Mediterranean are common, esp. in the accounts of Paul’s voyages, for which see Paul, Jesus once (Mk 7 24 sq) came to or near the sea.

The Mediterranean basin was the scene of most ancient civilizations which have greatly influenced that of the western world, excepting those whose home was in the western world, the river, the Tigris and the Euphrates; and even these, their civilization, has been blended into it, so far as they could. As its name implies, it is an inland sea, united to the Atlantic only by the narrow Straits of Gibraltar.

In comparatively recent geological time it was also joined to the Red Sea, the alluvial deposits of the Nile, which have extended the line of the Delta, having with the aid of drifting desert sands subsequently closed the passage and joined the coasts of Asia and Africa. The total length of the Mediterranean is about 2,290 miles, its greatest breadth, about 1,080 miles, and its area about 1,000,000 sq. miles. It falls naturally into the western and eastern (Levant) halves, dividing at the line running from Tunisia to Sicily, where it is comparatively shallow; the western end is generally the deeper, reaching depths of nearly 6,000 ft.

On the N. it is intersected by the Italian and Balkan peninsulas, forming the Gulf of Lyons, the Adriatic and the Aegean.

The temperature of the Mediterranean is in summer warmer, in winter about the same as that of
Atlantic. Its water has a slightly greater specific gravity, probably because of a larger proportionate evaporation.

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL

MEEDA, mē-ē-dā. See MEEDA.

MEEDA, mē-ēd-a (Mešēd, Meżadd, but Swete, Δεδων, Dadd, following B; AV Meeda): The head of one of the families of Nethinim (temple slaves) who went up with Zerubbabel from the captivity (1 Esd 5:32); identical with "Meida" of Ezr 2:52 and Neh 7:54.

MEEKNESS, mēk'nes (תָּנָדָד, ταπαίτις, πραοτις, πραοτίς, πραοτίτις, πραοτίτις; "Meekness" in the OT (תנדה, התנדה) is from תן, "suffering," "oppressed") "afflicted," denoting the spirit produced under such experiences. The word is sometimes translated "poor" (Job 24:4, RVm "meek"; Am 5:4). "Humble" (Pr 9:12-18, RV "meek"); "lowly" (Pr 3:34; 16:19, RV "poor", "m"meek"). It is generally associated with some form of oppression. The "meek" were the special objects of the Divine regard and to them special blessings are promised (Pr 3:34; etc.). The meek shall eat and be satisfied; 25:9, "The meek will be in due justice; and the meek will teach his way"; 37:11, "The meek shall inherit the land"; 147:6, "Jeh up-holdeth the meek"; 149:4, "He will beautify the meek"; 31:18, "Victory"; of Isa 11:4; 29:19; 61:1, "Jehovah hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek," RVm "poor"; Zeph 2:3; Ps 45:4, "because of [RVm "in behalf of"] truth and meekness and righteousness". Of Moses it is said that he was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth, notwithstanding the Divine revelations given him, and in the face of opposition (Nu 12:3; cf. 2 Cor 12:1-6). Meekness is ascribed even to Jeh himself (2 Sm 22:36, "Thy gentleness [תנדה] hath made me great"); cf Ps 18:36 (תנדה), RVm "condescension"; men are exhorted to seek it (Zeph 2:3, "Seek righteousness, seek meekness"); cf Prov 16:1; 16:14; 25:15; Eccl 4:10.

In the Apoc. also "meekness" holds a high place (Rev 1:27). The fear of the Lord is wisdom and instruction; faith and meekness are his delight. RV in "in the fear of God", "in faith", "in meekness", "in righteousness" (cf Ps 119:12; Prov 2:10; 3:4; 8:34). "The meek shall inherit the earth" (Mat 5:5; Ps 37:11; 39:7) - "meekness is the power of the Spirit" (Gal 5:23).

The conception of meekness, as it had been defined by Aristotle, was raised by Christianity to a much higher level, and associated with the commonly despised quality of humility (see s.v.). It was the spirit of the Saviour Himself (Mt 11:29), "I am meek [προδός] and lowly in heart" (cf 2 Cor 10:1, "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ"); it presupposes humility, flows from it, and finds expression in moderation (see s.v.). (See Trench, Syn. of N. T., 145; Wh., N. T. Lexicon, s.v.). Christians are exhorted to cherish it and show it in their relations to one another (Eph 4:2; Col 3:12; 1 Tim 6:11; Tit 3:2, "showing all meekness toward all men"); it ought to characterize Christian teachers or those in authority in "instructing [RVm "comforting""] them that oppose themselves" (2 Tim 2:25); the saving, "implanted" (RVm "inborn") word is to be received with "meekness" (Jas 1:21); a man is to "show by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom" (3:13) and to give reason for the hope that is in him, "with meekness and fear" (1 Pet 3:15).

The interchangeableness of "meek" with "poor," etc., in the OT ought to be specially noted. Our Lord's opening of His ministry at Nazareth (Lk 4:18), "He anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor", and His message to John (Mt 11:5), "The poor have good tidings preached to them", are in harmony therewith.

W. L. WALKER

MEET, mēt, adj. (יוֹעֵשׁ, yō'ēsh; ἀγωγὸς, ἀγωγός): Various words are employed to express meekness, the sense of which is proper, worthy, or fit. We "have yō'ēsh, "straight," "in straightness" (2 Kgs 10:3, "meetest"); Jer 26:14, RV "right"); yōshar (Jer 37:5, RV "right!"); yōsher (Prov 11:24, RV "what is justly due"); "arōk, Aram. "meet" (Ezr 4:14); bōn, "sons of" (Dt 3:19, AV "meet for the war"); "Heb sons of power", "sons of men", "sons of the kōn, to be righted," etc (Ex 8:26); "āshā, "to be made," "used" (Ezk 15:5 bis, RVm "made into"); gālēh, "to be good or fit for" (Ezk 14:4, RV "probable"); "rā̂āh, "seen," "looked out, "chosen" (Est 2:9); azios, "worthy" (Mt 3:8; Acts 26:20, RV "worthy"); 1 Cor 16:4, 2 Thess 1:3, dikaios, "just," "right" (Phil 1:7, RV "right"); 2 Pet 1:18, RV "right"); "euthetos, "well set" (He 6:7); "euchrēstos, "very useful," "profitable" (2 Tim 2:21, "meet for the master's use"); "bdaros, "sufficient" (1 Cor 15:9); kibanādō, "to make sufficient" (Col 1:12); kalos, "beautiful," "honourable" (Mt 16:28, Mk 7:27); etc, "it be-ho(v)eth" (Lk 15:32; Rom 1:27, RV "due"). "For meet (supplied) (Rom 10:4, RV has "for surely it is meet to be said unto God") (Job 34:31), "For hath any said unto God?" In 2 Mac 9:12, we have dikaios, RV "right".

W. L. WALKER

MEGIDDOD, mē-gid'dōs, MEGIDDO, mē-gid'dōn (מֶגָּדָד, "poet-hiđđon; MayešeĐ, Megiddô, Mageđ̓ Donna, Meǵada, Magadí): A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (Josh 12:21). It lay within the territory of Issachar, but was one of the cities assigned to Manasseh (Josh 17:11; 1 Ch 7:29). Manasseh, however, was not able to expel the Canaanites, who therefore continued to dwell in that land. Later, when the children of Israel were waxen strong, the Canaanites were put to taskwork (Josh 17:12; Jgs 1:27f.). The host of Sisera was drawn to the river Kishon, and here, "by the waters of Megiddo," the famous battle was fought (Jud 5). By the time of Solomon, Israel's supremacy was unquestioned. Megiddo was included in one of his administrative districts (2 Ch 9:26). It was one of the cities which he fortified (9:15). Ahaziah, mortally wounded at the ascent of Gur, fled to Megiddo to die (2 Kgs 27). At Megiddo, Josiah, king of Judah, attempted to arrest Pharaoh-neecho and his army on their march to the north against the king of Assyria. Here the Egyptian monarch "slew him . . . when he had seen him," and from Megiddo went the sorrowful procession to Jerus with Josiah's corpse (2 Kgs 23:29f.; 2 Ch 35:20f.). The sad tale is told again in 1 Esd 1:25ff. The "mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo" became a poetical expression for the deepest and most despairing grief (Zec 12:11). See also ARMAGEDDON.

The association of the city of Megiddo with Taanach (Tell Ta'anek) points to a position on the south edge of the plain of Esdraelon. In confirmation of this, we read (RP, 1st series, II, 35-47) that Thothmes III captured Megiddo, after having defeated the Palestinian allies who opposed him. He left his camp at Aruna the morning of the battle, after following a defile (possibly Wady 'Arakah), he approached Megiddo from the S. We should thus look for the city where the pass opens on the plain; and here, at Khân el-Leihûn, we find extensive ruins on both sides of a stream where the defile fell before falling into the Kishon. We may identify the site with Megiddo, and the stream with the
wheels of Megiddo." Pharaoh-necoh would naturally take the same line of march, and his advance could be nowhere more hopefully opposed than at el-Lejjûn. Tell el-Mutasellim, a graceful mound hard by, on the edge of the plain, may have formed the acropolis of Megiddo.

The name *Muṣūdādha* attaches to a site 3 miles S. of Betsiâd, the Jordan valley. Here Conder would place Megiddo. But while there is a resemblance in the name, the site really suits none of the Bib. data. The phrase "Ta'anach by the waters of Megiddo" alone confines us to a very limited area. No position has yet been suggested which meets all the conditions as well as el-Lejjûn.

The Khan here shows that the road through the pass from E德拉l to the plain of Sharon and the coast was still much frequented in the Middle Ages.

**MEHETABEL, mē-hē'ta-bel, MEHETABEL, mē-hē'ta-bel (מֵיהֵתָבֵל, mēhē'tābē'l, "whom God makes happy")**

(1) Daughter of Matred, wife of Hadad or Hadar, the 5th and apparently last of the kings of Edom (Gen 36 39; 1 Ch 1 50).

(2) Grandfather of that Shemaiah who played a treacherous part against Nehemiah at the suggestion of Tobiah and Sanballat, by trying to persuade Nehemiah to commit sacrilege (Neh 6 10–13).

**MEHIDA, mē-hī'da (מֵיהִדה, mēhī'dā), "re-nowned"; "Medea" [1 Esd 5 32]): Ancestor and patronymic of a family of Nethinim who came back from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 52; Neh 7 54).

**MEHIR, mē-hīr (מְהִיר, mēhīr, "price," "hire"): A descendant of Judah, son of Heluk, nephew of Shuaah (1 Ch 4 11). Perug, a Chaldean name of equivalent meaning, is given for this person in the Tg of R. Joseph.

**MEHOLATHITE, mē-hōlā-thite (מֵיהוֹלָטִית, mēhōlā'tīt): The gentle designation of Adriel, the son of Barzillai, who married Merab, the daughter of King Saul (1 S 18 19; 2 S 21 5), the name Michael in 2 S 21 5 being doubtless a copyist's error. See ABEIL-MEHOLAH.

**MEHUJAJEL, mē-hūjā'-el (מֶהוּיָגֵל, mēhūyā'ēl, mēhūjā'ēl, "emitter of God"): A descendant of Cain through Enoch and Jared (Gen 4 18). The list in Gen 5 12 ff is a working-over of the same material of genealogy by another hand at a different date of spelling (cf. spelling of Chaucer and that of today). In that case, Mehuelad was to be the correspondent name to Mehujael (see Expos T, X, 353).

**MEHUMAN, mē-hū'man (מֶהוּמָן, mēhu'mān) [Est 1 10]): A eunuch of Ahasuerus, the first of the seven chamberlains.

**MEHUMANIM, mē-hū'mīm (מֶהוּמִים, mēhu'mīm). See MEHUMAN.

**ME-JARKON, mē-jär'kon (מֶה-יָרָקון, mē ha-yärā'kon; בֵּלָאָסָא בְּרָקָן, belāsā bərākān; Hīsākān: The Heb may mean "yellow water." The phrase is lit. "the waters of Jarkon." LXX reads "and from the river Jarkon and the boundary near Joppa." From this possibility we should infer a place called Jarkon in the lot of Dan; but no name resembling this has been found. The text (Josh 19 46) is corrupt.

**MEKONAH, mē-kō'nā (מֶהֽוּקְוָן, mēkō'ônāh). See MEKONAH.

**MELATIAH, mē-lat'ia (מֶהֽוּלִּיתָא, mēlat'ēa, "Jeh's deliverance"): A Gibeonite who assisted in building the wall of Jerus under Nehemiah (Neh 3 7).

**MELCHI, mēl'ki (Tisch. Treg., WH, MALK, Melchi; T R, MALK, Melchi): The name of two ancestors of Jesus according to Lk's genealogy, one being in the 4th generation before Joseph, the husband of Mary, the other being in the 3rd generation before Zerubbabel (Lk 3 24 25).

**MELCHIAH, mēl'-ki'a (מֶהֽוּלִּיה, mēlē'ēa, "Jeh's king"): A priest and father of Pashur (Jer 21 1 AV); elsewhere and in RV called MALCHIÁH and MALCHIÁH (q.v.).

**MELCHIAS, mēl'-ki-as (B, MALKÁS, Melchetas, BPA, -as, -as): Name of three men who had taken "strange wives":

(1) 1 Esd 9 26 = "Malchijah" (Ezr 10 25).

(2) 1 Esd 9 32 = "Malchijah" (Ezr 10 31).

(3) One of those who stood at Ezra's left hand when the law was read (1 Esd 9 44) = "Malchijah" (Neh 8 4), possibly identical with (1) or (2).

**MELCHIEL, mēl'-ki-ēl (MALKÁH Melchétēl, B, MALKÁH, Melchietēl: The father of Charamis, one of the governors of Bethulia (Jth 6 15). Other readings are סֶלֶם, Sollem, and סְכָרִי, Mochiasl.

**MELCHISHUA, mēl'-ki-shō'ā (מֶהֽוּלִּישְׁוָע, mēlē'ēshō'āh, "king's help"). See MELCHISHUA.

**MELCHIZEDEK, mēl'-zi-dē'ēk, and (AV in He) MELCHISEDEC (מֶהֽוּלִּיזֵדֵק, malkit-sedēk, "Čedek, or Cidikh is my king" [Gen 14 18 ff; Ps 110 4]; MALKIZĐÈK, Melchisedek [He 5 6 10; 6 20; 7 1 10 11 15 17]): The name is explained in He 7 2 as "king of righteousness," with -ē as the old genitive ending; but the correct explanation is no doubt the one given above; of Adoni-zedek in Jos 10 1, where LXX with Jgs 1 5 7 has Adoni-bezek. M. was king of Salem (= Jesus) and a priest unto 'El Elyön (Gen 14 18). He brought bread and wine to Abraham after the latter's victory over the kings, and also bestowed upon him the blessing of 'El Elyön. Abraham gave him "a tenth of all," i.e. of the booty probably, unless it be of all his possessions. Gen 14 22 identifies Jeh with 'El Elyön, the title of the Deity as worshipped at Jerus; and so He 7 1 ff, following LXX of Gen 14 18 ff, calls M. "priest of God Most High," i.e. Jeh.

Skinner (Gen 271, where JTS, XVI, vi, 2, and Asm M § 1 are cited) points out that the Masoretes called "high priests of God most high." Hence some hold that the story of M. is an invention of Judæans, but Gunkel (Gen 285 ff) maintains that he is a traditional, if not a historical, character.

Ps 110 4 makes the king-priest who is addressed there a virtual successor of M., and the kings of Jerus might well, as Gunkel suggests, have been considered successors of M. in the same way that Charlemagne was regarded as the successor of the Caesars, and the latter as successors of the Pharaohs in Egypt. This leads naturally to an early date being ascribed to Ps 110.

The thought of a priest after the order of M. is taken up by the author of He. He wanted to prove the claim of Christ to be called priest. It was impossible, even had he so wished it, for the latter Jesus as an Aaronic priest, for He was descended from the tribe of Judah and not from that of Levi (7 14). The words of Ps 110 4 are taken to refer to Him
(5 ff.), and in 7 ff. the order of M. is held to be higher than that of Aaron, for the superiority of M. was acknowledged by Abraham (a) when he pried tithes to M. and (b) when he was blessed by M. for "the less is blessed of the better." It might be added that Jesus can be considered a priest after the order of M. in virtue of His descent from David, if the latter be regarded as successor to M. But the author of H. does not explicitly say this. Further, Aaron is only a "type" brought forward in H. to show the more excellent glory of the work of Jesus, whereas M. is "made like unto the Son of God" (7), and Jesus is said to be "after the like manner in Melchizedek" (7:15).

He 7:1 ff. presents difficulties. Where did the author get the material for this description of M.? (1) M. is said to be "without father, without mother, [i.e.] without genealogy"; and (2) he is described as "having neither beginning of days nor end of life"; he "abides a priest continually." The answer is perhaps to be had among the Am. T. and M., among which are at least 6, probably 8, letters from a king of Urusalm to Amenophis IV, king of Egypt, whose "slave" the former calls himself. Urusalm is to be identified with Jerusa, and the letters belong to c 1400 BC. The name of this king is given as Abd-Khiba (or Abd-hiba), though Hommel, quoted by G. A. Smith, Jerus., II, 14, n. 7, reads Arad-Chiba. Zimmer, in Z. A., 1891, 246, says that it should be read Abdihta, and so Sayce (HDB, III, 336b) calls him 'Ebedhó tōb.' The king tells his Egypt overlord, "Neither my father nor my mother set me in this place: the mighty arm of the king (or, according to Sayce, "the arm of the mighty king") established me in my father's house" (Letter 102 in Berlin collection, II, 9–13; also no. 103, II, 25–28; no. 104, II, 13–15; see, further, H. Winckler, Die Thonafelien von Tell-el-Amarra; Knudtzon, Bei träge zur Assyriologie, IV, 101 ff., 279 f., cited by G. A. Smith, Jerus., II, 8, n. 1.)

It thus becomes clear that possibly tradition identified M. with Abd-Khiba. At any rate the idea that M. was "without father, without mother, [i.e.] without genealogy" can easily be explained if the words of Abd-Khiba concerning himself can have been also attributed to M. The words meant originally that he acknowledged that he did not come to the throne because he had a claim on it through descent; he owed it to appointment. But Jewish interpretation explained them as indicating that he had no father or mother. Ps 100:4 has spoken of the king there as being "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," and this seems to have been taken to involve the perpetuity of M. as also priest. M. was then thought of as "having neither beginning of days" = "without father, without mother, without genealogy," and again as not having "end of life" = "abides a priest continually." Hence he is "made like unto the son of God," having both beginning of days and end of life. We get another NT example of Jewish interpretation in Gal 4:21 ff. We have no actual proof that M. is identical with Abd-Khiba; possibly the reference to the former as being "without father," etc., is not to be explained as above. But why should M. be left alone, and be after all of the OT characters be thought of in this way of? Westcott, He, 199, has a suggestive thought about M.: "The lessons of his appearance lie in the appearance itself. Abraham marks a new departure, but before the fresh order is established we have a vision of the old in its superior majesty; and this, on the eve of disappearance, may be blessing to the new." On the references to M. in Philo see Westcott, op. cit., 201; F. Renoult, Thes. Ap., 58 ff.; and esp. (with the passages and authorities cited there) G. Milligan, Theology of Ep. to the He, 208 ff.

The conclusions we come to are: (1) There was a tradition in Jerus. of M., a king in pre-Israelite times, who was also priest to 'El Elyon. This is the origin of Gen 14:18 ff., where 'El Elyon is identified with Jeh. (2) Ps 110 of this tradition and the Psalmist's king is regarded as M.'s successor. (3) The Ep. to the He makes use of (a) Ps 110, which is taken to be a prophecy of Christ, (b) of Gen 14 18 ff., and (c) of oral tradition which was not for long that tradition that is possibly explained by the Am. T. See, further, arts. by Sayce, Driver, and Hommel in Ezopos, T. VII, 9; see also Jerusalem.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS MELEA, mēl’ē-a, mel’ē-a (Melchizedek): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk's genealogy (Lk 3:31).

MELECH, mēl’ēk (mēlēk, "king"): Great-grandson of Jonathan, son of Saul, grandson of Mephibosheth or Meribaal (1 Ch 8:35; 9:41).

MELICU, mēl’ē-kū (mēlē-kă̂, also mēl’ē-kă̂, "regnant"): Same as MALLUCI (q.v.).

MELITA, mēl’ē-ta (Máltē, Melité, Acts 28:1): Is now generally identified with Malta. The former error in attributing the references to the geography of Melita on the E. coast of the Adriatic Sea was due to the ancient practice of employing the term Adria to include the Ionian and Sicilian seas. Malta is the largest of a group of islands including Gozo and the isleta Comino, Cominotto and Filfla, lying about 56 miles from the southern extremity of Sicily, 174 from the mainland of Italy, and 187 from the African coast. Malta itself is 17½ miles long and 9½ broad, and contains an area of 58 sq. miles. Its modern capital is Valetta, situated in 35°54′ N. lat. and 14°31′ E. long. The central position of Malta in the Mediterranean Sea gave it great importance as a naval station. It was probably at first a Phoenician colony, and later passed under the influence, if not domination, of the Sicilian Greeks. But the Romans captured it from the Carthaginians in 218 BC (Livy xxi.51) and attached it definitely to the province of Sicily. Under Rom rule the inhabitants were famous for their industry, esp. in the production of textile fabrics, probably of native creation. The celebrated vestis melitensis was a fine and soft material for clothes and for the covering of couches (Cicerò Ver. ii.72.176; ii.74.183; iv.46.103; Dio dorus v.12.22). At the time when Paul visited the island it would seem that the administration was intrusted to a deputy of the propraetor of Sicily, who is referred to as prōtōs Melitaitōn (Acts 28:7; CIG, 5784), or Melitænum prīnum omnium (CIL, x, 7485) (see Puhllus). A bay 2½ miles N.W. of Valetta, the mouth of which is held by tradition to be the place where the vessel that bore Paul ran ashore, tallies admirably with the description of the locality in Acts. The Admiralty charts indicate places near the west side of the entrance to the bay, where the depth is first 20 ft. and then 15 ft., while the rush of the breakers in front of the little island of Salmoneta and behind it suit the reference to a place "where two seas meet" (Acts 27:41). The inlet is called the Bay of St. Paul. The topographical question has been exhaustively treated by Ramsay in St. Paul's Traveller.

GEORGE H. ALLEN MELODY, mel’ō-di: μελόδι, zvárdh, a musical piece or song to be accompanied by an instrument (Isa 51:9); an instrument of praise (Am 5:25); nuḡan, “to play on any musical instrument” "Make sweet melody, sing many songs" (Jsa 23:16); ἔλαυνα, psalṭī, to celebrate the praises of God with music (Eph 5:19). See Music.
MEMBERS, mem'ber ([1] ⲳⲧⲓ, χώρας; μέλος, ρίζας; [2] ⲳⲧⲓ, ⲧⲧⲧⲃⲧⲧⲧⲧ, "membrum virile" [Dt 23:1]): The first Hebrew word is derived from a root meaning "to knead," "to mold in clay," "to create." It therefore denotes any feature or part of the body. So the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things (Jas 3:5). "The members" is equivalent with "the body" (which see; cf Ps 139:16 AV). The members are not self-governing, but execute the orders of the mind, obeying either the lower nature in the commission of sin or iniquity, unrighteousness and uncleanness (Rom 13:19), or following the higher nature, the Divine impulses in the fulfilling of the law of Christ (6:19).

By nature, the "law in my members" (Rom 7:23) is opposed to the better nature (Jas 4:1) until by "re-generation" (which see) this condition is changed, when the Spirit of Christ becomes the governing power, using all our abilities, i.e., all our members, in the execution of His plans. This is not done while we remain passive, but we have actively to yield or yield ourselves to our members to His service (Rom 6:19). Therefore our bodies must not be desecrated by baser uses (1 Cor 6:19). The Lord Jesus illustrates the severe discipline which is needed to subdue the members of every Christian to perform the mission under the higher law of the Spirit by the goodness and mercy of the right eye, which is to be plucked out, and the right hand, which is to be cut off (Mt 5:29-30), and St. Paul speaks of putting off to death (AV "mortifying") the "members which are upon the earth" (Col 3:5).

It is the difference in character and gifts of individual Christians which leads St. Paul to speak of the variety of members, which, though of manifold functions, are equally important to the completeness of the body. It is thus in the manifold variety of the body of Christ (1 Cor 12:12-27; Eph 4:16). In Christ there are members of Christ, who is the head (Eph 1:22; 4:15; 5:23), who are members one of another (Rom 12:5; Eph 4:25).

In Dt 23:1 the Israelite law against emasculation is referred to, and a religious disability is stated for the circumcision of the male in Semitic and other neighbors of Israel often castrated for religious purposes in the temple service of various divinities and for functions in princely palaces and harems. Heathen monarchs almost invariably had large numbers of these unfortunate, who frequently attained to positions of high power and responsibility. Herodotus states their frequent occurrence in the Persians (Hist. vi.52), and in the history of 2 K 20:18 and Dn 3:3. It appears as impossible that Daniel and his friends belonged to this class. In later years, their presence is certain in Israel (1 S 3:13; RVv; Jer 38:7; Mt 19:12). See also CONCISSION; EXONIUM.

H. L. E. LEUING

MEMORIAL, mem'o-ral, MEMORY, mem'or-i- (anoia, 'azkār; αἰμη, 'azkār; אذكر, א'זאקר, אזקר; 'azkār, אזקר, "memoro", making, "memor", "mem'or-y", "mem'orial"); "Memory" as the tr of 'azkār is a sacrificial term, that which brings the offerer into remembrance before God, or brings God into favorable remembrance with the offerer; it is used of the burning of a portion of the meal offering, RV (AV "meat-offering"); better, cereal offering, on the altar (Lev 2:2, RV "as the memorial"); 9:16; 5:12, RV "as"; 24:7; Nu 5:26, RV "as"); as the tr of 'azkār (zaḵār), it is a memorial in the sense of a remembrance (zaḵār, zaḵer, Ex 3:15; the memorial [name of Jeh] herself; hence) for "memory," for "remembrance" (Ps 30:4 ARV; 97:12, ERV "holy name," in "Heb holy name"); 102:13; 135:13; Isa 26:8; Hos 12:5, ERV "memorial") or "memorial" (Est 9:28; Ps 9:6, ARV "rememberance"); zaḵkārān, "a remembrance" (Ex 12:14; 13:9; Lev 23:24; Nu 5:15 [of the meal offering]; Josh 4:7; Neh 2:20; Zec 6:14); the Passover feast was to be in this sense a memorial...over" (Ex 12:14; 13:9); so also the abbreviation (Dt 6:4); "memorial" (Isa 21:6; Wisd 4:1 [memēnu]; RV "memory"); 4:19; Eccles 45:1 [memōnosoun;]; 49:1; 1 Macc 7:12; 53, RV "memorial.

"Memorial" occurs in the NT as the tr of memōnosoun, "a token of remembrance" (Mt 26:13; Mk 14:19, Acts 10:4. "Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial before God," which suggests the sense in which "memorial" was used in the sacrificial ritual, and also the "better sacrifices" of the new dispensation.

Memory is the tr of zaḵer (zaḵer) (Ps 109:15; 145:7; Prov 10:7; Ecc 9:5; Isa 26:14, RV "remembrance"); it occurs also in 1 Macc 3:29; 2 Macc 7:20. S. J. B. DICK. "to have, or hold fast, was rendered in 1 Cor 15:2 AV "keep in memory." We hold fast, ERV "hold it fast," i.e., the word preached to them.

W. L. WALKER

MEMPHIS, mem'phi-s: The ancient capital of Egypt, 12 miles S. of the modern Cairo. The Gr and Rom form of the name was derived from the Coptic form Menf (now Arab. Menf), the abbreviation of the Egyptian name Men-nejer, "the good haven." This name was applied to the part of the Nile near the cemetery above the city; some have thought the city name to have been derived from the pyramid, but this is unlikely, as the city must have had a regular name before that. It may perhaps mean "the excellence of Men," its founder. It appears still more shortened in Hos 9:6 as Meph (memph),
and in Isa (19 13), Jer (2 16), and Ezek (30 13) as Noph (noph).

The classical statements show that the city in Rom times was about 8 miles long and 4 miles wide, and the indications of the site agree

2. Political Position

Egypt from the 1st to the XVIth Dynasty; it shared supremacy with Thebes during the XVIIIth to XXVth Dynasties, and with Siis of the XXXth Dynasty. Alexandria

then gradually obscured it, but the governor of Egypt signed the final capitulation to the Arabs in the old capital. While other cities assumed a political equality, yet Memphis probably remained supreme until the Ptolemies.

The oldest center of settlement was probably the shrine of the sacred bull, Apis or Happy, which was in the S. of the city. This worship was doubtless prehistoric, so that when the first king of all Egypt, Mena, founded his capital, there was already a nucleus. His great work was taking in land to the N., and founding the temple of the dynastic god Ptah, which was extended until its enclosure included as much as the great temple of Amon at Thebes, about 3 furlongs long and 2 furlongs wide. To the N. of this was the sacred lake; beyond that, the palace and camp. Gradually the fashionable quarters moved northward in Egypt, in search of fresher air; the rulers had moved 10 miles N. to Babylon by Rom times, then to Fostat, then Cairo, and lastly now to Abassiyeh and Kubbek, altogether a shift of 18 miles in 8,000 years.

After the shrine of Apis the next oldest center is that of Ptah, founded by Mena. This was recently cleared in yearly sections by the British School, finding principally sculptures of the XVIIIth and XI Xth Dynasties. The account of the north gate given by Herodotus, that it was built by Amenemhat III, has been verified by finding his name on the lintel. An immense sphinx of alabaster 26 ft. long has also been found. To the E. of this was the temple of the foreign quarter, the temple of King Proteus in Gr accounts, where foreign pottery and terracotta heads have been found. Other temples that are known to have existed in Memphis are those of Hathor, Neit, Amen, Imhotep, Isis, Osiris-Sokar, Knumu, Bastel, Tuthu, Anubis and Sebek.

A large building of King Siamen (XXIst Dynasty) has been found S. of the Ptah temple. To the N. of the great temple lay the fortress, and in it the palace mound of the XXVth Dynasty covered two acres. It has been completely cleared, but the lower part is still to be examined. The north end of it was at least 90 ft. high, of brickwork, filled up to half the height by a flooring raised on cellular brickwork. The great court was about 110 ft. square, and its roof was supported by 16 columns 45 ft. high.

The principal sights of Memphis now are the great colossus of Rameses II, the lesser colossus of the same, and the immense alabaster sphinx. The cemetery of the city is the most important in Egypt; it lies 2 miles to the W. on the desert, and is known as Saqqareh, from So-kar, the god of the dead. See SAQQAREH.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE

MEMUCAN, mé-mu'kan; derivation unknown but probably of Pers origin [Est 1 14.16.21]: One of "the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king's face, and sat first in the kingdom." Ahasuerus consults these men, as those "that knew law and judgment," as to the proper treatment of the rebellious Vashti. Memucan is the spokesman of the reply. He recommends Vashti's deposition so that "all the wives will give to their husbands honor, both to great and small." This advice is adopted and incorporated into a royal decree—with what success is not said.

MENAHEM, men'a-hem (ם Enemies), "one who comforts": Mavâq, Mana b; 2 K 15 14–22): Son of Gadi and 16th king of Israel. He reigned 10 years. Menahem was probably the officer in charge of the royal troops in Tirzah, one of the king's residences, at the time of the murder of Zechariah by Shallum. Hearing of the deed, he brought up his troops and avenged the death of his master by putting Shallum to death in Samaria. He then seized the vacant throne. His first full year may have been 758 BC (others, as seen below, put later).

The country at this time, as depicted by Hosea and Amos, was in a deplorable condition of anarchy and lawlessness. Menahem, with a strong hand, enforced his occupation of the throne. One town only seems to have refused to acknowledge him. This was Tiphsah, a place 6 miles S.W. of Shechem, now the ruined village of Khurbet Tafsah. As Menahem is said to have attacked this inclosed city from Tiphsah, lying to its N., it is probable that he took it on the way to Samaria, before proceeding to do battle with Shallum. If this was so, it is some explanation of the cruelty with which his inhabitants (ver 16). One such instance of severity was enough. The whole kingdom was at his feet.

He proved to be a strong and determined ruler, and during the 9 or 10 years of his governorship had no further internecine trouble to contend with.

But there was another source of disquiet. Assyria, under Pul, had resumed her advance to the W. and threatened the kingdoms of Palestine. Menahem resolved on a policy of diplomacy, and, rather than risk a war with the conqueror of the East, agreed to the payment of a heavy tribute of 1,000 talents of silver. To raise this sum he had to assess his wealthier subjects to the extent of 50 shekels each. As there are 3,000 shekels in a talent of silver, it is obvious that asthma generosity, "mighty men of wealth," must have been laid under contribution in this levy—an indication at once of the enormity of the tribute, and of the prosperity of the country at the time. However short-sighted the policy, its immediate purpose was attained, which was that the hand of the Assyrian king "might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand" (ver 19).
A difficulty attaches to the dates of this period. The Pul of 2 K 15 19 and 1 Ch 5 26 is now identified with Tiglath-pileser III, who took this title on ascending the throne of Assyria in 745 BC. In an inscription of Tiglath-pileser, Menahem appeared as Mene or Menahem (Menahem the Samaritan), together with Rezin (Rezu in Assyrian) of Damascus and Hiram (Hiram) of Tyre. The date given to this inscription is 738 BC, whereas the last year we can give to Menahem is 749, or 10 years earlier.

The chronological difficulty which thus arises may be met in one of two ways. Either the inscription, like that on the black obelisk of Menelaus, is a forger's deception designed to deceive the world, but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calf.

5. Proposed of Kurkh (see note), was written some years after the events to which it refers and contains records of operations in which Tiglath-pileser took part before he became king; or Pekah—who was on the throne of Israel in 738 (?)—is spoken of under the dynastic name Menahem, though he was not of his family. The former of these hypotheses is that which the present writer is inclined to adopt. (By other dates the names of Menahem are lowered in conformity with the inscription; see Chronology of the OT.)

Menahem attempted no reformation in the national religion but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calf.

6. Character calves. On this account, like them, he incurs the heavy censure of the historian.

W. Shaw Caldecott

MENAN, mē′nan. See Manna.

Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin, mē′ne, mē′ne, tē′kele, ʿūfārṣin, men′a, men′ā, tekēl, ʿəfārṣin (Mene, Tekel, Upharsin; Theod., Μήναι, Τικέλ, Ὠφαρσίν; Theod., Μανῆ, Τικέλ, φάρσης, Μανῆ, θεκέλ, ϕαρῆς); These are the words that, according to Daniel's reading, were inscribed on the walls of Belshazzar's palace and that caused the great commotion on the occasion of his last feast (Dan 5:25). As the only authority that we have for the reading is that of Daniel, it seems but fair that the interpretation of the terms be left to the person who gave us the text. According to his interpretation, there is a double sense to be found in the three different words of the inscription (Dan 5:26-28). Mēne, which, however, it is pointed out, cannot be taken from the verb mēnah (Heb mēnah; Bab manu), is said to have indicated that God had numbered (the days of) Belshazzar's kingdom and finished it (or delivered it up). Both of these meanings can be shown to be proper to the mēne, Tekel, the contrary, is interpreted as coming from two roots: the first, tēkele, "to weigh," and the second, kele, "to be light or wanting" (Heb kalal; kal kalal).

Pāras (or parash) also is interpreted as coming from two roots: first, pāras, "to divide!" (Heb pāras or pārash; Bab parāsu), and the second as denoting the proper name Pāras, "Persia." Thus interpreted, the whole story hangs together, makes good sense, and is fully justified by the context and by the language employed. If the original text was in Bab, the signs were cunning; if they were in Aram, the consorts alone were written, and hence the reading would be doubtful. In either case, the inscription was apparent but not readable, except by Daniel with the aid of God, through whom also the seer was enabled to give the proper interpretation. That Daniel's interpretation was accepted by Belshazzar and the rest shows that the interpretation of the signs was reasonable and convincing when once it had been made. We see, therefore, no good reason for departing from the interpretation that the Book of Daniel gives as the true one.

As to the interpretation of the inscription, it makes no difference whether the signs represented a mina, a shekel, and two parases, as has been recently suggested by M. Clermont-Ganneau. In this case the meaning is warina (Menahem the Samaritan), together with Rezin of Damascus and Hiram of Tyre. The date given to this inscription is 738 BC, whereas the last year we can give to Menahem is 749, or 10 years earlier.

That Daniel's interpretation was accepted by Belshazzar and the rest shows that the interpretation of the signs was reasonable and convincing when once it had been made. We see, therefore, no good reason for departing from the interpretation that the Book of Daniel gives as the true one.

As to the interpretation of the inscription, it makes no difference whether the signs represented a mina, a shekel, and two parases, as has been recently suggested by M. Clermont-Ganneau. In this case the meaning is warina (Menahem the Samaritan), together with Rezin of Damascus and Hiram of Tyre. The date given to this inscription is 738 BC, whereas the last year we can give to Menahem is 749, or 10 years earlier.

The chronological difficulty which thus arises may be met in one of two ways. Either the inscription, like that on the black obelisk of Menelaus, is a forger's deception designed to deceive the world, but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calf.

5. Proposed of Kurkh (see note), was written some years after the events to which it refers and contains records of operations in which Tiglath-pileser took part before he became king; or Pekah—who was on the throne of Israel in 738 (?)—is spoken of under the dynastic name Menahem, though he was not of his family. The former of these hypotheses is that which the present writer is inclined to adopt. (By other dates the names of Menahem are lowered in conformity with the inscription; see Chronology of the OT.)

Menahem attempted no reformation in the national religion but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calf.

6. Character calves. On this account, like them, he incurs the heavy censure of the historian.

W. Shaw Caldecott

MENELAUS, men-e′lous (Menalos, Menelao): According to the less likely account of Jos (Ant, XII, v, 1; XV, iii, 1; XX, x, 3), Menelaus was a brother of Jason and Onias III, and his name was really Onias. But it is very unlikely that there should be two brothers of the same name. The account of 2 Macc is more credible—that Menelaus was the brother of the notorious Simon who suggested to the Syrians the plundering of the temple; he was thus of the tribe of Benjamin (2 Macc 4:23; with 3 4) and not properly eligible to the high-priesthood. He was intrusted by Jason (171 BC), who had supplanted Onias, with contributions to the king of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes, and by outbidding Jason in presenting the king with a golden crown, was elevated to the office of high priest for himself (4 23 f), 171 BC. Menelaus returned with "the passion of a cruel tyrant" to Jerus, and Jason fled. But as Menelaus failed to pay the promised amount, both he and Sostratus, the governor, were summoned to Jerusalem, where the king, Lysimachus, the brother of Menelaus, was left at Jerus in the meantime as deputy high priest. The king was called from his capital to suppress an insurrection of Tarsus and Mallus. Menelaus took advantage of his absence to win over Andronicus, the king's deputy, by rich presents stolen from the temple. For this sacrilege Onias III sharply reprimed him and fled to a sanctuary, Daphne, near Antioch. Andronicus was then further persuaded by Menelaus to desert his retreat and murder him (4 34 f)—an act against which both Jews and Greeks protested to the king on his return, and secured deserved punishment for Andronicus. Meanwhile, the oppression of Lysimachus, abetted by Menelaus, caused a bloody insurrection in Jerus, in connection with which a Jewish deputation brought an accusation against Menelaus on the occasion of Antiochus' visit to Tyre. Menelaus bribed Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, to win over the king in order to secure the execution of "those hapless men, who, if they had pleaded even before Scythians, would have been discharged uncondemned" (4 39 f). Menelaus returned in triumph to his office. But Jason, taking advantage of Epiphanes' absence in
Egypt and a false rumor of his death, made a bloody but unsuccessful attempt upon the city, in order to secure his enemy's life again; his rival took refuge in the citadel. The king returned in fury, caused a three-days' slaughter of the citizens, rifled the temple with Menelaus as guide, and left him as one of his agents to keep the Jews in subjection (2 Mac 5 1 f.). He appears next and for the last time in the reign of Eupator in 162 BC. Lysias, the king's chancellor, accused him to the king as the cause of all the troubles in Judaea (2 Mac 13 3–8). Eupator caused him to be brought to Beroea and there—before, according to 2 Mac, loc. cit., or, according to Jos, Ant. XII, ix, 7, the invasion of Judaea by Eupator and Lysias—to be put to death by being flung from the top of a high tower into the ashes of which it was full—a fitting end for such a wretch. S. Angus

MENESTHEUS, mē-nēstheus, mē-nēsthes'us (Mēnōsēus, Menestheus, A. Menestōrus, Menesthesōs): The father of Apollonius, a general of Ephanes (2 Mac 4 21 and in 2 Mac 4 of RV, following a conjecture of Hort [Mēnēsēus, Menesethōs, for mēnōsēus this, mainethai hēsō; the latter inserted in Swete and Fritzsche]). “Son of Menestheus” is added to distinguish this Apollonius from “A. son of Thraxeus” (2 Mac 3 5) and “A. son of Gennaeus” (12 2). See Apollonius.

MENI, mē'ni: Destiny, a god of Good Luck, possibly the Pleiades (Isa 45 11 m). See Astrol.-out, 10; Gap.

MENNA, mē'nna (Mēnā, Menand, WH, Tres., Tisch.; Malvāv, Mainān, TR; AV Menan): An ancestor of Jesus, a great-grandson of David (Lk 3 31).

MENUCHAH, men-ū'kah (μηνοκή, mēnokēth, “place of rest”; AV Menuchah, men-ūkah): Rendered in Jgs 20 45 AV “with ease,” RV “at their resting-place.” Both, however, have a marginal suggestion which would make the word a place-name, which would then more naturally read “from Nuhah over against Gibeah,” thus describing the ground over which the slaughter of the Benjamites occurred. In 1 Ch 2 2 the word “Nuhah” occurs as that of a Benjamite clan. The place intended is perhaps Manahath (q.v.).

MENUOHOTH, men-ū'oth (μηνοὐθ, mēnouthōth, “dwellings”; AV μηνουθ, ManuOTHes): The first form is the RV transliterated in the name; the second form is AV retained by RV in the passages where the word occurs (1 Ch 2 52; cf ver 54). The people here spoken of by AV as “half of the ManuOTHes” are mentioned as descendants of Salmon (ver 54), while those mentioned as MenuOthon are mentioned as descendants of Judah through Shobal, father of Kiriath-jearim. Both words are from the same root. AV keeps the same designation for both passages, while RV has marked the difference in spelling by changing the first passage and following AV in the second. Both sections of the family belong to the clan Caleb, and it would seem that they became the dominant people in the otherwise unknown town of Mananath, so that it came to be regarded as belonging to Judah. It may be connected with the Menuchah (RV “Meunah”) suggested as a place-name in Jgs 20 43 m. In the LXX between vs 59 and 60 of Josh ch 15 the name of 11 cities are inserted, among them being a Manocho whose Heb equivalent gives the word. It is difficult to identify, and the Vulg version by translating “dudium requiectionum”! See Mananath.

MEONENIM, mē-on'ē-nim, mē-onê-nim, OAK OF: (אֹאֵק אֵלֶּף, 'eōn mō'ēnīm; B, Πλατ- puamauiē, Elūmmōnētēm, A, δρῦς ἀπόβαςτων, drūs apōbasτōn; AV Plain of): This was a sacred spot which appeared to be sacred from the gate of Shechem (Jgs 9 37). No doubt it took its name from the soothsayers who sat under it, practising augury, etc. Several times mention is made of sacred trees in the vicinity of Shechem (Gen 35 4–6; Josh 24 20; Jgs 9 6, etc.). Where this tree stood is not known. See Auge's Oak.

MEONOTHAI, mē-onô-thai, mē-onô-thi, mē-onô-thi (Μηνωνθαι, mēnonthai, “my dwellings”): A son of Othniel, nephew of Caleb (1 Ch 4 14). Possibly, as AV suggests, and the Vulg and Complutensian LXX say, vs 14 should read “the sons of Othniel, Hathath and Meonothai; and Meonothai begat Ophrah,” etc. The latter may be the founder of the town of that name.

MEPHAATH, mē-fā'ath, mē-fā'ath (Μηφαάθ, mēphā'ath, מפָּחָת; B, Μα- φάαθ, Maiphath, Μηφαάθ, Mephaath): A city of the Amorites in the territory allotted to Reuben, named with Kedemoth and Kirjathaim (Josh 13 18), and given to the Merarite Levites (24 37; 1 Ch 6 30). It appears again as a Moabite town in Jer 48 21. It was known to Eusebius and Jerome (Onom) as occupied by a Roman garrison, but the site has been lost.

MEPHIBOSHETH, mē-fib-ô'bahth (Μηφιβοσθήθ, mēphibōsthēth, “idol-breaker,” also MERIB-BAAL [q.v.]; Memphibōsthe, Memphibōsthe):
(1) Son of Saul by his concubine Rizpah (q.v.), daughter of Aiah (2 S 21 8). See also Armoni.
(2) Grandson of Saul, son of Jonathan, and nephew of Mephibosheth (1) (2 S 4 4). He was 5 years old when his father and grandfather were slain. He was living in charge of a nurse, possibly because his mother was dead. Tidings of the disaster at Jezreel and the overthrow of the Philis terified the nurse. She fled with her charge in such haste that a fall lamed the little prince in both feet for life. His life is a series of disasters, disappointments, and anxieties. It is a weak, broken, dispirited soul that speaks in all utterings of the nurse. He carried him to Lo-debar among the mountains of Gilead, where he was brought up by Macir, son of Ammiel (2 S 9 4). There he evidently married, for he had a son Mica when he returned later at the nurse's request. When David had settled his own affairs and subdued his enemies, he turned his inquiries to Saul's household to see whether there were any survivors to whom he might show kindness for Jonathan's sake (2 S 9 1). The search caused the appearance of Ziba, a servant of Saul's house (ver 2), who had meanwhile grown prosperous by some rapid process which can only be guessed at (vs 9–10). From him David learned about Mephibosheth, who was sent for. His humble bearing was consistent with his chronically broken spirit. David put Ziba's property (which had belonged to Saul) at Mephibosheth's disposal and made Ziba steward thereof. Mephibosheth was also to be a daily guest at David's table (2 S 9 11–13). Seventeen years pass, during which Mephibosheth seems to have lived in Jerusalem. Then came Absalom's rebellion. David determined to flee, so distraught was he by the act of his son. At the moment of flight, in great depression and need, he was opportunist met by Ziba with food, refreshment and even horses for travel. Naturally, the king inquired for Ziba's master. The treacherous reply was made (2 S 16 1–4) that Mephibosheth...
had remained behind for his own ends, hoping the people would give him Saul’s grandson, the kingdom. David believed this and restored to Ziba the property lost. Not till many days after did the lame prince get his chance to give David his own version of the story. He met David on his return from the Ammonite rebellion. He had not dressed his feet, trimmed his beard nor washed his clothes since the hour of David’s departure (2 S 19 24). At David’s anxious request Mephiboseth told his story: his servant had deceived him; he went to meet with David, had even asked for his beast to be saddled; but Ziba had left him, and had slandered him to the king. But he would not plead his cause any more; David is “as an angel of God”! whatever he decides will be well! (2 S 19 26 27). Thus characteristically continued the speech of this lame, broken, humble man, son of a proud family (ver 28). David wearily settled the matter by passing the property between the prince and his servant, the prince expressing utmost content that Ziba should take all so long as David remained friendly (vs 29 30). That David accepted Mephiboseth’s explanation and was drawn out in heart toward the character of the broken man is shown when some expiation followed. Saul’s household was considered necessary to turn away the famine sent by an offended deity, Mephiboseth is spared when other members of Saul’s household were sacrificed (2 S 21 7). The character of Mephiboseth well illustrates the effects of continued disaster, suspicion and treachery upon a sensitive mind. Henry Wallace

MERAH, méráh, méráh, “increase” “more”; Mepáth, Meráb: The elder daughter of Saul (1 S 14 49). Meráb thought not the name to the time who should slay the Philí Goliath (1 S 17 25). David did this and was afterward taken by Saul to court (1 S 18 2), where he was detained in great honor. Meráb was not, however, given to him as quickly as the incident would lead one to expect, and the sequel showed some unwillingness on the part of some persons in the contract to complete the promise. The adulation of the crowd who met David on his return from Philí warfare and gave him magnificent gifts only added more to the feeling of those who, as Saul (1 S 18 6 16) woke the angry jealousy of Saul. He “eyed David from that day and forward” (ver 9). Twice David had to “avoid” the “evil spirit” in Saul and the Foolish Saul also feared David (ver 12), and this led him to incite the House of Saul to more dangerous deeds of valor against the Philis by a renewed promise of Meráb. He will have David’s life, but rather by the hand of the Philis than his own (ver 17). Meráb was to be the bait. But now another element complicated matters—Michal’s love for David (ver 20), which may have been the retarding factor from the first. At any rate Meráb is finally given to Adriel the Meholathite (ver 19). The passage of 2 S 21 5 doubles contains an error—Michal’s name occurring for that of her sister Meráb—though the LXX, Jos, and a consistent Heb text all perpetuate it, as well as the concise meaning of the Heb word Yádah, which is a physiological word for bearing children, and cannot be tr “brought up.” A 1g explanation reads: “The 5 sons of Meráb (which Michal, Saul’s daughter brought up) which she bare,” etc. Another suggestion reads the word “sister” after Michal in the possessive case, leaving the text otherwise as it stands. It is possible that Meráb died comparatively young, and that her children were left in the care of their aunt, esp. when it is said she herself had none (2 S 6 23). The simplest explanation is to assume a scribal error, with the suggestion referred to as a possible explanation of it. The lonely Michal (2 S 6 20 23) became so identified with her (deceased) sister’s children that they became, in a sense, hers. Henry Wallace

MERAIAH, méráyāh, méráyāh, “continuance”: A priest in the time of Joakim, son of Jedaiah, and head of the priestly house of Seraiah to which Ezra belonged (Neh 12 12; cf Ezr 7 1).

MERAIOOTH, méráyoth, méráoth (méráyoth): The name varies much in the Gr.

(1) A Levite, a descendant of Aaron (1 Ch 6 6 f; Ezr 7 3), called “Remembered” in 1 Esd 8 2; and “Marimoth” in 2 Esd 1 2.

(2) The son of Ahitub and father of Zadok (1 Ch 9 11).

(3) A priestly house of which, in the days of Joakim, Helcias was head (Neh 12 15). In ver 3 the name is given as “Meremoth.”

MERAN, meran. See Merran.

MERARI, mérārī, mérārī, “bitter”; Maparēi, Mararēi: (1) The 3d son of Levi, his brothers, Gershon and Kohath, being always mentioned together with him (Gen 46 11; Ex 6 16 ff). He was among those 70 who went down to Egypt with Jacob (Gen 46 8 ff; cf ver 26 and Ex 1 5 ff).

(2) The family of Merari, descendants of above, and always—with one exception, for which see Merarites—spoken of as sons of Merarī in numerous references, such as 1 Ch 6 16 19 29, which only repeat without additional information the references to be found in the body of this article. We early find them divided into two families, the Mahli and Mushli (Ex 6 19; Nu 3 17 20 33). At the exodus they numbered, under their chief Zuriel, 6200, and they were assigned the north side of the tabernacle as a tenting-place (Nu 3 34 35), thus sharing in the honor of those who immediately surrounded the tabernacle—the south side being given to the Kohathites, the west to the Gershonites, and the east toward the sun-rising—being reserved for Moses, Aaron and his sons. (Nu 3 25 26 30 ff).

To the Merarites was intrusted the care of the boards, bars, pillars, sockets, vessels, pins and cords of the tabernacle (Nu 3 36 37 4 29 33). They and the Gershonites were “under the hand” of Ithamar, son of Aaron, the sons of Mahli bearing charge of the softer material of the tabernacles—curtains, covers, hangings, etc (Nu 3 25 26). When reckoned by the number fit for service, i.e. between 30 and 50 years, the sons of Merari were 3200 strong (Nu 4 42 45). Because of the weight of the material in their charge they were allowed 4 wagons and 8 oxen for carriage (Nu 7 8). In marching, when the tabernacle was taken down, the standard of Judah went first (Nu 10 14); then followed the Merarite bearing the tabernacle (ver 17), and after them came the standard of Reuben (ver 18). After the settlement in Canaan they had 12 cities assigned them out of Gad, Reuben and Zebulun (Jos 21 7 41 40; 1 Ch 6 63 77 81), just as the other two branches of Levi’s family had their 12 cities respectively assigned out of the other tribes (Jos 21). The names of these Merarite cities are given (loc. cit.), and among them is Ramothgilead, one of the cities of refuge (ver 28). It is evident from 1 Ch 6 44 47; 16 41; 26 1 36 9 11. 15 19 21; f of 16 6 17 19 that they had charge under Ethan or Jeduthun of the temple music in the service. In David’s time Asaiah was their chief (1 Ch 15 6). Himself and 220 of the family helped David to bring up the Ark. David divided
the Levites into courses among the Gershonites, Kohathites and Merarites (1 Ch 23 6; cf vs 21–23; 24 26–30). The functions of certain Merarites are described in 1 Ch 26 10–19. They also took part in cleansing the temple in Hezekiah’s time (2 Ch 29 12) as well as in the days of Josiah (2 Ch 34 12), helping to repair the house of the Lord. Among the sons of Ezra, too, we find some of them numbered (Ezr 8 18). The family seems to have played a very important part in keeping steady and true such faithfulness as remained in Israel.

The father of Judith (Jth 8 1; 16 7).

Henry Wallace

Merarites, me-râ’ri’ts (םֵרָרִים, מַרְאֶרִים, “bitter”): The descendants of Merari (q.v.), son of Levi. The only place where this form of the word occurs is Nu 26 57. Elsewhere they are always referred to as “sons of Merari.”

Meratham, mer-â-thâ’im (םֵרֲתָם, מַרְתָּהִים, “double rebellion”: A name used for Babylon in Jer 50 21. According to Delitzsch it may be equivalent to the Bab Marâtan, i.e. land by the nar Marratun, “the bitter river” (Pers Gulf) = Southern Babylonia (OHL, s.v.).

Merchant, mûr’chàn-dîn (םְרַכְהָנִים, מְרַכְּהָנִים, “merchandise,” mûr’chan-dîn): (1) ðahar, ðahar, meaning thus: “Jeh of thy two is thaylm, you”); (2) “merchandise,” used thus: (a) “merchandise,” trade AV, 28 24; (b) “merchandise,” trade from the Targums, 1 Tim 1 13:16; (c) with his forbearance (Ps 146 8, “Jeh is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great lovingkindness”); cf Rom 2 4; 11 32; (d) with His covenant (1 K 8 23; Neh 1 5, “grace”) and with his justice (Ps 101 1), “mercy,” mercy, mercy, truth are united in Prov 3 3, 14 22, etc (Ps 86 10 we have “Mercy and truth are met together”); (e) it goes forth to all (Ps 145 9, “Jeh is good to all); and his tender mercies are over all his works”; of ver 16, “Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing,” RV “satisfy every living thing with favor”); (f) it shows itself in pitying help (Ex 3 7; Ezr 9 91), supremely in Christ and His salvation (1 Jn 3 18); (g) it is abundant, practically infinite (Ps 86 15, 119 64); (h) it is everlasting (1 Ch 16 34, 41; Ezr 3 11; Ps 100 5; 136 repeatedly).

(2) “Mercy” is used of man as well as of God, and is required on man’s part toward man and beast (Dt 25 4; Ps 73 21; 109 17; 119 60; Prov 24 31; 27 1; Mic 6 8; Mt 5 7, “Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy”; 26 31–46; Lk 6 36, “Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful”; 10 90, the Good Samaritan; 14 12–16; Jas 3 17).

(3) In the NT “mercy” (eleos, usually the LXX tr of heeseth, “kindness,” “loving-kindness” (see Lovenkindness), but rahamim, lit. “bowels,” the sympathetic, the merciful, the compassionate,” “compassion,” occurs a few times, also otrımno, “pitiful,” eleoth, “kind,” “compassionate,” twice; klesio, “forgiving,” and atelēs, “not forgiving,” without mercy,” once each (He 12 2; Jas 2 13).

(1) Mercy is (a) an essential quality of God (Ex 34 6; Dt 4 31; Ps 52 12, etc.); it is His delight (Mic 7 18; Ps 52 8); He is “the Father of mercies” (2 Cor 1 3), “rich in mercy” (Eph 2 4), “full of pity, and merciful” (Jas 5 11); (b) it is associated with forgiveness (Ex 34 7; Nu 14 14; 1 Tim 1 13:16); (c) with His forbearance (Ps 146 8, “Jeh is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great lovingkindness”); cf Rom 2 4; 11 32; (d) with His covenant (1 K 8 23; Neh 1 5, “grace”) and with his justice (Ps 101 1), “mercy,” mercy, truth are united in Prov 3 3, 14 22, etc (Ps 86 10 we have “Mercury and truth are met together”); (e) it goes forth to all (Ps 145 9, “Jeh is good to all); and his tender mercies are over all his works”; of ver 16, “Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing,” RV “satisfy every living thing with favor”); (f) it shows itself in pitying help (Ex 3 7; Ezr 9 91), supremely in Christ and His salvation (1 Jn 3 18); (g) it is abundant, practically infinite (Ps 86 15, 119 64); (h) it is everlasting (1 Ch 16 34, 41; Ezr 3 11; Ps 100 5; 136 repeatedly).

(2) “Mercy is used of man as well as of God, and is required on man’s part toward man and beast (Dt 25 4; Ps 73 21; 109 17; 119 60; Prov 24 31; 27 1; Mic 6 8; Mt 5 7, “Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy”; 26 31–46; Lk 6 36, “Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful”; 10 90, the Good Samaritan; 14 12–16; Jas 3 17).

(3) In the NT “mercy” (eleos, usually the LXX tr of heeseth, “kindness,” “loving-kindness” (see Lovenkindness), but rahamim, lit. “bowels,” the sympathetic, the merciful, the compassionate,” “compassion,” occurs a few times, also otrımno, “pitiful,” eleoth, “kind,” “compassionate,” twice; klesio, “forgiving,” and atelēs, “not forgiving,” without mercy,” once each (He 12 2; Jas 2 13).

(1) Mercy is (a) an essential quality of God (Ex 34 6; Dt 4 31; Ps 52 12, etc.); it is His delight (Mic 7 18; Ps 52 8); He is “the Father of mercies” (2 Cor 1 3), “rich in mercy” (Eph 2 4), “full of pity, and merciful” (Jas 5 11); (b) it is associated with forgiveness (Ex 34 7; Nu 14 14; 1 Tim 1 13:16); (c) with His forbearance (Ps 146 8, “Jeh is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great lovingkindness”); cf Rom 2 4; 11 32; (d) with His covenant (1 K 8 23; Neh 1 5, “grace”) and with his justice (Ps 101 1), “mercy,” mercy, truth are united in Prov 3 3, 14 22, etc (Ps 86 10 we have “Mercury and truth are met together”); (e) it goes forth to all (Ps 145 9, “Jeh is good to all); and his tender mercies are over all his works”; of ver 16, “Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing,” RV “satisfy every living thing with favor”); (f) it shows itself in pitying help (Ex 3 7; Ezr 9 91), supremely in Christ and His salvation (1 Jn 3 18); (g) it is abundant, practically infinite (Ps 86 15, 119 64); (h) it is everlasting (1 Ch 16 34, 41; Ezr 3 11; Ps 100 5; 136 repeatedly).

(2) “Mercy is used of man as well as of God, and is required on man’s part toward man and beast (Dt 25 4; Ps 73 21; 109 17; 119 60; Prov 24 31; 27 1; Mic 6 8; Mt 5 7, “Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy”; 26 31–46; Lk 6 36, “Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful”; 10 90, the Good Samaritan; 14 12–16; Jas 3 17).

(3) In the NT “mercy” (eleos, usually the LXX tr of heeseth, “kindness,” “loving-kindness” (see Lovenkindness), but rahamim, lit. “bowels,” the sympathetic, the merciful, the compassionate,” “compassion,” occurs a few times, also otrımno, “pitiful,” eleoth, “kind,” “compassionate,” twice; klesio, “forgiving,” and atelēs, “not forgiving,” without mercy,” once each (He 12 2; Jas 2 13).
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merciful Father and from the benefits of His merci-
fulness. Shakespeare’s question, “How canst thou
hope for mercy rendering none?” is fully warranted
by Our Lord’s teaching and by Scripture in general;
of esp. the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt
18:23-35).

(5) As the rule, AV has “loving-kindness” for
“mercy” when ἡσαβ is used of God, and “kindness
when it is used of men in relation to each other.” “Com-
passion” (tr. τασίμ) is also in several instances substi-
tuted for “mercy” (Isa 9:17; 14:1; 27:11; Jer 13:14;
30:2; also “mercies” (tr. τασίμ referring to ἡσαβ
(Hos 4:1; 6:6).

W. L. Walker

MERCY-SEAT, μῦρι-στή, THE (7725), kap-
poreth; NT Λαοστηρίον, hilaστερίον, He 9:5): The
name for the lid or covering of the ark of the cove-
nant. Ex 25:20 (and possibly also 26:34), where
the word is used of the lid of the ark. Jer 3:16;
Ezek 10:19, 20, 21; Hagg 2:15; the name is also
 Used of the lid of the Ark of the Covenant.

W. Shaw Caldecott

MERED, μήρεδ (7723), “mered”, “rebellion”;
LXX has at least four variants in 1 Ch 4 17.18): A
descent of Judah through Caleb, and mentioned
as a “son of Erah” (ver 17).

RV, rightly following the orthography of the Heb
which is more correct (b’lod, (b’lod, instead of, as in the name
of the well-known Ezra, saves us from confusing this
Ezra with the other by giving him the correct termi-
nal letter. Moreover, even if the question of spelling
were waived, the absence of the mention of children
in any known passages of the list of OT terms means
settle the question, since this passage (ver 17) is asso-
ciated with prophecy.

A difficulty meets us in ver 18, where Mered
is mentioned as taking to wife “Bithiah the daughter of
Phares”. Phares is not the proper name of some individual but the official title of Egypt’s
sovereign seems evident from the fact that AVµ
and RV text agree in translating the other wife of
Mered as “the Jewess, rather than as a proper
name Jewdahia, as if to distinguish the Jewess
from the Egyptian. Probably “Hodiap” also is
a corruption of Jewdiah in ver 19, and should be
twice again “the Jewess.” Tgs and traditions have so
changed and transposed and “interpreted” this
passage that a sufficiently confused text has become
warped confused, and the only solid fact that
emerges is that once a comparatively obscure Judah-
ite (though the founder of several towns—Gedor,
Socon, Eshtemoa, etc, ver 18) married an Egyptian
princess, whether as a captive or a freewoman we
do not know. See Bithiah. HENRY WALLACE

MEREMOTH, mer‘ē-moth, me-remoth (7789);
mer‘āmōth, “heights”; Μερεμωθ, Meremoth): (1)
Son of Uriah (Ezr 8 35), who was head of the 7th
course of priests appointed by David (1 Ch 24
16, 10), Kkavg = Koz; cf Neh 3 4,21). The family
of Koz were among those unable to prove their pedi-
gree on the return from Babylon, and were therefore
deposed as polluted (Ezr 2 61,62). Meremoth’s
divisiveness of the family may, however, have been
soothless, for he is employed in the temple after the
return as weight of the gold and the vessels (Ezr
8:33), a function reserved for priests alone (Ezr
8:24-28). He takes a double part in the reconstruc-
tion under Nehemiah, first as a builder of the wall
of the city (Neh 3 4), then as a restorer of that part
of the temple abutting on the house of Eliashib the
priest (Neh 3 21); “Marmoth” in 1 Esd 8 62.

(2) A member of the house of Bani, and, like so
many of that house, among those who married and
put away foreign wives (Est 10:36). He seems to
be named Carabas (1) in the corresponding list of
1 Esd 9 34.

(3) The name occurs in Neh 10 5 among those
who “seal the covenant” with Nehemiah (Neh 10 1).
It may there be the name of an individual (in which
case there were 4 of the name), or it may be a family
name. Certainly a “Meremoth” came back under
Zerubbabel 100 years before (Neh 12 3), and the
signatory in question may be either a descendant
of the same name or a family representative. The
name recurs later in the same list (Neh 12 15) as
“Meraitho” through a scribal error confusing the
two Heb letters ydh and hlam for mem. A compari-
note of Neh 12 1-3 and 12-15 shows clearly
that it is the same person. Note that in ver 15
“Helc” is the name of the contemporary leader.

(4) For Meremoth (1 Esd 8 2 AV), see Mere-
emoth. HENRY WALLACE

MERIBAH, mer‘ē-bāh, me-remoth. See Masseh
and Meribah.

MERIB-BAAL, mer-b-ba‘al (7780, mer‘ē-ba‘al;
also 7781, mer‘ē-ba‘al, “Ba'al contends”): The
spelling varies in a single verse; 1 Ch 9 40
contains the name twice: first, in the first form
above; second, in the second form. The name is
given also in 1 Ch 8 34. It is the other name of
Michubas (2) (q.v.).

As Jer 11 13 and Hos 9 10 the terms “Ba'al” and
“Bosheth” seem to be synonymous, as a corruption of being a slightly contemptuous alternative rendered
“shame.” This is akin to other like changes, such as
Esh-baal for Ith-bosheth, Jerub-besheth for Zorub-
baal, etc. The change in the first part of the name could occur through a clerical confusion of aspirate p and rdh in Hebrew.

HENRY WALLACE

MERIBATH-KADESH, mer-ibāth-kādeš, mer-
iboth-kadesh, mer‘ē-bōth-kādesh): The supreme deity of the Babylonians
(Jer 50 2); the Nimrod of Gen 10 8-12; and among
the constellations, Orion. See Astronomy, II;
Babylonia and Assyria, Religion of; Nimrod

MERODACH, mer‘ō-dāk, mer‘ō-dak (7770;
mer‘athak): the supreme deity of the Babylonians
(2 2); the Nimrod of Gen 10 8-12; and among
the constellations, Orion. See Astronomy, II;
Babylonia and Assyria, Religion of; Nimrod

MERODACH-BALADAN, mer‘ō-dāk-bal‘a’dan,
mer‘ō-dak-b. (7770 7770, mer‘athak bal‘a-dān;
Māraēdā Bahaladān, Marodaēch Baládān): The son of Baladon, is mentioned in Isa 39 1, as a king of Babylon who sent an embassy to Hezekiah, king of Judah, apparently shortly after the latter’s ill-
ess, in order to congratulate him on his recovery of health, and to make with him an offensive and
defensive alliance. This Merodach-baladon was a king of the Chaldaeans of the house of Yakin, and
was the most dangerous and inveterate foe of Sargon and his son Sennacherib, kings of Assyria, with
whom he long and bitterly contested the possession of Babylon and the surrounding provinces. M.-b.
seems to have seized Babylon immediately after
the death of Shalmanesar in 721 BC; and it was
not till the 18th year of his reign that Sargon suc-
ceeded in ousting him. From that time down to
the 8th campaign of Sennacherib, Sargon and his
son pursued with relentless animosity M.-b. and
his family until at last his son Nabushumishkun
was captured and the whole family of M.-b. was
apparently destroyed. According to the monuments, therefore, it was from a worldly point of view good politics for Hezekiah and his western allies to come to an understanding with M.-b. and the Aramaeans, Elamites, and others, who were conferred with him. From a strategical point of view, the weakness of the allied powers consisted in the fact that the Arabian desert lay between the eastern and western members of the confederacy, so that the Assyrs kings were able to attack their enemies when they pleased and to defeat them in detail.

R. Dick Wilson

**MEROZ, mē'roz** (Μέρος; B, Μηρός, Merōs; A, Μηρός, Mazōr): This name occurs only once in Scripture. The angel of the Lord is represented as invoking curses upon Meroz (Judg. 5 23). It is a strange fate, shared with Chorazin, to be preserved from oblivion only by the record of a curse. The bitterness in the treatment of Meroz, not found in the references to any of the other delinquents, must be due to the special gravity of her offence. Reuben, Gilead and Dan were far away. This, however, is not true of Asher, who was also absent. Perhaps Meroz was near the field of battle and, at some stage of the conflict, within sight and hearing of the strife. If, when Zebulun "jeopardized their lives unto the death, and Naphtali, upon the high places of the field," they turned a deaf ear and a cold heart to the dire straits of their brethren, this might explain the fierce reproaches of Deborah.

Meroz may possibly be identified with el-Murusus, a mud-built village about 5 miles N.W. of Besaín, on the slopes to the N. of the Vale of Jezreel. If the Redit where Heber's tent was pitched be identical with Kadish to the W. of the Sea of Galilee, Sisera's flight, avoiding the Israelites in the neighborhood of Mt. Tabor, may have carried him past el-Murusus. If the inhabitants had it in their power to arrest him, but suffered him to escape (Moore, "Jgs." ICC. 153), such treachery to the nation's cause might well rouse the indignation of the heroic prophetess.

W. Ewing

**MERRAN, mer'an (Mappōv, Merrān; AV Meron):** Many identifications have been suggested on the assumption that the text as it stands is correct. Some of these are the Sidonian Meareh (Grotius), Marane, a city of which Pliny speaks as being near the Red Sea (Keil), and the desert of Mahr in Arabia (Fritzsche). It is very probable, however, that the name represents an error in transcription from the original Sem text, confusing the "m" with the "w", so that we should read Medan, or Median, i.e. Midian. The phrase will then run, "the merchants of Midian and Teman" (Bar 3 23). The merchants of Midian are referred to in Gen 37 28.

W. Ewing

**MERRUTH, mē'ruth.** See EMMERUTH.

**MESALOTH, mes'a-loth (Mesorاة, Messolah, Maasalah, Masaloth):** A place mentioned in the account of the march of Bacchides and Alcimus into Judah, as "in Arbela" (1 Macc. 9 2). If Arbela be identical with Ἰβιλ or Ἰβίδ on the southern lip of Wady el-Hammûn, W. of the Sea of Galilee, this fixes the locality; but no name resembling Mesaloth has been found.

**MESECH, mē'sek.** See MESHEC.

**MESHA, mē'sha:**

(1) (מֶשָה, mēshâ; B, Mapos, Marisai, A, Mapo, Marisâ), Caleb's firstborn son, the father of Zipph, probably the ancestor of the Zipphites (1 Ch. 2 42).

(2) (מֶשָה, mēshâ; B, Mered, Mizăd, A, Merad, Mizăd): A Benjaminite, son of Shaharaim by his wife Hodeph, born in the land of Moab (1 Ch. 4 9).

(3) (מֶשָה, mēshâ; Merad, Mizăd): A king of Moab. All the Bib. information regarding this monarch is contained in 2 K 3. Here we gather that Mesha was contemporary with Ahab, Azaziah and Jehoram. He was tributary to Israel; his annual contribution consisting of 100,000 lavers of silver and 100,000 rams. After the death of Ahab he asserted his independence. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and
the king of Edom joined forces with Jehoram in an attempt to quell the rebellion. At the instance of Elisha, who accompanied the host, water was miraculously provided when the army of the allies was ready to perish of thirst. Mesha came out against them and fell upon the Edomites. His attack was repulsed with heavy slaughter, and the defeated king was chased by the victors until he took refuge in the great fortress of Kir-hareseth. A vigorous siege was begun. Seeing that his case was desperate, Mesha attempted, with 700 men, to break through the lines. Failing in this, he offered his firstborn as a burnt offering upon the wall. Then "there came great wrath upon Israel" (by which, probably, panic is meant), and the besiegers retired, leaving their conquest incomplete.

In his inscription—see MoABITE Stone—Mesha gives an account of his rebellion, naming the places captured and fortified by him. It is not surprising that he says nothing of his defeat by Jehoram and his allies. There is, however, one serious discrepancy. The time Moab was under the supremacy of Israel, during the reign of Omri and half the reign of Ahab, he puts at 40 years. According to Bib. chronology, Omri and Ahab together reigned only 34 years. If, with Mesha, we deduct half the reign of Ahab, the period is reduced to 22 years. It is impossible to add to the length of either reign. So great a difference cannot be explained by the use of round numbers. Why Mesha should wish to increase the age of his people's subjection is not clear, unless, indeed, he thought in this way to magnify the glory of his deliverer.

In Mesha the sentiment of patriotism was wedded to some measure of military capacity. Judging by his inscription, he was also a deeply religious man, according to his light. Substitute "dehoviah" for "Chemosh," and his phraseology might be that of a pious Heb king. The sacrifice of his son is at once the mark of the heathen and an index of the strength of his devotion.

(4) (אֵלֶּאֱלֵי, meshesah; Mes'eh, Massah): This appears to mark the western boundary of the land occupied by the descendants of Joktan (Gen 10 30). No certain identification is possible, but several more or less probable have been suggested: e.g. (a) The Gr Me'ere, on the Pers Gulf, not far from the mouth of the Tigris and the Euphrates; (b) the Pishrawi, an Arab desert, called Meshu in the Assy inscriptions; the name here, however, could hardly cover such a vast tract as this; more probably it denoted a place; (c) Dilmann would alter the vowels and identify it with Massi, a branch of the Ishmaelites, and suit (Gen 26 14; 1 Ch 1 30). This, however, furnishes no clue to the locality of the territory of that tribe being also unidentified.

W. EWING

MESHECH, m’eshek, MESECH, m’esek (מֶשֶכֶּחַ, mesheshekh): Possibly the Sumerian form of the Bab Súl-Asbaridu, "the shadow of the prince," just as Shadrac probably means "the servant of Sin," and Abednego the "servant of Ishtar." Meshech was one of the three Hebrew companions of Daniel, whose history is given in the first chapters of the Book of Dn. See, further, under SHADRACH.

MESHECH, m’eshek, MESECH, m’esek (מֶשֶכֶּחַ, mesheshekh), "long," "tall": Moroxh, Moseth: Son of Japheth (Gen 10 2; 1 Ch 1 5; ver 17 is a scribal error for Mesh of Gen 10 23). His descendants and their dwelling-place (probably somewhere in the neighborhood of Armenia [Herod. iii.94]) seem to be regarded in Scripture as synonyms for the barbaric and remote (Ps 120 5; of Isa 56 19, where Meshech should be read instead of "that draw the bow"). It is thought that the

"Tibareni and Moschi" of the classical writers refer to the same people. Doubtless they appear in the annals of Assyria as enemies of that country under the names Tabali and Mushki—the latter the descendants of Meshech and the former those of Tubal to whom the term "Tibareni" is applied. The phrase "Tibareni" in the Mesha inscription very significantly—heavily for making the suggested change in Isa 66 19, where Meshech would be in the usual company of Tubal and Javan. Ezekiel mentions them several times, first, as engaged in contributing to the trade of Tyre (Tiras of Gen 10 27), in "vessels of brass" and—very significantly—slaves; again there is the association of Javan and Tubal with them (Ezk 27 13); second, they are included in his weird picture of the under-world: "them that go down into the pit" (32 18,20). They are mentioned again with Javan and Magog twice as those against whom the prophet is to "set his face" (Ezk 38 23; 39 1).

HENRY WALLACE

MESHELEMIAN, m'eshele-ma' (מ'שֶלֶּמִי, meshelemi), "Jeh repays"; Father of Zechariah, one of the porters of the tabernacle (1 Ch 23 21; 25 12.9). In the latter passage Meshelemin, with a final u, is credited with "sons and brethren, valiant men. 18. He is the "Shelemian" of ver 14, the "Shallum" of 1 Ch 17 19,31, and the "Meshullam" of Neh 12 25.

MESHEZABEL, m'eshe'eza-bel (מ'שְּצֶבֶל, meshezebel), "God a deliverer"; AV Meshezabel, m'eshe'ez-bel; (1) A priest, ancestor of Meshullam, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jezre (Neh 3 4). (2) One of the chief of the people giving name to the family which sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10 21). (3) A descendant of Judah through Zerah, and father of Pethahiah (Neh 11 24). 1.2.9)

MESHELLEMITH, m'eshe1t'mith (מ'שֶלֶּמְת, meshellemith, retribution"): A priest, son of Immer, ancestor, according to 1 Ch 12 9, of Adaiah and Pashhur, and according to Neh 11 13, of Amashai. In the latter passage this name is spelled Shellemith (q.v.).

MESHELLEMOTH, m'eshe1'lmoth (מ'שֶלֶּמּוֹת, meshellemoth, recompense"): (1) An Ephraimites ancestor of Berechiah, chief of the tribe in the reign of Pekah (2 Ch 28 12). (2) The "Meshellemith" of Neh 11 13.

MESHEBAB, m'eshe'bab (מ'שֶבָב, meshehabh): A Simeonite (1 Ch 4 34). This name head the list of those who, for the sake of wider pasture- lands, occupied a Hamitic settlement in the neighborhood of Gerar (MT Gevar, q.v.), and a Moabite settlement in Edomite territory (1 Ch 4 39-41). The latter event is dated in the days of Hezekiah (see Curtis, Chron., in loc.).

MESHULLAM, m'eshul'lam (מ'שֶלּוֹלָם, meshullam), "resigned" or "devoted"; cf. Arab. Muslimeh, Me'shulem: An OT name very common in post-exilic times. (1) The grandfather of Shaphan (2 K 22 3). (2) A son of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 19). (3) A Gadite (1 Ch 5 13). (4) (5) (6) Three Benjamites (1 Ch 8 17; 9 7-8). (7) The father of Hilkiah (1 Ch 9 11; Neh 11 11).
(8) A priest, son of Meshillemith (1 Ch 9:12); the parallel list (Neh 11:13) omits the name. (9) A Kohathite appointed by Josiah as one of the overseers to direct the repairs of the temple (2 Ch 34:11). (10) One of the chief men sent by Ezra to procure Levites to go up with him to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16; cf 1 Esd 8:44). (11) A Levite opposed to Ezra’s regulations against marriage with foreigners (Ezr 10:15; 1 Esd 9:14). (12) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:29; cf 1 Esd 9:30). (13) One of the repairers of the wall (Neh 3:43). His daughter was married to Jehohanan, the son of Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh 6:18). (14) One of the repairers of the Old Gate (Neh 3:6). (15) A supporter of Ezra at the reading of the Law (Neh 8:4). (16) One of those who subscribed the Covenant (Neh 10:28). (17) A priest who subscribed the Covenant (Neh 10:7). (18) (19) Two priests at the time of the high priest Joiakim (Neh 12:13,16). (20) A porter at the time of the high priest Joiakim (Neh 12:25). (21) A processionist at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 12:33).

MESHULLEMETH, mē-shul’le-meth (מֶשׁוֹלֶם, mšsĥēllemeth): The wife of King Manasseh and mother of Amon (2 K 21:19). She is further designated “daughter of Haruce of Jothibah.” This is the earliest instance of the birthplace being added to the designation of the queen mother. The name is properly the fem. of the frequent occurring MESHULLAM (q.v.).

MESOBIAITE, mē-sō’bi-a. See MIZOBIAITE.

MESOPOTAMIA, mē-sōpō-tä-mi-a. See SYRIA.

MESS, mes (מַס, mas): Any dish of food sent (Lat missum; Fr. messe) to the table. It occurs in the OT in Gen 43:34 (biss); 2 S 11:8 EV, and in the NT in He 12:16, translating ἀπεσπάσατο, brōtis.

MESSENGER, mes’en-jër: The regular Heb word for “messenger” is מָשִׁיחַ, maššîḥ, the Gr ἀγγέλος, ágelos. This may be a human messenger or a messenger of God, an angel. The context must decide the right tr. In Hg 1:13 the prophet is called God’s messenger; Job 33:23 changes AV to “angel” (m ‘messenger’); and Mal 3:1, suggests “angel” instead of “messenger.” The Mal passages 2:7; 3:1 (biss) have caused a great deal of comment. See MALACHI. The Gr ἀπεσπάσατο, apóstolas, “apostle,” is rendered “messenger” in 2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25; 1 S 4:17 tr* lit. from Heb זֶבֶל, zabēl, “to tell good news,” “he that brought the tidings.” Gen 50:16 reads “message” instead of “messenger.” A. L. BRESLICH

MESIAH, mē-sā’ (מְשַׁא, mš̂āḥ); Aram. מַשָּׁא, mš̂āḥ; LXX Μὴσσα, Christós, “anointed”; NT “Messiah.”
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LITERATURE

“Messiah” (Jn 1:41; 4:25 AV) is a transcription of Μέσσιας, Mēssias, the Gr representation of the Aramaic. “Messiah” thus a modification.

1. Meaning of the Gr term form of the word, and Use of according to the Heb.
2. The Term
   The term is used in the OT of kings and priests, who were consecrated to office by the ceremony of anointing. It is applied to the priest only as an adj.—“the anointed priest” (Lev 4:3,5,16; 22[Heb 10:1]). Its substantive use is restricted to the king; he only is called “the Lord’s anointed,” e.g. Saul (1 S 24:6,10[Heb 7:11], etc); David (2 S 19:22 [Heb 22]; 23:1, “the anointed of the God of Jacob”); Zebediah (Lam 2:20). Similarly in the Ps the king is designated “mine,” “thine,” “his anointed.” Thus also even Cyrus (Isa 45:1), as being chosen and commissioned by Jah to carry out His purpose with Israel. Some think the sing. “mine anointed” in Hab 3:13 denotes the whole people; but the Heb text is somewhat obscure, and the reference may be to the king. The pl. of the subst. is used of the patriarchs, who are called “mine anointed ones” (Ps 105:15; 1 Ch 16:22), as being Jah’s chosen, consecrated servants, whose persons were inviolable. It is to be noted that “Messiah” as a special title is never applied in the OT to the unique king of the future, unless perhaps in Dn 9:25 (māshāh nāḥādīth, “Messiah-Prince”), a difficult passage, the interpretation of which is very uncertain. It was the later Jews of the post-prophetic period who, guided by a true instinct, first used the term in a technical sense.

The Messiah is the instrument by whom God’s kingdom is to be established in Israel and in the world. The hope of a personal deliverer is thus inseparable from the Messianic wider hope that runs through the OT.

HOPE

The Jews were a nation who lived in the future. In this respect they stand alone among the peoples of antiquity. No nation ever cherished such strong expectations of a good time coming, or clung more tenaciously amid defeat and disaster to the certainty of final triumph over all enemies and of entrance upon a state of perfect peace and happiness. The basis of this larger hope is Jah’s covenant with Israel. “I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God” (Ex 6:7). On the ground of this promise the prophets, while declaring God’s wrath against His people on account of their sin, looked beyond the Divine chastisements to the final era of perfect salvation and blessedness, which would be ushered in when the nation had returned to Jah.

The term “Messiah” is used in a double sense to describe the larger hope of a glorious future for the nation, as well as the narrower one of a personal Messiah who is to be the prominent figure in the perfected kingdom. It may be remarked that many writers, both prophetic and apocalyptic, who picture the final consummation, make no allusion whatever to a coming deliverer.

This art. will treat of the personal Messianic hope
as it is found in the OT, in the pre-Christian age, and in the NT.

1. The Messiah in the OT.—The chief element in the concept of the Messiah in the OT is that of the king. Through him as head of the nation Jeh would most readily accomplish his purposes. But the kingdom of Israel was a theocracy. While there are passages in both of these writers which refer to a succession of pious rulers, this fact should not dominate our interpretation of other utterances of theirs which seem to point to a particular individual. By Jeremiah the Messiah is called the "righteous one," who is to be raised up to David and be called "Jehovah [is] our righteousness," that is, as the one making righteous dwells in him (Jer 23:5; of 30:9). In Ezek he is alluded to as the coming one "whose right it is" (21:27), and as Jeh's "servant David" who shall be "prince" or "king" forever over a reunited people (34:23; 37:24). It is difficult to resist the impression which the language of Ezekiel makes that it is the ideal Messianic ruler who is here predicted, notwithstanding the fact that afterward, in the prophet's vision of the ideal theocracy, not only does the prince play a subordinate part, but provision is made in the constitution for a possible abuse of his authority.

(3) Later prophets.—After Ezekiel's time, during the remaining years of the exile, the hope of a preeminent king of David's house naturally disappears. But it is reawakened at the restoration when Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David and the civil head of the two kingdoms under David's line. But it is not till we reach the Assyrian age, when the personality of the king is brought into prominence against the great worldpower, that we meet with any mention of a unique personal ruler who would bring special glory to David's house.

The kings of Syria and Israel having entered into a league to dethrone Ahaz and supplant him by an obscure adventurer, the king of Juda (727 BC) appointed to the kings of Judah that while, by the help of Assyria, he would sur- vive, the attack of the confederate kings, Jeh would, for his disobedience, bring devastation upon his own land through the instrumentality of his ally. But the prince is thus far limited as in the case of Moses, for he has no power to the horizon of his own time, reaches be- yond the realm of Judah's deliverance. To the spiritual mind of Isaiah the revelation is made of a king, Immanuel, "God-with-us," who would arise out of the house of David, and of whose name is given the prophetic Ahaz. While the passage is one of the hardest to interpret in all the OT, perhaps too much has been made of the interpretation of a passage so accidentally connected with the word אֱוֶה, "virgin." It is the mysterious personality of the child to which prominence is given in the prophecy. The significance of the name and the pledge of victory it implies, the reference to Immanuel as ruler of the land in 8:8 (the present rendering be correct), as well as the parallelism of the line of thought in the prophecy be with that of 4:6, would tend to point to the identity of Immanuel with the Prince of the peace.

"Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace" (9:6 RM). These Divine titles do not necessarily imply that in the mind of the prophet the Messianic king is God in the metaphorical sense—the essence of the Divine nature is not a dogmatic conception in the OT—but only that Yah is present in Him in perfect wisdom and power, so that He exercises over His people forever a fatherly and peaceful rule. In confirmation of this interpretation reference may be made to the last of the great trilogy of Isaiatic prophecies concerning the Messiah of the house of David (11:2), where the attributes with which He is endowed by the Spirit are those which qualify for the perfect discharge of royal functions in the kingdom of God. See IMMANUEL.

A similar description of the Messianic king is given by Isaiah's younger contemporary Micah (5:2ff), who emphasizes the humble origin of the extraordinary ruler of the future, who shall spring from Jesse's house, who represents the line of David, and is to bear him confirms the interpretation which regards the virgin in Isaiah as the mother of the Messiah.

(2) Jeremiah and Ezekiel.—After the time of Isaiah and Micah the throne of David lost much of its power and influence, and the figure of the ideal king is never again present in a more definite or color. Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk make no reference to him at all. By the great prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, however, the hope of a Davidic ruler is kept before the people.

In one passage in both of these writers which refer to a succession of pious rulers, this fact should not dominate our interpretation of other utterances of theirs which seem to point to a particular individual. By Jeremiah the Messiah is called the "righteous one," who is to be raised up to David and be called "Jehovah [is] our righteousness," that is, as the one making righteous dwells in him (Jer 23:5; of 30:9). In Ezek he is alluded to as the coming one "whose right it is" (21:27), and as Jeh's "servant David" who shall be "prince" or "king" forever over a reunited people (34:23; 37:24). It is difficult to resist the impression which the language of Ezekiel makes that it is the ideal Messianic ruler who is here predicted, notwithstanding the fact that afterward, in the prophet's vision of the ideal theocracy, not only does the prince play a subordinate part, but provision is made in the constitution for a possible abuse of his authority.

2. Prophetic Moses, or a priest of Aaron's line, and Priestly whose personal features are portrayed in the picture of the future. The promise in Dt 18:15-20, as the context shows, refers to a succession of true prophets as opposed to the diviners of heathen nations. Though Moses passed away there would always be a prophet raised up by Jeh to reveal His will to the people, so that they would never need to have recourse to heathen soothsayers. Yet while the prophet is not an ideal figure, being already fully inspired by the Spirit, prophetic functions are to this extent associated with the kingship, that the Messiah is qualified by the Spirit for the discharge of the duties of His royal office and makes known the will of God by His righteous decisions (Isa 11:2-5).

It is more difficult to define the relationship of the priesthood to the kingship in the final era. They are brought into connection by Jeremiah (30:9-21) and the lifting of the priestly right of immediate access to Jeh, while the Levitical priesthood, equally with the Davidic king-
ship, is assured of perpetuity on the ground of the covenant (Jer 33 18 ff). But after the restoration, when prominence is given to the high priest in the reconstitution of the kingdom, Joshua becomes the type of the coming "Branch" of the Davidic house (Zec 3 8), and assuming the title of "high priest," is described as "the high and mighty priest in the Messiah (Zec 6 11 ff). Many scholars, however, holding that the "branch" and the "counsel of peace shall be between the two" (Isa 41 11; see AV) and substituting "Zerubbabel" for "Joshua" in 11, and read in ver 13, "there shall be a priest upon his right hand" (cf RV, LXX). The prophet's meaning would then be that the Messianic high priest would sit beside the Messianic king in the perfected kingdom, both working together as Zerubbabel and Joshua were then doing. There is no doubt, however, that the Messiah is both king and priest in Psp 10.

The better experiences of the nation during the exile originated a new conception, Messianic in the deepest sense, the Servant of Jeh (Isa 40:6-66; chsly 41:8; 42:1-719; Servant of Jehovah 52:15-53:6). This Servant of Jehovah refers in his splendid delineation of this mysterious being, scholars are hopelessly divided. The personification theory—that the Servant represents the ideal Israel, as God meant it to be, as fulfilling its true vocation in the salvation of the world—is held by those who plead for a consistent use of the phrase throughout the prophecy. They regard it as inconceivable that the same title should be applied by the same prophet to two distinct subjects. Others admit that the chief difficulty in the way of this theory is to conceive it, but they maintain that it best explains the use of the title in the chief passages where it occurs. The other theory is that there is an expansion and contraction of the idea in the mind of the prophet. In some passages the title is used to denote the whole nation; in others it is limited to the pious kernel; and at last the conception culminates in an individual, the ideal yet real Israelite of the future, who shall fulfill the mission in which the nation failed. Many expositors is the interpretation of 52:15-53:6. The question is not whether this passage was fulfilled in Jesus Christ—on this all Christian expositors are agreed—but whether the "Servant" is in the mind of the prophet merely the symbolification of the godly portion of the nation, or a person yet to come.

May not the unity argument be pressed too hard? If the Messiah came to be conceived of as a specific king while the original promise spoke of a dynasty, is it so inconceivable that the title "Servant of Jeh" should be used in an individual as well as in a collective sense? It is worthy of note, too, that not only in some parts of this prophecy, but all through it, the individuality of the sufferer is made prominent; the collective idea entirely disappears. The contrast is not between a faithful portion and the general body of the people, but between the "Servant" and every single member of the nation. Moreover, whatever objections may be urged against the individual interpretation, this view best explains the doctrine of substitution that runs through the whole passage. Israel was Jeh's elect people, His messenger of salvation to the Gentiles, and its faithful remnant suffered for the sins of the mass; even "Emmanuel" shared the sorrows of His people. But here the "Servant" makes atonement for the sins of individual Israelites; by his death they are justified and by his stripes they are healed. To this great spiritual conception only the prophet of the exile attains.

It may be added that in the Suffering Servant, who offers the sacrifice of himself as an expiation for the sins of the people, prophetic activity and kingly honor are associated with the priestly function. After he has been raised from the dead he becomes the great spiritual teacher of the world—by his knowledge of God and salvation which he communicates to others he makes many righteous (53 11; cf 42 1 f; 49 2; 50 4); and as a reward for his sufferings he attains to a position of the highest royal standing (52 15b; 55 12b; cf 49 7).

In the Book of Dnl, written to encourage the Jewish people to steadfastness during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Messianic hope of the prophets assumes a new form. Here the apocalyptic idea of the Messiah appears for the first time in Jewish literature. The coming into the world of the Messianic Israel, as in Av, "like the son of man," comes with the clouds of heaven, and is brought before the ancient of days, and receives an imperishable kingdom, that all peoples should serve him.

Scholars are by no means agreed in their interpretation of the prophecy. In support of the view that the "one like unto a son of man" is a symbol for the ideal Israel, appeal is made to the interpretation given of the vision in vs 18 22 27, according to which it is given to "the saints of the Most High." Further, as the four hundred and twenty years between the exiles, and it would be natural for the higher power, which is to take their place, to be symbolized by the human form. But strong reasons may be urged on the other hand, for the personal Messianic interpretation of the passage. A distinction seems to be made between 'one like unto a son of man' and the saints of the Most High in vs 21, the saints being there represented as the object of persecution from the little horn. The scene of the judgment is earth, where the saints already are, and to which the "one like unto a son of man" descends (vs 22 13). And it is in accordance with the interpretation given of the vision in vs 1-42, that here reference is made to the four kings of the bestial kingdoms, that the kingdom of the saints, which is to be established in their place, should also be represented by a kingdom.

It may be noted that a new idea is suggested by this passage, the preexistence of the Messiah before His manifestation.

II. The Messiah in the Pre-Christian Age.—After prophetic inspiration ceased, there was little in the teaching of the scribes, or in the reconstitution of the kingdom under the rule of the high priests, to quicken the ancient hope of the nation. It would appear from the Apoc that while the elements of the general expectation were still cherished, the specific hope of a perfect king of David's line has grown very dim in the consciousness of the people. In Eccl (47 11) mention is made of a "covenant of kings and a throne of glory in Israel which the Lord gave unto David"; yet even this allusion to the event in the line of the Davidic dynasty is more of the nature of a historical statement than the expression of a confidant hope.

In the earlier stages of the Maccabean uprising, when the struggle was for religious freedom, the people looked for help in the line of David, and would probably have been content to acknowledge the political supremacy of Syria after liberty had been granted them in 162 BC to worship God according to their own law and ceremonial. But the successful effort of the Maccabean leaders
in achieving political independence, while it satisfied the aspirations of the people generally ‘until this man shall arise and humble his nation’ (1 Mac 14 41; cf 2 57), brought religious and national ideals into conflict. The “Pious” (ḥāṣidīm), under the new name of Pharisees, now became more than ever devoted to the Law, and repudiated the claim of a Messiah (13:10) to be a king (15:1). It is evident that his subsequent assumption of the royal title, while the Maccabees with their political ambitions took the side of the aristocracy and alienated the people. The national spirit, however, had been stirred into fresh life. Nor did the hope thus quickened lose any of its vitality where amid the strife of factions and the quarrels of the ruling family, Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 BC. The fall of the Hasmonaeus house, even more than its ascendancy, led the nation to set its hope more firmly on God and to look for a deliverer of Judah.

The national sentiment evoked by the Maccabees finds expression in the Apocalyptic lit. of the century and a half before Christ.

3. Apocalyptic Literature

In the oldest parts of the 2 Hr Or (7 85) there occurs a brief prediction of a king whom God shall send from the sun, to cause the whole earth to escape from wicked war, killing some and exacting faithful oaths from others. And this he will do, not according to his own counsel, but in obedience to the benevolent decrees of God.” And in a later part of the same book (9 3) there is an allusion to “a pure king who will exalt the sceptre over the whole earth for ever.” It may be the Messiah also who is represented in the earlier part of the Book of Enoch (80 37 f) as a glorified man under the symbol of a white bull with great horns, which is feared and worshiped by all the other animals (the rest of the religious community) and into whose likeness they are transformed.

But it is in the Ps Sol, which were composed in the Pompeian period and reveal their Pharisaic origin by representing the Hasmonaeans as a race of usurpers, that we have depicted in clear outline and glowing colors the portrait of the Davidic king (Ps Sol 17 18). The author looks for a personal Messiah who, as son of David and king of Israel, will reconcile Israel and gather together a holy people who will all be the “sons of their God.” He shall not conquer with earthly weapons, for the Lord Himself is his king; he shall smite the earth with the breath of his mouth; and the heathen of the ancient world shall worship and obey the weariest children of Israel as gifts. His throne shall be established in wisdom and justice, while he himself shall be pure from sin and made strong in the Holy Spirit.

That in these descriptions of the coming one we have something more than a mere revival of the ancient hope of a preeminent king of David’s house. The repeated disasters that overtook the Jews led to the transference of the national hope to a future world, and consequently to the transformation of the Messiah from a mere earthly king into a being with supernatural attributes. That this supernatural apocalyptic hope, which was at least coming to be cherished, exercised an influence on the national hope is seen in the Ps Sol, where emphasis is laid on the striking individuality of this Davidic king, the moral grandeur of his person, and the Divine character of his rule.

We meet with the apocalyptic conception of the Messiah in the Similitudes of Enoch (chs 37-71) and the later apocalypses. Reference may be made at this point to the Similitudes on account of their unique expression of Messianic doctrine, although Christ’s doctrine differs not later than 64 BC, is much disputed. The Messiah who is called “the Anointed,” “the Elect one,” “the Righteous one,” is represented, though in some sense man, as belonging to the heavenly world. His preexistence is affirmed. He is the supernatural Son of Man, who will come forth from heaven to judge the living and the dead, and to display the glory of His glory, and dwell on a transformed earth with the righteous forever. For further details in the conceptions of this period, see Apocalyptic Literature (Jewish); Eschatology of the OT.

III. The Messiah in the NT

To the prevalence of the Messianic hope among the Jews in the time of Christ the Gospel records bear ample testimony. We see from the question of the Baptist that “the coming one” was expected (Mt 1 13 and Lk 3 15), while the people wondered whether John himself was the Christ (Lk 3 15).

1. The Messiah as king.—In the popular conception the Messiah was chiefly the royal son of David who would bring victory and prosperity to the Jewish nation and set up His throne in Jerusalem. In this conception capacity the multitude hailed Jesus on His entry into the capital (Mt 21 9 and Lk 19; cf 21 9 and Lk 19); to the Pharisees also the Messiah was the son of David (Mt 22 42). It would seem that apocalyptic elements mingled with the national expectation, for it was supposed that the Messiah would come forth suddenly from concealment and attest Himself by miracles (Jn 7 27-31).

But there was no “messianic mind and vision” that interpreted the nation’s hope, not in any conventional sense, but according to their own devout aspirations. Looking for “the consolation of Israel,” “the redemption of Jerusalem,” they seized upon the spiritual features of the Messianic kingdom and recognized in Jesus the promised Saviour who would deliver the nation from its sins (Lk 2 25 30; cf 1 68-70).

(2) His prophetic character.—From the statements in the Gospels regarding the expectation of a prophet it is clear that the prophetic function was regarded as belonging to the Messiah. We learn not only that one of the old prophets was expected to reappear (Mt 16 14; Lk 18 14 and Jn 1 16), but also that a preeminent prophet was looked for, distinct from the Messiah (Jn 1 21 25; 7 40 f). But the two conceptions of prophet and king seem to be identified in Jn 6 14 f, where we are told that the multitude, after recognizing in Jesus the expected prophet, wished to take Him by force and make Him a king while the masses were looking forward to a temporal king, the expectations of some were molded by the image and promise of Moses. And to the woman of Samaria, as to her people, the Messiah was expected to come as a man of Divine knowledge into the world (Jn 4 25). On the other hand, from Philip’s description of Jesus we would naturally infer that he saw in Him whom he had found of the prophet like unto Moses and the Messianic king of the prophetical books (Jn 1 45).

(3) The title “Son of God.”—It cannot be doubted that the “Son of God” was used as a Messianic title by the Jews in the time of Our Lord. The high priest in presence of the Sanhedrin recognized it as such (Mt 26 63). It was applied also in its official sense to Jesus by His disciples: John the Baptist (Jn 1 34, Nathanael (1 49), Mary (11 27), Peter (Mt 16 16, though not in Lk). This Messianic use was based on Ps 2 7; cf 25 7 14. The title as given to Jesus by Peter in his confession, “the Son of the living God,” is suggestive of something higher than a mere official dignity, although its full significance in the unique sense in which Jesus claimed it has scarcely been apprehended by the disciples till after His resurrection.

(1) His claim.—The claim of Jesus to be the Messiah is written on the face of the evangelic history. But while He accepted the title, He stripped
it of its political and national significance and filled it with an ethical and universal content. The assumption of the great king who would restore the throne of David and free the nation from a foreign yoke was interpreted by Jesus as of one who would deliver God's people from their spiritual foes and found a universal kingdom of love and peace.

(2) His delay in making it.—To prepare the Jewish mind for His transformation of the national hope Jesus delayed putting forth His claim before the time when His triumphal entry into Jerusalem would be thought of as a way to justify His interpretation of the Messiah of the prophets, while He delayed emphasizing it to His disciples till the memorable scene at Caesarea Philippi when He drew forth Peter's confession of Him.

(3) "The Son of Man."—But He sought chiefly to secure the acceptance of Himself in all His loveliness as the true Messianic king by His later use of His self-designation as the "Son of Man." While "Son of Man in Aram., בנו נאמו," may mean simply "man," an examination of the chief passages in which the title occurs shows that Jesus applied it to Himself in a unique sense. That He had the passage in Dn in His mind is evident from the phrase He employs in describing His future coming (Mt 8:18; 13:36 and ]; 14:62 and ]). By this apocalyptic use of the title He put forward much more clearly His claim to be the Messiah of national expectation who would come in heavenly glory. But He used the title also to announce the tragic destiny that awaited Him (Mt 8:31). This He could do without any contradiction, as He regarded His death as the beginning of HisMessianic reign. And those passages in which He refers to the Son of Man giving His life a ransom for many (Mt 20:28 and ]] and going "as it is written of Him" (Mt 26:24 and []), as well as Lk 22:37, indicate that He interpreted Isa 53 of Himself in His Messianic character. By His death He would complete His Messianic work and inaugurate the kingdom of God. Thus by the help of the title "Son of Man" Jesus sought, toward the close of His ministry, to explain the seeming contradiction between His earthly life and the glory of His Messianic kingship.

It may be added that Our Lord's use of the phrase indicates that He was influenced by the "Son of Man," notwithstanding the references in Dn and the Similitudes of Enoch (if the pre-Christian date be accepted), was not regarded by the Jews generally as a Messianic title. For He could not then have applied it, as He does, to Himself before Peter's confession, while maintaining His reserve in regard to His claims to be the Messiah. Many scholars, however, hold that the "Son of Man" was already a Messianic title before Our Lord employed it in His conversation with the disciples at Caesarea Philippi, and regard the earlier passages in which it occurs as inserted out of chronological order, or the presence of the title in them either as a late insertion, or as due to the ambiguity of the Aramaic. See SON OF MAN.

The thought of a suffering Messiah who would come for sin was alien to the Jewish mind. This is evident from the conduct, not only of the opponents, but of the followers of Jesus (Mt 16:22; 17:23). While He alluded to the suffering of Messiah, they could not understand His allusions to His sufferings, and regarded His death as the extinction of all their hopes (Lk 18:34; 24:21). But after His resurrection, when they were led, by the impression His personality and teaching had made upon them, to see how entirely they had misconceived His Messiahship and the nature and extent of His Messianic kingdom (Lk 24:31; Acts 2:36, 38]). They were confirmed, too, in their spiritual conceptions when they searched into the prophecies in the light of the cross. In the mysterious form of the Suffering Servant they beheld the Messianic king on His way to His heavenly throne, conquering by the power of His atoning and bestowing all spiritual blessings (Acts 3:13-18; 21:26; 4:27; 35; 10:36-43).

(1) Future manifestation.—New features were now added to the Messiah in accordance with Jesus' own teaching. He had ascended to the Father and had ascended to the heavenly Elements. But all things were not yet put under Him. It was therefore seen that the full manifestation of His Messiahship was reserved for the future, that He would return in glory to fulfill His Messianic office and complete His Messianic reign.

(2) Divine personality.—Higher views of His personality were now entertained. He is declared to be the Son of God, not in any official, but in a unique sense, as equal with the Father (Jn 1:1; Rom 1:4; 1 Cor 1:3, etc.). His preexistence is affirmed (Jn 1:1; 2 Cor 8:9); and when He comes again in His Messianic glory, He will exercise the Divine function of Universal Judge (Acts 10:42; 17:30, etc.).

(3) Heavenly priesthood.—The Christian conception of the Messianic king who had entered into His glory through suffering and death carried with it the doctrine of the Messianic priesthood. But it took some time for early Christians to advance from the new discovery of the combination of humiliation and glory in the Messiah to concentrate upon His heavenly life. While the preaching of the first Christians was directed to show from the Scriptures that "Jesus is the Christ" and necessarily involved the ascription to Him of many functions characteristic of the true priest, it was reserved for the author of the Ep. to the Hebrews to set forth this aspect of His work with separate distinctness and to apply to Him the title of our "great high priest" (He 4:14). As the high priest on the Day of Atonement not only sprinkled the blood upon the altar, but offered the sacrifice, so it was now seen that by passing into the heavens and presenting to God the work of Jesus, He, as God, the earth, Jesus had fulfilled the high-priestly office.

Thus the ideal of the Heb prophets and poets is amply fulfilled in the person, teaching and work of Jesus of Nazareth. Apologists may often seek support from prophecy by an extravagant symbolism and a false exegesis; but they are right in the contention that the essential elements in the OT conception—the Messianic king who stands in a unique relation to Jehovah as His "Son," and who will exercise universal dominion; the supreme prophet who will never be superseded; the priest forever—are gathered up and transformed by Jesus in a way the ancient seers never dreamed of. As the last and greatest prophet, the suffering Son of Man, and the sinless Saviour of the world, He meets humanity's deepest longings for Divine knowledge, human sympathy, and spiritual deliverance; and as the unique Son of God, who came to reveal the Father, He rules over the hearts of men by the might of eternal love. No wonder that the NT writers, like Jesus Himself, saw references to the Messiah in OT passages which would not be conceded by a historical interpretation. On the place of the prophecy, in the history of salvation, they sought to discover in the light of the fulfilment in Jesus the meaning of the OT which the Spirit of God intended to con-
The Divine, saying "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Rev 19:10). To Him, hidden in the bosom of the ages, all the scattered rays of prophecy pointed; and from Him, in His revealed and risen splendor, shine forth upon the world the light and power of God's name and truth. The copper ore and tin bronze. Because of the difficulties in getting it separated from its compounds, iron was the last in the list to be employed. In regard to the sources of these metals in Bible times we have few Bib. references to guide us. Some writers point out that certain formulas are "for those who refer to Pal."

**LITERATURE—Drummond, The Jewish Messiah; S. S. Shellabear, Dr. D. & the Christian Messiah; Behm, Messianic Prophecy; Delitzsch, Messianic Prophecies; v. Delitzsch, A.B. Davidson, OT Prophecy; A. B. Davidson, OT Theology; Schurer, H.T.P., div. II, vol. II, sec. 29. "The Messianic Hope"; Westcott, Intro to the Study of the Gospels, ch. II. "The Jewish Doctrine of Messiah"; Ebers, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, ch. v. What Jesus said and did; the Jews Express; J. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah; Fairweather, The Background of the Gospels; arts. in DB, HDB, EB, DC6. For further list see Behm and Schurer; see also Apocalyptic Literature.

James Crichton

**METAL, met' al (ῥέγμαν, ἡσαθνάλ; ῥέκτορος, ἀκτρόν; AV amber; Ezek 8:2, RVm "amber").** The substance here intended is a matter of great uncertainty. In Egypt bronze was called k̄esmen, which may be connected with the Heb. hashmal; the Romans had a red-metal in their alloy of gold or silver or other metals, but this is far from certain. Professor Ridgeway (EB, I, cols. 134-36) has conclusively shown, however, that amber was well known in early times and that there is nothing archaeologically improbable in the reading of Ezek.

Amber is a substance analogous to the vegetable resins, and is in all probability derived from extinct coniferous trees, some of them perhaps being obtained by the ancients from the coasts of the Baltic where it is still found more plentifully than elsewhere. A red amber has been found in South Europe and in Phoenicia. From earliest times amber has been prized as an ornament; Homer apparently refers to it twice. Amber brooches and ornaments of amber are highly prized by the Orientals;—esp. Jews—today, and they are credited with medicinal properties. See ELECTRUM; STONES, PRECIOUS.

E. W. G. Masterman

**METALLURGY, met' al-ur'ji:** There are numerous Bib. references which allude to or allude to the various metallurgical operations. In Job 28:1 occurs ρήγμα, ἀθάνατος, "refine," "refine," "refine." This undoubtedly refers to the process of separating the gold from the earthy material as pictured in the Egyptian sculptures (Thebes and Beni Hassan) and described by Diodorus. The ore was first crushed to the size of lentils and then ground to powder in a handmill made of granite slabs. This powder was spread upon a slightly inclined stone table and water was poured upon it in order to wash away the earthy materials. The comparatively heavy gold particles were then gathered from the table, dried, and melted in a closed crucible with lead, salt and bran, and kept in a molten condition 5 days, at the end of which time the gold came out pure. The alloying of gold and silver with copper, lead or tin, and then removing the base metals by cupellation is used figuratively in Ezek 22:22 to denote the coming judgment of Jeh. Again in Is 44:12 it indicates chastening. The fact that the prophets used this figure shows that the people were familiar with the common metallurgical operations. See REFINER.

James A. Patch

**METALS, met' al; (Lat. metallum, "metal," "mine"); Gr. μετάλλον, metallon, "mine").** The metals known by the ancients were copper, gold, iron, lead, silver and tin. Of these copper, gold and silver were probably first used, because, occurring in a metallic state, they could be separated easily from earthy materials by mechanical processes. Evidence is abundant of the use of these metals by the earliest antiquity. Lead and tin were later separated from their ores. Tin was probably used in making bronze before it was known as a separate metal, because the native oxide, cassiterite, was smelted together with the copper ore to get bronze. Because of the difficulties in getting it separated from its compounds, iron was the last in the list to be employed. In regard to the sources of these metals in Bible times we have few Bib. references to guide us. Some writers point out that certain formulas are "for those who refer to Pal."

In the Anti-Lebanon and Northern Syria, esp. in the country E. of Aleppo now open up by the Bagdad Railroad and its branches, there are abundant deposits of copper. This must have been the land of Nuhahse referred to in the Am Tab. If we are to believe the OT, copper is the ore that was smelted in the time of Moses; if this is doubted, then the last-mentioned source was probably the one referred to. No doubt Cyprus (Alasia in Am Tab) furnished the ancients with much copper, as did also the Sinaite peninsula.

Tarshish (2 K 10:22) was a source of silver, iron, tin, and lead. This name may belong to Southern Spain. If so it corresponds to the general belief that the Phoenicians brought a considerable proportion of the metals used in Pal from that country. The names of the mines are still remembered. The large deposits of copper, lead, gold and silver, which are known from the Roman times and are mentioned as sources of gold, were probably probably refer to districts of Arabia. Whether Arabia produced all the gold or simply passed it on from more remote sources is a question (see Golds).

From the monuments in Egypt we learn that that country was a producer of gold and silver. In fact, the ancient mines and the ruins of the miners' huts are still to be seen in the desert regions of upper Egypt. In the Sinaite peninsula are deposits of copper, lead, gold, and silver. The track of the ancient Egyp mines are situated here (J. Sarabit el Khadim, U. Sidr, W. Maghara). The early Egypt kings (Suemun, Amenemhat II, and others) not only mined the metals, but cut on the walls of their mines inscriptions of the methods of mining. Here, as in upper Egypt, are remains of the buildings where miners lived or carried out their metallurgical operations. It is hardly to be conceived that the large deposits of lead (galena) in Asia Minor were unworked by the ancients. No richer deposits of tin than those of Southern Europe have yet been found. (For further background on metals see separate articles.)

James A. Patch

**METAL WORKING.** See CRAFTS, 10; MINING.

METE, mé'te (מַדָּח, madhath): "To measure," either with a utensil of dry measure, as in Ex 16:18, or to measure with a line or measure of length, as in Ps 60:6; 106:7; Isa 40:12. In Is 18:2,7 it is the rendering of ká̂, which is used for a measuring line, referring to the Ethiopians as a nation that measured off other peoples for destruction and trod them down, as in RV. It is regarded by some as signifying strength, being cognate with the Arab. کَوَف, "strong." For metot
METERS, mē-tēr'us. See Baiterus.

METEYARD, mēt-'yārd (תַּמְרָד, middāh, "a measure," Lev 19:35); Has this meaning in AV and RV, but in ARV, "measures of length."

MEHEG-AMMAH, mē-heg-ām'a, meth-eg-am'a (תְּמֵה-אָמָה, methheg há-amāh, "bride of the metropolis"); LXX ἁγιερομητρής, ἡ ἁγιερομήτρης); It is probable that the place-name M. in 2 S 8:1 AV should be rendered as in RV, "the bride of the mother city," i.e., Gath, since we find in the passage in 1 Ch 18:1 ἠγιερομητρής, gath ἀββᾶ-μεθη, "Gath and her daughters," i.e., daughter towns. The LXX has an entirely different reading: "and David took the tribute out of the hand of the Philistines," showing that they had a different text from what we now have in the Heb. The text is evidently corrupt. If a place is intended its site is unknown, but it must have been in the Philistine plain and in the vicinity of Gath. H. Porter

METHUSELAL, mē-thūsē-lā, See Methuselah.

METHUSELALH, mē-thūsē-lā, me-thūsē-la (תְּמֶשֶּל, mēšēlaḥ, "man of the javelin"): A descendant of Seth, the son of Enoch, and father of Lamech (Gen 5:21 ff; 1 Ch 1:3; Lk 3:37). Methuselah is said to have lived 969 years; he is therefore the oldest of the patriarchs and the oldest man. It is doubtful whether these long years do not include the duration of a family or clan.

METHUSELAH, mē-thūsē-lāh, me-thūsē-laḥ (תְּמֶשֶּלָה, mēšēlah; "man of the javelin"): A descendant of Cain, and father of Lamech in the Cainite genealogy (Gen 4:18). The meaning of the name is doubtful. Dillmann suggested "suppliant or man of God."

MEUNIM, mē-u-nīm (AV Meunim). See MAON.

MEUZAL, mē-u'-zāl (מְאָצָל, mē'āzāl, or מְאָצ, mē'āz); A word which occurs only in AVs of Ezk 27:19. The rendering in AV text is "going to and fro," in RV text "with yawn," but in BVs, in agreement with BDB and most modern authorities, Meual is regarded as a proper noun with a prefixed preposition, and is rendered "from Usal." See Usal.

ME-ZAHAB, me'-zā-hab, me-zā-hab (מְצָה-ב, mē'zā-hab, "waters of gold"); B. Ma'zehah, Mezob; A. Mezob, Mezob): Grandfather of Mehetabel, the wife of Hadar, the last-mentioned "duke" of Edom descended from Esau (Gen 36:39). The Jewish commentators made much play with this name. Abarbanel, e.g., says he was "rich and great, so that on this account he was called Mezahab, for the gold was in his house as water." The name, however, may denote a place, in which case it may be identical with Dizahab.

MEZARIM, mes'-ə-rīm (NORTH). See Astronomy, II, 13, (1).

MEZOBAITE, mē-zō'-bā-it (מְצֹבֵי, ha-mēzōbhēyāth); The designation of Jaasiel, one of David's heroes (1 Ch 11:47).

MIAMIN, mī'-a-min. See MIAMIN; MINIMIN.

MIIBHAR, mīb-hār (מִיבָר, mībhar, "choice"): According to 1 Ch 11:38, the name of one of David's heroes. No such name, however, occurs in the passage (2 S 23:36). A comparison of the two records makes it probable that mībhar is a corruption of meṣūbbāh = "from Zobah," which completes the designation of the former name, Nathan of Zobah. The concluding words of the verse, Ben-Hagri = "the son of Haggi," will then appear as a misreading of Bani ha-gadāh = "Bani, the Gadite," thus bringing the two records into accord.

MIBSAM, mīb-sām (מִיבָסָם, mībsām, "perfume"?):
(1) A son of Ishmael (Gen 26:13; 1 Ch 1:29).
(2) A Simeonite (1 Ch 4:25).

MIBZAR, mīb-zār (מִיבָצָר, mībhar, "a fortress"): An Edomite chief, AV "duke" (Gen 36:42; 1 Ch 1:53). The text according to Eusebius, Mibzar is connected with Mibsara, a considerable village subject to Petra and still existing in his time. Cf Holzinger and Skinner in respective comm. on Gen.

MICA, mī'ka (מִיכָה, mīkhā), "a variant of the name Micah, and probably like it a contracted form of Mīkah (q.v.). In AV it is sometimes spelled "Mica."

(1) A son of Merib-baal or Mephibosheth (2 S 9:12, AV "Miah"). In 1 Ch 8:34, he is called "Miah."
(2) The son of Zichri (1 Ch 9:15). In Neh 11:17 (AV "Micha"), he is designated "the son of Zabdi," and in Neh 12:35, his name appears as "Micaiah [AV "Michaiah"]; the son of Zaccur."
(3) One of the signatories of the Covenant (Neh 10:11, AV "Mica").

MICAH, mī'kā (מִיכָה, mekhāh, contracted from נִיכֶה, nikēh, "who is like Jeh"?): B. Meixâas, Meixahas, A. Miex, Micha; sometimes in AV spelled "Miahah"

(1) The chief character of an episode given as an appendix to the Book of Jgs (Jgs 17:18). Micah, a dweller in Mt. Ephraim, was the founder and owner of a small private sanctuary with accessories for worship (17:1–5), for which he hired as priest the Judahite Levite (17:7–13). Micah's abode, in quest of new territory by the Danites, who had failed to secure a settlement upon their own tribal allotment, visited Micah's shrine, and obtained from his priest an oracle favoring their quest (18:1–6). They then went on until they reached the town of Laish in the extreme N., and deeming it suitable for their purpose, they returned to report to their fellow-tribesmen. These at once dispatched thither 600 armed men, accompanied by their families (18:7–12). Passing Micah's abode, they appropriated his idols and his priest, and when their owner pursued, he was insulted and threatened (18:13–26). They took Laish, destroyed it with its inhabitants and rebuilt it under the name of Dan. There they established the stolen images, and appointed Micah's Levite, Jonathan, a grandson of Moses (AV "Manasseh"), priest of the new sanctuary, which was long famous in Israel (18:27–31).

The purpose of the narrative is evidently to set forth the origin of the Danite shrine and priesthood. A few peculiarities in the story have led some critics—e.g., Moore, "Judges," in ICC and "Judges" in SBOT; Budde, Richter—to regard it as composite. Wellhausen, however, considers that the peculiarities are editorial and have been introduced for the purpose of smoothing or explaining the ancient record. Most authorities are agreed that the story is nearly contemporary with the events which it narrates, and that it is of the highest value for the study of the
MICAH (מְיָח, mīyāḥ; מיכה, Mīkha; an abbreviation for Micah) [Jehovah has loved], the third major prophet, and one of the twelve minor prophets. Born in the city of Moresheth of Gath (2 Ch 23:15), he prophesied during the reigns of Josiah, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, the last three kings of Judah.

1. Name. Micah, son of Numah (Mic 1:1) and descendant of the Lachishite Levite (1 Ch 27:21; 2 Ch 24:1 ff). Micah was a Levite (1 Chr 23:15) and a Levite of the Kohathites (1 Ch 5:1). He is also referred to as a man of the tribe of Zebulun (Mic 1:1). Micah is also referred to as a Levite of the Kohathites (1 Ch 23:15). Micah was a Levite of the Kohathites (1 Ch 23:15). Micah was a Levite of the Kohathites (1 Ch 23:15).

2. Time of Prophecy. Micah prophesied in the days of kings Ahaz and Hezekiah (Mic 1:1). Micah lived in the time of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah (Mic 1:1). Micah lived in the time of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah (Mic 1:1). Micah lived in the time of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah (Mic 1:1). Micah lived in the time of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah (Mic 1:1).

3. Character and Style of Prophecy. Micah's prophetic style is characterized by his use of metaphor and symbol, as well as his emphasis on social justice and moral reform. Micah's prophecies are known for their vivid imagery and concise, direct language. Micah's prophecies are known for their vivid imagery and concise, direct language. Micah's prophecies are known for their vivid imagery and concise, direct language. Micah's prophecies are known for their vivid imagery and concise, direct language. Micah's prophecies are known for their vivid imagery and concise, direct language.

4. Contents. Micah's prophecies are divided into two main sections: the Early Prophecies (chs 1-3) and the Late Prophecies (chs 4-5). The Early Prophecies (chs 1-3) deal with the impending Babylonian exile and the subsequent return of the people of Judah. The Late Prophecies (chs 4-5) focus on the future of the people of Judah and the establishment of a new covenant with God.

5. Form and Style. Micah's prophecies are marked by their simplicity and directness, as well as their use of metaphor and symbolism. Micah's prophecies are marked by their simplicity and directness, as well as their use of metaphor and symbolism. Micah's prophecies are marked by their simplicity and directness, as well as their use of metaphor and symbolism. Micah's prophecies are marked by their simplicity and directness, as well as their use of metaphor and symbolism. Micah's prophecies are marked by their simplicity and directness, as well as their use of metaphor and symbolism.

6. Influence and Legacy. Micah's prophecies have had a significant influence on Judaism and Christianity. The Book of Micah is considered one of the most important works of biblical prophecy, and its messages of social justice and personal holiness continue to be relevant today. The Book of Micah is considered one of the most important works of biblical prophecy, and its messages of social justice and personal holiness continue to be relevant today. The Book of Micah is considered one of the most important works of biblical prophecy, and its messages of social justice and personal holiness continue to be relevant today. The Book of Micah is considered one of the most important works of biblical prophecy, and its messages of social justice and personal holiness continue to be relevant today. The Book of Micah is considered one of the most important works of biblical prophecy, and its messages of social justice and personal holiness continue to be relevant today.
A. VON ORELLI

MICIAH, mî-kî'ya, mî-kî'a (םִּקַּיָּה, "who is like Jeh!"); Mic'ayâs, Mîchælas): A frequently occurring OT name occasionally contractible to Mîca or Mîcâh (q.v.). In AV it is usually spelled "Micah."  

(1) The mother of Abijah (2 Ch 13 2, AV "Micah"). The | passage (1 K 15 2; cf 2 Ch 11 20) indicates that Micahiah here is a corruption of Maacah (q.v.) (so LXX).  

(2) The father of Ashbor (2 K 22 12, AV "Micah"). See Micah, (5).  

(3) A prince of Judah sent by Jehoshaphat to teach in the cities of Judah (2 Ch 17 7, AV "Micah").  

(4) The son of Zacur, a priestly processionist at the dedication of the wall (Neh 12 35, AV "Micah").  

(5) A priestly processionist at the dedication of the wall (Neh 12 41; wanting in LXX).  

(6) The canonical prophet. See Micah, (7), and special article.  

(7) The son of Imlah, the chief character of an important episode near the end of the reign of Ahab (1 K 22 4 38; 2 Ch 18 13 27). In the Heb. his name appears once in the contracted form "Miah" (2 Ch 18 14). Ahab had suggested to his visitor, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, that they should undertake a joint campaign against Ramoth-gilead. Jehoshaphat here politely declined, but asked that the mind of Jeh should first be ascertained. Ahab forthwith summoned the official prophets, to the number of 400, into the royal presence. Obsequious to their master, they, both by oracular utterance and by the symbolic action of their leader, Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, gave the king a favorable answer. Their ready chorus of assent seems to have made Jehoshaphat suspicious, for he pleaded that further guidance be sought. Micah, for whom Ahab, then, with evident relish at first, at last repeated the favorable response of the 400; but adjured by the king to speak the whole truth, he dropped his ironical tone, and in sad earnest described a vision of disaster. Ahab endeavored to lessen the effect of this oracle by pettishly complaining that Micahiah was always to him a prophet of evil. The latter thereupon related an impressive vision of the heavenly court, whence he had seen a lying spirit dispatched by Jeh to the prophets in order to bring about Ahab's delusion and downfall. His answer to a public challenge from Zedekiah, who acted as spokesman for the 400, Micahiah confidently appealed to the issue for proof of the truth of his prediction, and was promptly committed to prison by the king.

The narrative is exceedingly vivid and of the utmost interest to students of Israelish prophecy. Several of its details have given rise to divergent questions: How far were the prophet's visions objective? How far did he admit the inspiration of his opponents? Is the Divine action described by the holy character of Jeh? have occasioned difficulty to many. But their difficulty arises largely either because of their Christian viewpoint, or because of their lack of mechanical theory of prophetic inspiration. Micahiah's position was a delicate one. For the sake of his country, disaster, he did his best to avert it. This he could only do by warning the king from the influence of the 400 time-serving prophets. He sought to gain his end, first, by an ironical aculeus in their favorable answer; then, by a short oracle foretelling disaster esp. to Ahab; and, these means having failed, by discarding in the most solemn manner the courtly prophets opposed to him. Thus regarded, his vision, no admission of their equal inspiration: rather is it an emphatic declaration that these men were uttering falsehood in Jeh's name, thereby endangering their country's safety and their king's life. Their obsequious time-service made them at forersome of the false prophets denounced by Jeremiah (Jer 23 9 40) and by Ezekiel (Ezk 13 15). The frank anthropomorphism of the vision need be no stumbling-block if allowed to drop into its proper place as the literary device of a prophet intensely conscious of his own inspiration and as whole-heartedly patriotic as those opposed to him.

The record ends very abruptly, giving no account of Micahiah's vindication when at length the course of events brought about the fulfilment of his prediction. The closing words, "Hear, ye peoples, all of you" (1 K 22 28; 2 Ch 18 15), of Mic 1 2, are an evident interpolation by some late scribe who confused the son of Imlah with the contemporary of Isaiah.

For fuller treatment see Eb, Hdb, and comm. on K and Ch.  

JOHN A. LEES

MICE, mls. See Mouse.

MICHA, mî'ka, MICHAIÀ, mî'ka. See Mîca; Micah.

MICHAEL, mîkâ-êl, mîk'el (מִּיכָאֵל, mîkhâ'el), "who is like God?" (Mîchæl, Michael):  

(1) The father of Sethur the Asherite spy (Nu 13 13).  

(2) (3) Two Gadites (1 Ch 5 13 14).  

(4) A name in the genealogy of Asaph (1 Ch 6 40 [Heb 25]).  

(5) A son of Izriaiah of Issachar (1 Ch 7 3).  

(6) A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 16).  

(7) A Manassite who ceded to David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12 20).  

(8) The father of Omri of Issachar (1 Ch 27 18).  

(9) A son of King Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 21 21).  

(10) The father of Zebediah, an exile who returned with Ezra (Ezr 8 5 1 Esd 8 34).  

(11) "The archangel" (Jude ver 9). Probably also the unnamed archangel of 1 Thes 4 16 is Michael. In the OT he is mentioned only by name only in Dnl. He is "one of the chief princes" (Dnl 10 13), the "prince of Israel" (10 21), "the great prince" (12 1); perhaps also, "the prince of the host" (8 11). In all these passages Michael appears as the heavenly patron and champion of Israel; as the watchful guardian of the people of God against all foes earthly or devilish. In the uncanonical apocalyptic writings, however, Jewish angelology is further developed. In them Michael frequently appears and exercises functions similar to those which are ascribed to him in Dnl. He is the first of the "four presences that stand before God"—Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel or Phanuel (En 9 1 40 9). In other apocalyptic books and even elsewhere in En, the number of archangels is given as 7 (En 20 1 7; Tob 12 15; cf also Rev 8 2). Among the many characterizations of Michael the following may be noted: He is "the merciful and long-suffering" (En 40 9 65 2,3).
“the mediator and intercessor” (Asc Isa, Lat VS 9 23; Test. XII P, Levi 5; Dan 6). It is he who opposed the devil in a dispute concerning Moses’ body (Jude verse 9). This passage, according to most modern authorities, is derived from the apocryphal Asm M (see Charles’ ed., 105–10). It is Michael also who leads the angelic armies in the war in heaven against “the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan” (Rev 12 7 ff). According to Charles, the supplanting of the “child” by the archangel is an indication of the Jewish origin of this part of the book.

The earlier Protestant scholars usually identified Michael with the preincarnate Christ, finding support for their view, not only in the juxtaposition of the “child” and the archangel in Rev 12, but also in the attributes ascribed to him in Dn 13 (for a full discussion see Hengstenberg, Offenbarung, I, 611–622, and an interesting survey in English by Dr. Douglas in Fairbairn’s BD).

JOHN A. LEES

MICAH, mī‘kä. See MICAH.

MICHAIAH, mī-kā‘yä, mī-kā‘ä. See MICAIAH.

MICHAL, mī'kāl (מִיכָל, mikhāl, contracted from מִיכָל, mikhā‘el, “Michael” [q.v.]; מִכָּל, Mikhāl, Michāh), Saul’s younger daughter (1 S 14 49), who, falling in love with David after his victory over Goliath (1 S 18 20), was at last, on the payment of double the dowry asked, married to him (1 S 18 27). Her love was soon put to the test. When Saul in his jealousy sent for David, she was quick to discern her husband’s danger, connived at his escape, and not only outwitted and delayed the messengers, but afterward also soothed her father’s jealous wrath (1 S 19 11–17). When David was outlawed and exiled, she was married to Palti or Paltiel, the son of Laish of Gallim (1 S 25 44), but was, despite Palti’s sorrowful protest, forcibly restored to David on his return as king (2 S 3 14–16). The next scene in which she figures indicates that her love had cooled and had even turned to disdain, for after David’s enthusiastic joy and ecstatic dancing before the newly restored Ark of the Covenant, she received him with bitter and scornful mockery (2 S 6 20), and the record closes with the fact that she remained all her life childless (2 S 6 23; cf 2 S 21 8 where Michal is an obvious mistake for Merab). Michal was evidently a woman of unusual strength of mind and decision of character. She manifested her love in an age when it was almost an unheard-of thing for a woman to take the initiative in such a matter. For the sake of the man whom she loved too she braved her father’s wrath and risked her own life. Even her later mockery of David affords proof of her courage, and almost suggests the inference that she had hesitated being treated as a chattel and thrown from one husband to another. The modern reader can scarce withhold from her, if not admiration, at least a slight tribute of sympathy.

JOHN A. LEES

MICHÆAS, mî-kē'ās (MICAES): In 2 Esd 1 39 = the prophet Michah.

MICHMAS, mik-mas (מִכִּמָּס, mikhmas; B, Mîx̄âmās, Machmâs, A, Xîx̄âmâs, Chamâmâs): The form of the name “Michmash” found in Ezr 2 27; Neh 7 31. In 1 Esd 5 21 it appears as MACALON (q.v.).

MICHMASH, mik-mash (מִכִּמָּשׁ, mikhmas; Mîx̄âmash, Machmās): A town in the territory of Benjamin, apparently not of sufficient importance to secure mention in the list of cities given in Josh 18 21 ff. It first appears as occupied by Saul with his 2,000 men, when Jonathan, advancing from Gibeah, smote the Philis garrison in Geba (1 S 13 2). To avenge this injury, the Philis came up in force and pitched in Michmash (ver 5). Saul and Jonathan with 600 men held Geba, which had been taken from the Philis garrison (ver 16). It will assist in making clear the narrative if, at this point, the natural features of the place are described.

PASS OF MICHMASH

Michmash is represented by the mod. Mukhmas, about 7 miles N. of Jerus. From the main road which runs close to the wathered, a valley sloping eastward sinks swiftly into the great gorge of Wady es-Suewinit. The village of Mukhmas stands to the N. of the gorge, about 4 miles E. of the carriage road. The ancient path from Al southward passes to the W. of the village, goes down into the valley by a steep and difficult track, and crosses the gorge by the pass, a narrow defile, with lofty, precipitous crags on either side—the only place where a crossing is practicable. To the S. of the gorge is Geba, which had been occupied by the Philis, doubtless to command the pass. Their camp was probably pitched in a position E. of Mukhmas, where the ground slopes gradually northward from the edge of the gorge. The place is described by Jos as “upon a precipice with three peaks, ending in a small, but sharp and long extremity, while there was a rock that surrounded them like bulwarks to prevent the attack of the enemy” (Art. VI, vi, 2). Conder confirms this description, speaking of it as “a high hill bounded by the precipices of Wady es-Suewinit on the S., rising in three flat but narrow mounds, and communicating with the hill of Mukhmas, which is much lower—by a long and narrow ridge.” The Philis purpose to guard the pass against approach from the S. On the other hand they were not eager to risk an encounter with the badly armed Israelites in a position where superior numbers would be of little advantage. It was while the armies lay thus facing each other across the gorge that Jonathan and his armor-bearer performed their intrepid feat (14 1 ff). See BOZÉ; SÉNEH.

It will be noted that the Philis brought their chariots to Michmash (1 S 13 5). In his ideal picture of the Assyrian advance on Jerus, Isaiah makes the invader lay up his baggage at Michmash so that he might go lightly through the pass (10 28). A company of the men of the town of Michmash (see Mich) returned with Zerubbabel from exile (Ezr 2 27; Neh 7 31). Michmash produced excellent barley. According to the Mish, “to bring barley to Michmash” was equivalent to our Eng. “to carry coal to Newcastle.” Michmash was the seat of government under Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc 9 73).

The modern village is stone-built. There are
rock-cut tombs to the N. Cisterns supply the water. There are foundations of old buildings, arge stones, and a vaulated cistern. W. Ewing

**MICHMEAH**, mîkh’mē-thah (מִכְמֶה, ḫmnkhm’t-hēd; B, 'ɪsâpâw, ḥkmsmâw, A, Ṣâwâb, Mâchnâh): A place named in defining the territory of Ephraim and Manasseh (Josh 16 6; 17 7). It is said to lie "before," i.e. to the E. of Shechem. In the name itself, the meaning of which is obscure, there is nothing to guide us. The presence of the art., however ("the Michmethah"), suggests that it may not be a proper name, but an appellative, applying to some feature of the landscape. Conder suggests the place of Michmethah, which lies to the E. of Naḥalua (Shechem), in which case there may possibly be an echo of the ancient name.

**MICHRIC, mîk’rî (מְכִרִ֥י, mikhērî): A Benjamite dweller in Jerus (1 Ch 9 8).**

**MICH'TAM, mîk’tām. See Psalms.**

**MIDDAY, mîd’dā (מְדַד, mîddîn), mabâchîth ha-yōm, דַּדְךָ, ֹהָךְ, ֹוָךְ, ֹוָךְ, יַמָּּוָּו, hêmârêa mîd’în (Heb mabâchîth ha-yōm) (Neh 8 3) and the Gr hêmârēas mîd’în (Acts 16 12) are strictly the middle of the day, but the Heb ֹוָךְ, ֹוָךְ, ֹוָךְ, meaning "light," hence light or brightness, i.e. the brightest part of the day (1 K 18 29). See Noon.

**MIDDIN, mîd’in (מְדִ֣דִּין, mîddîn; in GB, Atâvâ, ' Ainôn, "springs"): One of the six cities in the wilderness of Judah (Josh 16 61). There are no many possible sites. The Heb name may possibly survive in Kh. Mînîr, a very conspicuous site with many ancient cisterns, overlooking the plateau of the Buke’tâ, above which it towers to a height of 1,000 ft.; it is the Mones Mardes of early Christian pilgrims; the existing remains are Byzantine. It is a site of great natural strength and was clearly once a place of some importance. The Gr reading ' Ainôn, "place of springs," suggests the neighborhood of the extensive oasis of ' Ain Pesakhkâh at the northwest corner of the Dead Sea where there are at Kh. Qumrân remains of buildings and a rock-cut aqueduct. See PEF, III, 210, 212, Sh XVIII.

E. W. G. Masterton

**MIDDLE WALL. See Partition.**

**MIDIAN, mîd’î-an, MIDIANITES, mîd’î-an-îts (מְדִיָאָנִי, mîdyânîn, מְדִיָאָנִי, Mâdyânîn, Mâdyânîn, Mâdyânîn): 1. The Seed Midian was a son of Abraham by his of Abraham concubine Keturah. To him were to the Time born 5 sons, Ephah, Epher, Hanoch, of the Abida and Eldaah (Gen 25 2-4; 1 Judges Ch 1 32 f). Bearing gifts from Abrahaam, he and his brothers, each with his own household, moved off from Isaac into the "east country" (Gen 25 6). The first recorded incident in the history of the tribe is a defeat suffered "in the field of Moab" at the hands of Hadad, king of Edom. Of this nothing beyond the fact is known (36 55; 1 Ch 1 46). The Midianites next appear as merchants traveling from Gilead to Egypt, with "spicery and balm and myrrh," with no prejudice against a turn of slave-dealing (Gen 37 25 f). Moses, on fleeing from Egypt, found refuge in the land of Midian, and became son-in-law of Jethro, the priest of Midian (Ex 2 15 21). In Midian Moses received his commission to Israel in Egypt (4 19). A Midianite, familiar with the desert, acted as guide ("instead of eyes") to the children of Israel in their wilderness wanderings (Nu 10 29 ff). The friendly relations between Israel and Midian, which seem to have prevailed at first, had been ruptured, and we find the elders of Midian acting with those of Moab in calling Balaam to curse Israel (22 4-7). Because of the grievous sin into which they had seduced Israel on the shrewd advice of Balaam, a war of vengeance was made against the Midianites in which five of their chiefs perished; the males were ruthlessly slain, and Balaam also perished (Ex 25 17; 31 2 f). We next hear of Midian as oppressor Israel for 7 years. Along with the Amalekites and the children of the East they swarmed across the Jordan, and their multitude beasts swept up the produce of the earth. Overwhelming disaster fell on this horde at the onset of Gideon's chosen men. In the battle and pursuit there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew sword; their kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, and their princes, Oreb and Zeeb, sharing the common fate (Jdg 6-8). Echoes of this glorious victory—"the day of Midian"—are heard in later lit. (Ps 83 9; 1Sa 9 4; 10 26; Hab 3 7).

The Kenites appear to have been a branch of the Midianites. Jethro could hardly have attained the dignity of the priesthood in Midian had he been of alien blood (Jgs 1 16). 2. The Kenite Branch are named indifferently Ishmaelites and Midianites (Gen 37 25-28 36; Jgs 8 22-24). They must therefore have stood in close relations with the descendants of Hagar's son.

The representations of Midian in Scripture are consistent with what we know of the inmemorable ways of Arabian tribes, now engaged in pastoral pursuits, again as carriers of merchandise, and yet them as freebooters. Such tribes often roam through wide circles. They appear not to have practised circumcision (Ex 4 25), which is now practically universal among the Arabs. The men wore golden ornaments, as do the modern nomads (Jgs 8 24 ff).

The name of "Midian" is not found in Egypt or Assy documents. Delitzsch (Wo lag das Paradies? 384) suggests that Ephah (Gen 25 4) may be identical with Ephata, or the cuneiform inscriptions. If this is correct the references point to the existence of this Midianite tribe in the N. of el-Hujât in the times of Tiglath-pileser and Sargon (745-705 BC). Isaak speaks of Abraham and Ephah apparently as separate tribes, whose dronedaries bear gold and frankincense to Zion (60 6); but he gives no hint of the districts they occupied. The tribe of Ghiçår, found in the neighborhood of Medina in Mohammed's day, Knobel would identify with Ephah, another of Midian's sons.

No boundaries can now be assigned to "the land of Midian." It included territory on the W. as well as on the E. of the Gulf of 'Akaba.

3. Modern Arabs. archaeological studies, e.g. those of the Coptic inscriptions, show that Midian was an important power at a very early date. The site of el-Hujât in the times of Tiglath-pileser and Sargon (745-705 BC). Isaak speaks of Abraham and Ephah apparently as separate tribes, whose dronedaries bear gold and frankincense to Zion (60 6); but he gives no hint of the districts they occupied. The tribe of Ghiçår, found in the neighborhood of Medina in Mohammed's day, Knobel would identify with Ephah, another of Midian's sons.

No boundaries can now be assigned to "the land of Midian." It included territory on the W. as well as on the E. of the Gulf of 'Akaba.

**MIDIANITISH, mîd’î-an-ît-îsh, WOMAN (מְדִיָאָנִי, ho-mîdyânîth, "the Midianites"): The
designated given to the daughter of Zur, Cozbi, whom Zimri the son of Salu brought into the camp of Israel (Nu 25:6–19). Both were of noble parentage (26:15). The majority of the people strongly resented this act of profanation (25:6). A pestilence was raging in the camp, and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, in an outburst of zeal pursued the two delinquents and slew them by a spear-throw through their bodies (25:8). He obtained as a reward the immediate staying of the plague and the promise of perpetual priesthood to his family (25:7–11).
seems to show that this word is purely native, and not Sem., to say nothing of philological objections. This town may, however, have lain in the required direction, according to a scribe’s report of the time of Sest II (or about 1250 BC).

Migran has been created by quoting this report as illustrative of the exodus, the actual words according to Brugsch’s tr may be given (Hist. II, 132): “we set out from the hall of the royal palace on the 9th day of Epiph, in the evening, after the two servants. I arrived at the fort Zechu (7 pia) on the 10th of Epiph. I was informed that we must resolve to take their way toward the S. On the 12th I reached Ked manners. There I was informed that, groves which came from the neighborhood of the “sedge city” reported that the fugitives had already passed the rampart (Amba or wall).” to the S. of the Market of King Soti Minephthah.” As to the position of this “wall see Sura.

C. R. Conder

Migron, mīgrôn (מִגְרֹן, mīgrôn; ἡ Μηγρόν, Mēgroun, Mapōn):
(1) A place in the uttermost part of Geba—which read here instead of Gibeah—marked by a pomegranate tree, where Saul and his 600 men encamped over against the Philis, who were in Michmas (1 S 14 2). Jos describes the distress of Saul and his company as they sat on a hill (bōnūs hupselō) viewing the widespread desolation wrought by the enemy. There is, however, nothing to guide us as to the exact spot. Many suppose that the text is corrupt; but no emendation suggested yields any satisfactory result. The place was certainly S. of Michmas.
(2) (R. Mayeṣṭh, Mageđh, A. Mayeṣṭh, Mageđh): The Migron of Isa 10 28 is mentioned between Aiath (Ai) and Michmas. If the places are there named in consecutive order, this Migron must be sought to the N. of Michmas. It may with some confidence be placed at Makron, a ruined site to the N. of the road leading from Michmas to Ai.

There is nothing extraordinary in two places having the same name pretty close to each other. The two Beth-horons, although distinguished as upper and lower, are a case in point. So also are the two Bethsaisidas. There is therefore no need to try to identify the two with one another, as some (e.g. Robertson Smith in Journal of Philol., XIII, 62 ff) have attempted to do with no success.

W. Ewing

Mijamin, mījš-min (מִיָּשָׁם, mīyā́šm; AV Miamia):
(1) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ex 16 25). He is also called Mæclus (1 Esd 26). (2) The one to whom fell the lot for the 6th priestly course (1 Ch 24 9). His family returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (Neh 12 5).

(3) A signatory of the Covenant (Neh 10 7).

Mikloth, mīk’loth (מְכַלֵּת, miklōṯ):
(1) A Benjamite, son of Jeiel (1 Ch 8 32; 9 37-38). A comparison of the two passages shows that the name Mikloth has been dropped at the end of 1 Ch 8 31.

(2) An officer designated “the ruler,” appointed in the priestly course for the 2st month (1 Ch 27 4).

Mikneia, mīk-ne’ya, mīk-n’a (מִקְנֵיה, mīkne’iḥ; mīkneḥaḥ): A Levite doorkeeper (1 Ch 15 18).

Milaia, mil-λα’i, mil’a-li (μίλαλα, mlalal): A Levite musician (Neh 12 38).

Milcah, mil’ka (מִלְכַּה, milḵa; ἡ Μηλκά, Mēlkā; Melcha, Melchah):
(1) Daughter of Haran, wife of Nahor, and grandmother of Rebekah (Gen 11 29; 22 20-23; 24 5,24-47).

(2) Daughter of Zelophehad (Nu 26 35; 27 1; 36 11; Josh 17 3). Many recent authorities are of opinion that Milcah is an abbreviation of Bethmilcah, and is a geographical rather than a personal name.

Milcom, mil’kom, mil’kōm. See Molech.

Mildew, mil’dw (מִילֶד, mil’d); LXX usually tɛrɛpɔs, ɛtɛrɛos, lit. “jaundiced”): In the 5 passages where it occurs it is associated with shidâdphôn, “blasting” (Dt 28 22; 1 K 8 37; 2 Ch 6 28; Am 4 9; Hag 2 17). In Jer 30 6, the same word is translated “pale,” but the “yellow color of one with abdominal disease. The root-meaning is “greenish yellow”; of the Arab. يَرَحُونَ, yarḥon, meaning both “jaundice” and “blight.” Mildew or “rust” in corn is due to a special fungus, Puccina graminis, of the same order as the potato fungus. It is a generic term which may be used as a substitute for the name of any particular fungus. It is a common name for the disease which affects the leaves of many plants. E. W. G. Masterman

Mile, mil (μῖλος, milion, Lat mille pæsæ, milia passuum): A thousand paces, equal to 1,618 Eng. yds. (Mt 5 41). See Weights and Measures.

Miletus, mil-le’tus (Μῆλετος, Milëtus): A famous early Ionian Gr city on the coast of Caria, near the mouth of the Meander River, which, according to Acts 20 15—21 1, and 2 Tim 4 20 (AV “Mileyum”), Paul twice visited. In the earliest times it was a prominent trading post, and it is said that 75 colonies were founded by its merchants. Among them were Abydos, Cyzicus and Sinope. In 494 BC, the city was taken by the Persians; it was recovered by Alexander the Great, but after his time it rapidly declined, yet it continued to exist until long after the Christian era. In the history of early Christianity it plays but a little part. The Meander brings down a considerable amount of silt which it has deposited at its mouth, naturally altering the coast line. The gulf into which the river flows has thus been nearly filled with the deposit. In the ancient gulf stood a little island called Lade; the island now appears as a mound in the marshy marshland, and the modern village which stands on the site of Miletus, is 6 miles from the coast. Without taking into account the great changes in the coast line it would be difficult to understand Acts 20 15—21, for in the days of Paul, Ephesus, a city of 20,000, could be reached from Miletus by land only by making a long détour about the head of the gulf. To go directly from one of these cities to the other, one would have been obliged to cross the gulf by boat and then continue by land. This is what Paul’s messenger probably did. The direct journey may now be made by land. Miletus has been so ruined that its plan can no longer be made out. Practically the only remaining object of unusual interest is the theater, the largest in Asia Minor, which was not far from a hollow of the hillside, as most ancient theaters were, but in the open field.

E. J. Banks

Milk, milk (מִלֶק, halâh; γάλα, Gall; Lat lac [2 Esd 3 19; 8 10]): The fluid secreted by the mammary glands of female mammals for the nourishment of their young. The word is used in the Bible of that of human beings (Isa 28 9) as well as of that of the lower animals (Ex 25 18). As it is rankled next in importance (20-31) Ps frequently described as a land “flowing with milk and honey” (Ex 3 8 17; Nu 13 27; Dt 6 3; Jos 6 5; Je 11 5; Ezk 20 6-15). Milk was among the first things set before the weary traveler (Gen 18 5). In fact, it was considered a luxury (Jgs 8 25; Cant 8 1). The people used of kin
and also that of sheep (Dt 32 14), and esp. that of goats (Ex 27 27). It was received in units (21 16; Job 21 24), and kept in leather bottles (21 18), Jgs 4 19), where it turned sour quickly in the warm climate of Pal before being poured out thickly like a melting substance (nāḥakh; cf Job 10 4). Cheese of various kinds was made from it (gbérēk and hārdel ko-hālākh, lit. “cuts of milk”); or the curds (ben ‘ād) were eaten with bread, and possibly also made into butter by churning (Prov 30 33). See Foon, I. It is possible that milk was used for seething other substances; at least the Israelites were strictly forbidden to seethe a kid in its mother’s milk (Ex 23 19; 34 26; Dt 14 21), and by a very general interpretation of these passages Jews have come to abstain from the use of mixtures of meat and milk of all kinds.

Figuratively the word is used (1) of abundance (Gen 49 12); (2) of a loved one’s charms (Cant 4 11); (3) of blessings (Isa 55 1; Joel 3 18); (4) of the (spiritual) food of immature people (1 Cor 3 2; He 5 12.13); (5) of purity (1 Pet 2 2). NATHAN ISAACS

MILL, mil, MILLSTONE, mil’stôn (πᾶς), rēqeh; μῶλος, μύλος, μύλων, mulōn): The two most primitive methods of grinding grain were (1) by pounding it in a mortar, and (2) by rubbing it between two stones. In Nu 11 8 both methods are mentioned as used for rendering the manna more fit for cooking. Numerous examples of both mill and mortar have been found in ancient excavations. Bliss and Macalister in their excavations at Gezer and other places have found specimens of what is called the saddle-quern or mill, which consists of two stones. The “nether” stone, always made of hard lava or basalt from the district of the Hauran, was a large heavy slab varying in length from 1¾ ft. to 2½ ft., and in width from 10 in. to 1½ ft. Its upper surface was hollowed out slightly, which made it look a little like a saddle and may have suggested the name of “riding millstone” applied by the Hebrews to the upper stone which rested on it (Jgs 9 53). The “upper stone” or “rider” was much smaller, 4 in. to 8 in. long and 4½ in. to 6 in. wide, and of varying shapes. This could be seized with the two hands and rubbed back and forth over the nether stone much the same as clothes are scrubbed on a wash-board. Such a stone could be used as a weapon (Jgs 9 53; 2 S 11 21), or given as a pledge (Dt 24 6).

Macalister goes so far as to say that “the rotary hand-quern, in the form used in modern Pal and in remote European regions, such as the Hebrews, is quite unknown throughout the whole history, even down to the time of Christ” (Excavations at Gezer). The same writer, however, describes some mills belonging to the 3d and 4th Jor periods which are much like the present rotary quern, except smaller (4 in. to 6 in. in diameter), and with no provision for a turning handle. Schumacher describes the Roman millstone. Two only performed. The upper millstones found in the excavations at Gezer belong to the early Arab. period.

If the above assertions are substantiated then we must alter somewhat the familiar picture of the two women at the mill (Mt 21 41), commonly illustrated by photographs of the mills still used in modern Pal. These latter consist of two stone discs each 18 in. to 20 in. in diameter, usually made of Hauran basalt. The upper one is perforated in the center to allow it to rotate on a wooden peg fixed in the nether stone, and near the circumference of the upper stone is fixed a wooden handle for turning it. The grain to be ground is fed into the central hole on the upper stone and gradually works down between the stones. As the grain is reduced to flour, it flies out from between the stones on to a cloth or skin placed underneath the mill. To make the flour fine it is reground and sifted. Larger stones 4 ft. to 5 ft. in diameter, working on the principle of the handmill, are still used for grinding sesame seed. These are turned by asses or mules. Another form of mill, which is possibly referred to in Mt 18 6; Mk 9 42; Rev 18 21.22, consisted of a conical nether stone on which “rode” a second stone like a hollowed-out capstan. The upper stone was probably turned with handspikes in much the same way as an old-fashioned ship’s capstan was turned. The material to be ground was fed into the upper cone which formed the hopper and from which it was delivered to the grinding surfaces between the “rider” and the nether stone. This form of mill must have been known in late Bib. times, because many examples of the upper stone dating from the Gr-Rom period have been found. One may be seen in the museum of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut. Another large one lies among the ruins at Petra, etc. In Mt 18 6; Mk 9 42, the mill is described as a μῦλος βωδιός, μῦλος οίκος, lit. a mill turned by an ass, hence a great millstone. It is not at all unlikely that the writers have confused the meaning of βωδιός, ὄμηρος (דבון, hāmēr), a term commonly applied to the upper millstone of a handmill, thinking it referred instead to the animal which turned the mill. This explanation would make Christ’s words of condemnation more applicable. The upper millstone of a handmill would be more than sufficient to sink the condemned, and the punishment would be more easily carried out. A few years from now handmills will have disappeared from the Syrian house- holds, for the more modern gistmills turned by water or other motor power are rapidly replacing them. See CRAFTS, II, 8.

Figuratively: (1) Of firmness and undaunted courage (Job 41 24). “The heart of hot-blooded animals is liable to sudden contractions and expansions, producing rapid alternations of sensations; not so the heart of the great saurians” (Canan Cook ad loc.). (2) To “grind the face of the poor” (Isa 3 15) is cruelly to oppress and afflict him. (3) The ceasing of the sound of the millstone was a sign of desolation (Jer 25 10; Rev 18 29).

JAMES A. PATCH

MILLINNIIUM (POSTMILLENNIAL VIEW). See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT.

MILLENNIUM, ml-1en-i-um (PREMILLENNIAL VIEW):

DIVERGENT VIEWS OF THE Subject: Article
I. THE TEACHING OF JESUS
A. The Millennium Not before the Advent (1) Parable of the Wise and Foolish Builders (Matt 7 21-23) (2) Parable of the Pounds (Matt 25 14-30)

II. THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES
A. Expectation of the Millennium (1) Expectation of the Early Church (2) Expectation of the Apocalypse (3) Expectation of Later Christians
B. Possibility of Survival—Its Implications
C. Prophecy of "Man of Sin"
D. No Room for Premillennialism
E. Harmony of Christ and Apostles

LITERATURE
The great majority of evangelical Christians believe that the kingdom of God shall have universal sway over the earth, and that righteousness and peace and the knowledge of the Lord shall everywhere prevail, commonly called the Millennium, or the thousand years' reign. Divergent views are entertained as to how it is to be brought about. Many honest and faithful men hold that it will be produced by the agencies now at work, mainly by the preaching of the gospel of Christ and the extension of the church over the world. An increasing number of men equally honest teach that the Millennium will be established by the visible advent of the Lord Jesus Christ. The aim of this brief article is to set forth some of the Scriptural grounds on which this latter view rests. No reference will be made to objections, to counter-objections and interpretations; the single point, namely, that the Millennium succeds the second coming of Jesus Christ, that it does not precede it, will be rigidly adhered to. Those who hold this view believe that neither Christ nor His apostles taught, on fair principles of interpretation, that the Millennium must come before His advent.

1. The Teaching of Jesus.—The Lord Jesus said nothing about world-wide conversion in His instructions to His disciples touching the mission of the Millennium; Mk 13:19-20; Mt 16:16; Lk 24:46-48; Acts 1:8. The Millennial age was not before to be His witnesses and carry the Advent. His message to the race, but He does not promise the race will receive their testimony, or that men will generally accept His salvation. On the contrary, it warns them that they shall be hated of all men, that sufferings and persecutions shall be their lot, but if they are faithful to the end their reward will be glorious. But world-wide evangelism does not mean world-wide conversion. The universal offer of salvation does not pledge its universal acceptance. In His instructions and predictions the Lord does not let fall a hint that their world-wide mission will result in world-wide conversion, or that thereby the longed-for Millennium will be established. There is a time to come when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters the sea, when teaching shall no longer be needed, for all shall know Him from the least to the greatest. Accordingly, conversion shall be the last, for the effects stated in that are not contemplated in the instructions and the results of this. To the direct revelation of Christ on the subject we now turn. In two parables He explicitly announces the general character and the consummation of the gospel age, and those we are briefly to examine.

(1) Parable of the Wheat and Tares (Mt 13:24-30,36-43).—Happily we are not left to discover the meaning and scope of this parable. We enjoy the immense advantage of having Our Lord's own interpretation of it. Out of His Divine explanation certain important facts emerge: (a) The parable covers the whole period between the first and second advents of the Saviour. The Sower is Christ: He has begun the good work; He opened the new era. (b) The field is the world. Christ's work is no longer confined to a single nation or people as once; it contemplates the entire race. (c) His people, the redeemed, begotten by His word and Spirit, are the good seed. Throughout the Gentile world the gospel of His grace is to be propagated throughout the whole world. (d) The devil is also a sower. He is the foul counterfeit of God's work. He sowed the tares, the sons of the evil one. (e) The tares are not wicked men in general, but a particular class of wicked brought into close and contaminating association with the children of God. "Within the territory of the visible church the tares are deposited!" (Dr. David Brown). It is the corruption of happy time, the gigantic fact to which we cannot shut our eyes. (f) The mischief, once done, cannot be corrected. "Let both grow together until the harvest." Christendom once corrupted remains so to the end. (g) The harvest is the consummation of the age. This is the culmination of our age; it terminates with the advent and judgment of the Son of God. He will send forth His angels who "gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire.

Here, then, we have the beginning, progress and consummation of our age. Christ Himself introduced it, and it was distinguished for its purity and its excellence. But the glorious system of truth was soon marred by the cunning craftiness of Satan. No after-vigilance or earnestness on the part of the servants could repair the fatal damage and were forbidden to attempt the removal of the tares for by so doing they would endanger the good grain, so intermixed had the two become! The expulsion of the tares is left for angels' hands in the day of the harvest. This is Our Lord's picture of our age: a Zizanian field wherein good and bad children of God and children of the evil one, live side by side down to the harvest which is the end. In spite of all efforts to correct and reform, the corruption of Christendom remains, nay, grows apace. To expel the vast evil system of false teachers, is now as it has been for centuries an impossibility. Christ's solemn words hold down to the final consummation, "Let both grow together until the harvest." In such conditions a millennium of universal righteousness and knowledge of the Lord seems impossible until the separation takes place at the harvest.

(2) Parable of the Pounds (Lk 19:11-27).—Jesus was on His last journey to Jerusalem, and near the city the city was in an excited condition. They supposed the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear. The parable was spoken to correct this mistake and to reveal certain vital features of it. "A certain nobleman went into a far country; he left his own possessions and gave authority. His return is His second coming. The parable spans the whole period between His ascension and His advent. It measures across our entire age. It tells of Christ's going away, it describes the conduct of His servants and of the citizens during His absence; it foretells His return and the reckoning that is to follow. Mark the words, "And it came to pass, when he was come back again, having received the kingdom." It is in heaven He receives the investiture of the kingdom (Rev 11:15). It is on earth that He administers it. The phrase, "having received the kingdom," cannot by any dexterity of exegesis be made to denote the end of time or the end of the Millennium, or of His receiving it at the end of the world; it is then He
delivers it up to God, even the Father (1 Cor 15 24-28).

The order and sequence of events as traced by the apostles is the same. The same fact made prominent in the parable of the Wicked and Wise Tares, namely that during the whole period between His ascension and His return there is no place for a Millennium of world-wide righteousness and prosperity. But Scripture warns that the belief such blessedness is surely to fill the earth, and if so, it must be realized after Christ’s second coming.

II. Teaching of the Apostles.—There is no unmistakable evidence that the apostles expected a thousand years of prosperity and peace during Christ’s absence in heaven. In Acts 1 11 we read that the heavenly visitants said to the apostles, ‘Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven?’ This attitude of the men of Galilee became the permanent attitude of the primitive church. It was that of the uplifted gaze. Paul’s exultant words respecting the Thessalonians might well be applied to all believers of that ancient time, that they “turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven” (1 Thess 1 9-10). It is the prominent theme of the NT epistles. In the NT it is mentioned 318 times. One verse in every thirty, we are told, is occupied with it. It is found shining with splendor in the first letters Paul wrote, the Thessalonians. It is found in the last he wrote, the second to Timothy, gleaming with the bright anticipation of the crown he was to receive at the Redeemer’s appearing. James quickens the flagging courage and renews the drooping spirits of believers with this trumpet call: “Be ye also patient; establish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord is at hand” (5 8). Peter exhorts to all holy conversation and godliness by the like motive: “Looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God” (2 Pet 3 12 m). Amid the deepening gloom and the gathering storms of the last days, Jude (ver 14) cheers us with the words of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, “Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon . . . . . . the ungodly.” John closes the Canon with the majestic words, “Behold, he cometh with the clouds,” “Behold, I come quickly.” These men, speaking by the Spirit of the living God, know there can be no reign of universal righteousness, no deliverance of groaning creation, no redemption of the body, no binding of Satan, and no Millennium while the tares grow side by side with the wheat; while the ungodly world flings its defiant shout after the retiring nobleman, “We will not have this man to reign over us”; and while Satan, that strong, fierce spirit, loose in this age, deceives, leads captive, devours and ruins as he lists. Therefore the passionate longing and the assurance of nearing deliverance at the coming of Christ fill so large a place in the faith and the life of the primitive disciples.

In 1 Thess 4 17 Paul speaks of himself and others who may survive till the Lord’s coming:

“Then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air” (1 Thess 4 17). This implies fairly that the apostle did not know that long ages would elapse between his own day and Christ’s advent. There was to be the mind the possibility of His coming in his lifetime; in fact, he seems to have an expectation that he would not pass through the gates of death as at all, that he would live to see the Lord in His glorious return, for the day and the hour of the advent is absolutely concretized.

3. Prophecy led to believe that “the day of the Lord is near” (Rev 1 10). The apostle of “Man of Sin” He assures them that some things must precede that day, and that this is the “turning away,” or apostasy, and the appearing of a powerful adversary who he calls the Beast (Rev 13) and describes as “the Son of Perdition.” Neither the one nor the other of these two, the apostasy and the Man of Sin, was present. But the road was prepared for them. There was the “mystery of lawlessness” already at work at the time, and although a certain restraint held it in check, nevertheless when the check was removed it would at once precipitate the apostasy, and it would issue in the advent of the Man of Sin, and he should be brought to nought by the personal coming of Jesus Christ. This appears to be the import of the passage.

Here was the appropriate place to settle forever for these saints the great uncertainty of a long period to intervene before the Saviour’s advent. How easy and natural it would have been for Paul to write, “Brothers, there is to be first a time of universal blessedness for the world, the Millennium, and after that there will be an apostasy and the revelation of the Man of Sin whom Christ will destroy by the brightness of His coming. But Paul intimated nothing of the sort. Instead, he distinctly says that the mystery of iniquity is already at work, that it will issue in “the falling away,” and that shall appear the great adversary, the Lawless One, who shall set up his kingdom by the power of Satan. The mystery of lawlessness, however, is held in restraint, as are told. May it not be that he shall be taken off, then the Millennium succeed, and after that the apostasy and the Son of Perdition? No, for its removal is immediately followed by the coming of the great foe, the Antichrist. For this foe has both an apocalypse and a parousia like Christ Himself. Hence, the lifting of the restraint is sudden, by no means a prolonged process.

The apostle speaks of the commencement, progress, and close of a certain period. It had commenced when he wrote. It is

4. No Room at the coming of Christ. What inter-Millennial prophesies? The continuidad of the evil nation secretly at work in the body of professing Christians, and its progress from the incipient state to the maturity of daring wickedness which will be exhibited in the Man of Sin. This condition of things fills up the whole period, if we accept Paul’s teaching as that of inspired truth. There appears to be no place for a Millennium within the limits of the Bible here sets. The only escape from this conclusion, as it seems to us, is, to deny that the coming of Christ is His actual, personal second coming. But the two words, epiphaneia and parousia, which elsewhere are used separately to denote His coming are here employed to give “graphic vividness” and certainty to the event, and hence they peremptorily forbid a figural interpretation. The conclusion seems unavoidable that there can be no Millennium on this side of the advent of Christ.

Our Lord’s Olivet prophecy (Mt 24, 25; Mk 13; Lk 21) accords fully with the teaching of the apostles on the subject. In that dis}-

5. Harmony course He foretells wars, commotions of Christ among the nations, Jerusalem’s capture and the destruction of the temple, and Apostles Israel’s exile, Christians persecuted while bearing their testimony throughout the world, cosmic convulsions, unparalleled tribulation and sufferings which terminate only with His advent. The day of the Lord was spoken down to the hour of His actual coming. He offers no hope of a Millennium. He opens no place for a thousand years of blessedness for the earth.

These are some of the grounds on which Bib. students known as Premillennialists rest their belief touching the coming of the Lord and the Millennial reign.
Millet, mil'ēt, mil'ēt (מִלִּט, ὀξύς, kēxōs, kēkhōn); One of the ingredients of the prophet’s bread (Ezk 4 9). The Arab. equivalent is dūkhn, the common millet, Panicum miliaceum, an annual grass 3 or 4 ft. high with a much-branched nodding panicle. Its seeds are as small as mustard seeds and are used largely for feeding small birds, but are sometimes ground to flour and mixed with other cereals for making bread. The Italian millet, setaria Italică, known as Bengal grass, is also called in Arab. dūkhn, and has a similar seed. A somewhat similar grain, much more widely cultivated as a summer crop, is the Indian millet—also called “Egypt maize”—the Sorghum annuum. This is known as dhūrah in Arab., and the seed as dhūrah bēid, “white dourra.” It is a very important crop, as it, like the common millet, grows and matures without any rain. It is an important breadstuff among the poor.

Both the common millet and the dourra were cultivated in Egypt in very ancient times; the Heb ḫōhan was certainly the first, but may include all three varieties.

Millo, mil’ō (מִילו, milī), generally interpreted to mean a “filling,” as e.g. a solid tower or an earth embankment; in Jgs 9 6 20; 2 K 12 20, we get נִילוֹת מִילו, bēth milī, a tower in EV “House of Millo,” which Winckler thinks may have been the original Jebusite temple.

References

1. OT

References of the Jebusite temple—shrines of Judah (see Bēth-Millo); LXX reads Μιλλόν, Bēthmaalōn, also Maalēn and οἰκός Maalēn: it is generally supposed that “The Millo” was some kind of fortress or other defence, but many speculations have been made regarding its position. In 2 S 5 9, we read that David built round about from the Millo and inward, or (in LXX) “he fortified it, the city, round about from the Millo and his house” (cf 1 Ch 11 8). In connection with Solomon’s strengthening of the fortifications, there are several references to Millo. In 1 K 9 15, Solomon raised a levy “to build the house of Jeh, and his own house, and Millo, and the wall of Jerusalem,” etc; in ver 24, “Pharaoh’s daughter came out up the city of David unto her house which Solomon had built for her; then did he build Millo”; in 1 K 11 27, Solomon “built Millo, and repaired the breach of the city of David his father.” At a later time Hezekiah “took courage, and built up all the wall that was broken down, and raised it up to the towers, and the other wall without, and strengthened Millo in the city of David.” (2 Ch 29 2 5; 2 K 12 20). Josiah was slain by his servants “at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla,” but possibly this may have been in Shechem (cf Jgs 9 6).

The mention of the site in the days of David and the reference to it in connection with the city of David (1 K 11 27) point to some

2. Identical part of the southeastern hill 8. of the with the temple. It is suggestive that Millo Akra Site is in LXX always τῆς by “Akra.” It seems to the present writer very probable that it was a fortress crowning the hill on which at a later time stood the Syrian Akra, which hill, if we are to believe Jos (BJ, V, iv, 1, etc), was cut down because its commanding situation dominated the temple. This hill cannot have been the site of Zion afterward known as “David’s Burg” (City of David), because the tombs of the Judean kings were within its walls, and that alone would have made the complete leveling of the site impossible, but whereas the Jebusite fortress was probably not far from Ghom, this fortified summit may have been, as Watson suggests for the Akra, as far north as where the present At Ākān mosque is situated. In David’s time it may have been an isolated and detached fort guarding the north approach, but if it was originally a Jebusite high place (Winckler), a party of sun-dried brick like similar constructions in Babylonia, the account of its being leveled would be much more credible. The importance of this site in the days of Solomon is fully explicable if this was the citadel guarding the newly built temple and royal palaces.

Dr. G. A. Smith is inclined to think that Millo may have been a fortress “off the south end of Ophel, to retain and protect the old pool,” and Vincent suggests that the site of Millo is that now occupied by the great causeway connecting the Western and Eastern hills along which runs the farīk bāb es sitelēh.

E. W. G. Masterman

Millo, mil’ō. See Mill.

Mina, mīn. See Mena.

Mincing, min’sing (דפוס, ṭōphaph): “Taking short steps,” “walking trippingly.” Only in Isa 3 16, “walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinking [a jingling of the metal anklets] with their feet.” Of OHL.
MIND, mind (νοῦς, nous, πνεῦμα, dianoia, πνεύμα, ψυχή, σύνεσις): We look in vain in the OT and NT for psychological or theological writing of the employment of terms which are meant to define mental operations. Terms Used In the OT ἐνθὰ is made to stand for the various manifestations of our intellectual and emotional nature. We are often misled by the different renderings in the different versions, both early and late.

Sometimes nēphesh or "soul" is rendered by "mind" (Dr 18 6 AV, "desire of his soul" or "mind"); sometimes ψυχή and εἰρήνη, "spirit of heart," and ἐνθὰ. Here Luther renders the terms Herzstück ("grief of heart"), and καρδιακαί, and ἐκ τῆς καρδιᾶς. Thus ψυχή is used, as in Isa 48 8, "bring it to mind" (lit. "heart"), or in Ps 51 12, "I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind" (lit. "heart"), as in LXX, καρδία, and in Vulg. ε̄ ψυχή, Luther, in Horsen, new Dutch tr, ut de gedachtenis (i.e. "memory").

In the Apoc this precision is equally lacking. Thus we read in Wis 9 15, "For the corruptible body [soul] preseth down the soul [soul] and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind [soul] that museth upon many things." But these distinctions are alien to the letter and spirit of revelation, a product of the Gr and not of the Heb mind.

In the NT the words nous and dianoia are used, but not with any precision of meaning.

Here too several terms are rendered by the same word. Thus the Heb הֵנִחָה is rendered in nos 1 Cor 2 16 ("mind of the Lord," with reference to Isa 40 13, where "הֵנִחָה YHWH [Jeh] occurs"). Nous evidently here the organ of spiritual perception—a word borrowed from the Assyrian, where it is sometimes used to stand for ἐνθὰ (Job 7 17; Isa 41 22); sometimes for ψυχή (Isa 40 13). In Lk 4 45 the solitary text, when ἐνθὰ occurs in the Gospels, it is rendered "understanding" in AV, "mind" in RV.

For a true solution we must turn to the Epp. of Paul, where the word frequently occurs in an ethical sense—sometimes in connection with the (sinful) flesh as in Col 2 18, "puffed up by his fleshly mind," sometimes in direct contrast to it, as in Rom 7 25, "with my mind I serve the law of God; with the flesh the law of sin." In Tit 1 15 it is brought into parallelism with conscience ("the mind and their consciences are defiled"). Phrases like "a reprobate mind," "corrupted in mind" occur elsewhere (Rom 1 28; 1 Tim 6 5). From this state of "reprobation" and "corruption" man must be saved. Hence the necessity of complete transformation of heart and the renewal of the inner man (Rom 12 2), "transformed by the renewing of your mind [nous]."

Another word, with possibly a deeper meaning, is sometimes employed, viz. dianoia, which lit. means "meditation," "reflexion." It is found as synonymous with nous in a good sense, e.g. in 1 Jn 5 20 (He "hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true"). Evidently the sense here is the same as in Rom 12 2, a renovated mind capable of knowing the Christ. It may also bear a legal sense, as in Eph 4 18, where the Gentiles are represented as having a "darkened understanding," or in parallelism with στρῶ: "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph 2 3), and with nous: "walking in vanity of mind, [nous] and a darkened understanding [dianoia] in Eph 4 18. At times also "heart" and "mind" are joined to indicate human depravity (Lk 1 51: "He hath scattered the proud in the imagination [dianoia] of their heart"). It is interesting also to know that the Heb למד is rendered in Mt 22 37—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul [soul] [pœuch]; and with all thy understanding [dianoia] [EV "mind"]—though Mk has two renderings in one of which dianoia occurs, and in the other sense (Mk 12 30-33), though possibly without any psychological recension in the Heb text. Sometimes מַעְיָן occurs elsewhere in conjunction with pneumatikos ("spiritual understanding," Col 1 9). It also stands alone in the sense of an "understanding enlightened from above" (2 Tim 2 7 AV: The Lord give thee understanding above all things.

The history of these terms is interesting, but not of great theological significance.

It seems to us that Godet's interpretation of the Great Commandment in Lv 10 27 is somewhat far-fetched.

4. THE THE GREAT COMMANDMENT.

The Great Commandment, ἀγαπᾶ τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν, "the two commandments," from which all the laws of the moral life derive their origin, is a direction for spiritual life. It is focused on the three principal directions: the powers of feeling, or the impulsive, emotional life; the active powers, the impulsive aspirations, the will (with all that might); and in the intellectual powers, analytical or contemplative, dianoia (with all thy mind). The difference between the heart, which resembles the trunk and the branches, feeling, will, understanding, is emphasized in the Alexandrian variation, by the substitution of the preposition σε ("in") for σε ("with") in the three last members. Moral life proceeds from the heart and manifests itself without, in the three forms of activity. The impulse God-wants and predestined, and is realized in the life through the will, which confers itself actively to the accomplishment of things and through the mind, which pursues the track of His thought in all His works" (Godet, Comm. on the Gospel of Lk, II, 38, 39).

J. I. MARAISS

MINE, min, MINING, min'ing: In Job 28 1-11 we have the only Bib reference to mines. The writer very likely derived [information either from personal observation or from a description of mining given in an eyewitness, of the mining operations of Sinai (see Metals). No traces of ancient mines have yet been found in Pal and Syria. What metals were taken out came from the deeper strata. The mines of Upper Egypt have already been mentioned. Burton and other travelers in Northern Arabia and the Red Sea country have found there evidences of ancient mining operations.

The usual Egyp method of mining was to follow the vein from the surface as far as it was practicable with tools corresponding to our pick and hoe, hammer and chisel. The shafts frequently extended into the ground a distance of 180 to 200 ft. The rock at the bottom, when too hard to be dug out was first cracked by having fires built on it. The mined-out stone was carried in baskets to the surface, where the crushing and separating took place. The mining operations were performed by an army of slaves who were kept at their work both day and night, driven with the lash until they died, when their places were taken by others. See Metals; Crafts, II, 10.

JAMES A. PATCH

MINERALS, min'er-slz. See Metals; Stones, Precious.

MINGLED PEOPLE, min'gd pêp'l (MIXED MULTITUDE):

(1) "Mixed multitude" occurs in Nu 11 4 as a tr of ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος, "collection," "rabble." The same phrase in Ex 12 38; Neh 13 3 is the rendition of 2żêb, 2żêb. "Mingled people" is used also to translate 2żêb, and is found in Jer 25 20-24; 50 27; Ezek 30 5, and in 1 K 10 15 (AV [Arabic] "mixed people"). In the last case both revised VSS have followed the pointing of the MT, and this pointing alone distinguishes "mingled people" (2żêb) from "Arabia" (2żêbb); in the unpointed text both words are equally 2żêb. Now "the mixed multitude" is applied to the Arab camp, and the correction into "Arabia," as in the MT (and EV of the 2 Ch 9 14, is indicated. Probably the same change should
be made in Ezek 30 5, reading "Ethiopia, and Put, and Lud, and Arabia, and Cub." A similar textual context seems to be responsible for either "and all the kings of Arabia" in Jer 25 4 or "and all the kings of the mingled people" in Jer 25 24. On all these verses see the comments.

(2) In Jer 25 20; 50 37, "mingled people" is a term of contempt for the hybrid blood of certain of Israel's enemies. Something of this same contempt may be contained in Ex 12 38, where a multitude of non-Israelisitish camp-followers are mentioned as accompanying the children of Israel in the exodus, and in Nu 11 4 it is this motley body of Israel's town. But who were they, why they wished or were permitted to join in the exodus, and what eventually became of them or of their descendants is a very perplexing puzzle. In Neh 13 5, the "mixed multitude" consists of the inhabitants of Pal whom the Jews found there after the return from the exile (see Samaria). In accord with the command of Dt 23 3-5, the Jews withdrew from all religious intercourse whatever had been established with these.

(3) A priestly family of the time of the high priest Joiakim (Neh 12 17), probably = Mijamin (2).

(4) A priestly participant in the ceremony of the dedication of the wall (Neh 12 41).

MINISH, min'ish (AV and ERV Ex 5 19; Ps 107 39; ERV Isa 19 6; Hos 8 10): The vb. "minish," "make small," is now obsolete, replaced by its derivative "diminish" (cf ARV in all vs above).

MINISTRY, min'is-tri:
I. The Word "MINISTRY"—Use of the Word in This Article
II. The Kinds of Ministry
1. The Prophetic Ministry
   (1) Apostles
   (2) Prophets
   (3) Teachers
2. The Local Ministry
   Origin
III. Threefold Congregational Ministry
1. assistance on Organization
   (1) Selecting a Bishop
   (2) Presbyters and Elders
   (3) Multiplication of Orders: Growth of a Hierarchy
IV. Synods
Literature
I. The Word "Ministry."—The common NT term for the ministry is diakonia (διακονία), and along with it we find diaconos (διακόνος), "minister," he diakonos (ὁ διακόνος), "he who ministers," and diakonéin (διακονεῖν), "to minister." All these words have a very extensive application within the NT and are by no means restricted to denote service within the Christian church; even when so restricted the words are used in a great variety of meanings: e.g. (1) discipleship in general (Jn 12 26); (2) service rendered to the church because of the "gifts" bestowed (Rom 12 7; 1 Cor 12 5), and hence all kinds of service (Acts 6 2; Mt 20 26; Mk 10 45) specifically the "ministry of the Word" (Eph 4 12), and most frequently the "apostleship" (Acts 1 17; 20 24; 21 19; Rom 11 13, etc); (4) such services as feeding the poor (Acts 6 1; 11 29; 12 25), or organizing and providing the great collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem (Rom 16 25; 2 Cor 8 4,10, etc); (5) such services as rendered by Stephanas (1 Cor 16 15), by Archippus (Col 4 17), by Tychicus (Eph 6 21; Col 4 7), etc.

In this art. the word has to do with the guidance and government of a united community, fellowship, or brotherhood of men and women.

Use of the Word.—The words in Rom 16 25; 1 Cor 16 5; Eph 4 12; Col 4 17; the word "minister" in Rev 1:6; 2 Thess 1:7 were translated "bishop" in the A.V. and RSV. The RSV has "minister" in Acts 13 1-3 while the A.V. has "bishop" in Acts 6:1-6. In Matt 16 18; 18:17-20 the English versions read "apostle," but in Acts 1:20; 14:23 they read "bishop." The A.V. and RSV use the word "minister" in Matt 28 19, but "presbyter" in Acts 14:23. In the A.V. the word "minister" or "apostle" is used to denote the head of a church or of a group of churches, even in cases in which the existence of a local church is not presupposed. The RSV uses the word "minister" for the English "bishop" in Acts 18:23; 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Tim 1:6; 3:4. The "minister" in 1 Cor 4:16 is the "bishop" of the English versions.

In this art. the word has to do with the guidance and government of a united community, fellowship, or brotherhood of men and women.

II. Two Different Kinds of Ministry.—The earliest fact we have about the organization of the Christian church is given in Acts 6, where we are told that "seven" men were set apart by the apostles who composed a committee that is called a "ministry of tables" (diakoneln του ληθανου), which is distinguished from the "ministry of the word" (diakoneln του ληθανου), which appears at the very beginning of the church and is the basis of the apostolic church and beyond it into the sub-apostolic. It can be traced in the Ep's of St. Paul and in other parts of the NT. It is seen in the Didache, in the Pastor of Hermas, in the Ep's of Barnabas, in the Apology of Justin Martyr, in the writings of Irenaeus and elsewhere. For a full list of authorities, see Harnack, Texte u. Untersuchungen, II, ii, 111 ff. The one ministry differs from the other in function, and the distinction depends on a conception to be afterward examined —that of "gifts." The common name, in apostolic and sub-apostolic literature, for the members of the one kind of ministry is "those who speak the Word of God" (kaleides) ον ληθανου του ληθανου). Modern writers have called it the "charismatic" ministry, but perhaps the better term is the "prophetic ministry;" while to the other class belong all the names which are given to denote office-bearers in the local churches. The two existed side by side. The great practical distinction between them is that the members of the former were in no sense office-bearers in any one Christian community; they were not elected or appointed to any office; they were not set apart for duties by any eclesiastical ceremony. The "Word" came to them and they were compelled by inward impulse to speak the message given them to deliver. Some were wanderers; others confined themselves to their own community. They were responsible to no ecclesiastical authority. Churches were encouraged to test them and their message; for the "gift" of discerning whether a so-called prophet spoke a truly Divine message was always presupposed to be within the local church. But once accepted they took a higher place than the office-bearers, they presided at the Lord's Supper, and their judgments in cases of discipline could overbear ordinary ecclesiastical rules. The contest of Cyprian with the "confessors" at Carthage was the last stage of the long struggle which arose in the 2d cent. between the two ministries. Out of the latter kind of ministry came, by ordinary development, all the various kinds of ecclesiastical organization which
now exist. Its members were office-bearers in the strictest sense of the word; they were selected to do ecclesiastical work in a given community, they were set apart for it in a special way, and they were responsible to the church for its due performance. In this sense there is no distinction. Only that two kinds of ministries are thoroughly distinct from each other, the same individuals might belong to both kinds. The "prophetic gift" might fall on anyone, private member or office-bearer alike. Or reposing in a not private sense, it is the Holy "office-bearer." ApoUos, Gal, Prophets, denied make Cor 21 whatever the 1 every Paul earliest As 35 Junias were mentioned the (Rom 16:21), and the name for "gift." For, it may be seen of Smyrna, was a prophet; so was Ignatius of Antioch, and many others. The "gift" of speaking the Word of God was a personal and not an official source of enlightenment.

In the prophetic ministry we find a threefold division—apostles, prophets and teachers. Some would add a fourth, evangelists, i.e. men like the apostles in all respects save in having seen the Lord in the Ministry—Jesus of Nazareth. This distinction may hold good for the apostolic period, though that appears to be very doubtful; it disappears utterly in the sub-apostolic; evangelist and apostle seem to be one class. This triple division may be traced through the early Christian 1. C. down to the Clementine Homilies, which can scarcely be earlier than 200 AD. It is hardly possible to define each class in any mechanical fashion; speaking generally, the first were the missionary pioneers who were at first the Twelve and what is chiefly, while the second and third classes belonged exhortation and instruction within the Christian communities.

(1) Apostles.—In the NT and in the other lit. of the early church the word "apostle" is used in a narrow and in a wider sense, and it is the more extensive use of the word which is the first division of the prophetic ministry. The Lord selected the Twelve, "whom also he named apostles" (Mc 3:14, RvM), to be trained by personal fellowship with Him and by apprenticeship work among the villages of Galilee for that proclamation of His gospel which was to be their future life-work. Two things strictly personal and excluding every thought of successors separated the "Eleven" from all other men: long personal fellowship with Jesus in the inner circle of His followers, and their selection by Himself while still in the flesh. They were the "Apostles" in the narrow sense of the word. But the name was given to many others. Matthias, who had enjoyed personal intercourse with Jesus both before and after the resurrection, was called by the disciple company, confirmed by decision of the lot, to the same 'service and sending forth' (diakonia kat apostol) (Acts 1:25). Paul was called by the Lord Himself, but in vision and inward experience, and took rank with those before mentioned (Rom 1:1 ff; Gal 2:7–9). Others, called apostles, are mentioned by name in the NT.

Barnabas is not only an apostle but is recognized to have rank equal to the "Eleven" (Acts 14:14; Gal 2:7–9). The correct order for these two men (Rom 16:7) declares that Andronicus and Junia were apostles who had known Christ before Paul became a believer. Chrysostom, who thinks that Junias or Junia was a woman, does not believe that her sex hindered her from being an apostle. Silas or Silvanus and Timothy, on the most natural interpretation of the passage, are called apostles by St. Paul in 1 Thess 1:6. The title can hardly be denied to Apollos (1 Cor 4:6,9). St. Paul32 promises him to be called "apostle of churches," and declares them to be "the glory of Christ" (2 Cor 8:23m). One of them, Epaphroditus, is mentioned by name—"your apostle," says Paul writing to the Christians of Philippi (Phil 2:25m); and there must have been many others.

"Apostles" are distinguished from the "Twelve" by St. Paul in the rapid summary he gives of the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection (1 Cor 15:5,7). Besides those true apostles the NT mentions others who are called "false apostles" (2 Cor 11:13), and that while of these two kinds of ministries are thoroughly distinct from each other, the same individuals might belong to both kinds. The "prophetic gift" might fall on anyone, private member or office-bearer alike. Or reposing in a not private sense, it is the Holy "office-bearer." ApoUos, Gal, Prophets, denied make Cor 21 whatever the 1 every Paul earliest As 35 Junias were mentioned the (Rom 16:21), and the name for "gift." For, it may be seen of Smyrna, was a prophet; so was Ignatius of Antioch, and many others. The "gift" of speaking the Word of God was a personal and not an official source of enlightenment.

In the prophetic ministry we find a threefold division—apostles, prophets and teachers. Some would add a fourth, evangelists, i.e. men like the apostles in all respects save in having seen the Lord in the Ministry—Jesus of Nazareth. This distinction may hold good for the apostolic period, though that appears to be very doubtful; it disappears utterly in the sub-apostolic; evangelist and apostle seem to be one class. This triple division may be traced through the early Christian 1. C. down to the Clementine Homilies, which can scarcely be earlier than 200 AD. It is hardly possible to define each class in any mechanical fashion; speaking generally, the first were the missionary pioneers who were at first the Twelve and what is chiefly, while the second and third classes belonged exhortation and instruction within the Christian communities.

(1) Apostles.—In the NT and in the other lit. of the early church the word "apostle" is used in a narrow sense, and in a wider sense; the first is the more extensive use of the word which is the first division of the prophetic ministry. The Lord selected the Twelve, "whom also he named apostles" (Mc 3:14, RvM), to be trained by personal fellowship with Him and by apprenticeship work among the villages of Galilee for that proclamation of His gospel which was to be their future life-work. Two things strictly personal and excluding every thought of successors separated the "Eleven" from all other men: long personal fellowship with Jesus in the inner circle of His followers, and their selection by Himself while still in the flesh. They were the "Apostles" in the narrow sense of the word. But the name was given to many others. Matthias, who had enjoyed personal intercourse with Jesus both before and after the resurrection, was called by the disciple company, confirmed by decision of the lot, to the same 'service and sending forth' (diakonia kat apostol) (Acts 1:25). Paul was called by the Lord Himself, but in vision and inward experience, and took rank with those before mentioned (Rom 1:1 ff; Gal 2:7–9). Others, called apostles, are mentioned by name in the NT. Barnabas is not only an apostle but is recognized to have rank equal to the "Eleven" (Acts 14:14; Gal 2:7–9). The correct order for these two men (Rom 16:7) declares that Andronicus and Junia were apostles who had known Christ before Paul became a believer. Chrysostom, who thinks that Junias or Junia was a woman, does not believe that her sex hindered her from being an apostle. Silas or Silvanus and Timothy, on the most natural interpretation of the passage, are called apostles by St. Paul in 1 Thess 1:6. The title can hardly be denied to Apollos (1 Cor 4:6,9). St. Paul promises him to be called "apostle of churches," and declares them to be "the glory of Christ" (2 Cor 8:23). One of them, Epaphroditus, is mentioned by name—"your apostle," says Paul writing to the Christians of Philippi (Phil 2:25m); and there must have been many others.
recognized that they had a regular place in the meeting for public worship (1 Cor 14); he desired that every member in the Corinthian church should possess the "gift" of prophecy (1 Cor 14 5, 9); he exhorted the brethren at Thessalonica to "cherish prophecysings" (1 Thess 5 20), and those in Rome to make full use of prophecy (Rom 12 6). If he criticized somewhat severely the conduct of the "corinthiats" of the Corinthian church, it was not because he did not teach them how to make full use of their "gift" for the right edifying of the brethren.

Prophecy was founded on revelation; the prophets were men, esp. "gifted" with spiritual intuition and magnetic presence. Sometimes their "gift" took the form of ecstasy, but no means always; St. Paul implies that prophets have a real command of and can control their utterances. Sometimes their message came to them in visions, as we find in the Apocalypse and in Hbises; but this was not a necessary means. The prophets spoke as they were moved, and the Spirit worked on them in various ways.

The influence of these prophets seems to have increased rather than diminished during the earlier decades of the 1st cent. While the duty of the apostle was to the unbelievers, Jewish or heathen, the sphere of the prophecy lay in the mission and the Christian congregation. It was his business to edify the brethren. Prophets had a recognized place in the meeting for the purpose of edifying the congregation; if one happened to be present at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, he was present in the person of the office-bearers, and no prayers were expected to be extemporized (Did. x. 7). He had special powers when matters of discipline were discussed, as is plain from a great variety of evidence from Hbises down to Tertullian. From St. Paul's statements it seems that the largest number of the prophets he spoke of were members of the communities within which they used their "gift" of prophecy; but many of the more eminent prophets traveled from community to community edifying each. When such wandering preachers, with their wives and families, dwelt for a time in any Christian society, preaching and exhorting, it was deemed to be the duty of that society to support them, and regulations were made for such support. According to the Didache (ch. xi): "Every true prophet who shall settle among you is worthy of his support. . . . Every first-fruit item of the products of the winepress and threshing-floor, of oxen and of sheep and of birds, take it and give it to the prophets. . . . In like manner also when thou hastest a jar of wine or oil, take the first of it and give it to the prophets; and of meat and clothing and every possession take the first as may seem right to thee, and give according to the commandment of God. . . . The true prophets. Each congregation had to exercise the "gift" of discrimination and sift the true from the false, as the apostles confronted the true in early Christianity as well as in the old Judaism.

(3) Teachers.—While the third class of the prophetic ministry, the teachers, is found joined to the other two both in the NT and in sub-apostolic lit., and while St. Paul assigns a definite place for their services in the meeting for edification (1 Cor 14 26), we hear less about them and their work. They seem, however, to have lingered much longer in active service in the early church than did the apostles and the prophets.

As has been said, the first notice we have of organization within a local church is in Acts 6, where at the suggestion of the apostles seven men were selected to administer the Local Ministry of the congregation.

1. The Local Ministry

The expression that "the Seven" were a sort of court of office-bearers, deacons, is a comparatively late suggestion. These men are nowhere called deacons; the official designation is "the Seven".

It may be that the appointment of those men was only a temporary expedient, but it is more probable that "the Seven" were the elders of Acts 6 11; for we find those "elders" performing the duties which "the Seven" were appointed to fulfill. If we turn back to Acts 6 the name "elders" is "seven", the beginnings of local organization as a whole. When we turn to the expansion of Christian communities outside this one distinct picture of beginnings; but as all the churches in Palestine evidently regarded the society in Jerusalem as the mother church, it is likely that their organization was the same. Acts tells us that Paul and Barnabas left behind them at Derbe, Lystra and Iconium societies of a similar sort at their head. The word used suggests an election by popular vote and was probably the same as had been used in the selection of the "seven" in the Jerusalem church.

When we examine the records of the distinctively Pauline churches, there is not much direct evidence for the origins of the ministry there, but a great deal about the existence of some kind of rule and rulers. For one thing, we can see that those churches had and were encouraged to have feelings of independ-
rule supposed to be essential. Even in the mother-church in Jerusalem, the congregational meeting exercised rule over the apostles themselves, for we find apostles summoned before it and examined on their conduct (Acts 11:1–4). The whole question demands the recognition of several facts:

1. Evidence abounds to show that the local church, during the apostolic and sub-apostolic age were self-governing communities and that the real background of the ministry was not apostolic authority but the congregational meeting. Its representative character and its authority are seen in the apostolic and sub-apostolic lit. from St. Paul to Cyprian.

2. The uniquely Christian correlation of the three conceptions of leadership, service and "gifts"; leadership depended on service, and service was possible by the possession and recognition of special gifts. (The general evidence existing to show that there was a gradual growth of the principle of association from looser to more compact forms of organization (Gayford, art. "Church" in HDB; also Harnack, Epis. 1887, January to June, 322–24), must not be forgotten; only because "gifts" gave the church a Divine authority to exercise rule and oversight apart from any special apostolic direction.

3. The general evidence existing to show that there was a gradual growth of the principle of association from looser to more compact forms of organization (Gayford, art. "Church" in HDB; also Harnack, Epis. 1887, January to June, 322–24), must not be forgotten; only because "gifts" gave the church a Divine authority to exercise rule and oversight apart from any special apostolic direction.

4. We must also bear in mind that the first Christians were well acquainted with various kinds of social organization which entered into their daily life and which could not fail to suggest how they might adopt them in their new society.

Examples occur readily: (a) Every Jewish village community was ruled by its "seven wise men," and it is probably that the appointment of the "Seven" in the primitive Jewish church was suggested by familiarity with this example of social polity. (b) It was and is an almost universal oriental usage that the "next of kin to the founder is recognized, after the founder's death, to be the head of the new religious community founded, and this may account for the selection of James, the eldest male surviving relative of Our Lord, to be the recognized and honored head of the church in Jerusalem. James has been called the first bishop; but when we read in Eusebius (HE, III, 14, 1: 32: 4: IV, 22, 4, 31: 209) that his successors were chosen by the term seems inappropriate. A succession in the male line of the king, the emperor, and the selection of the office is made in the hands of a family council, and where two (James and Zopher) can rule together, has small analogy to any religious rule. The relation of the "patron" to "clerks" by which in one form or other had spread throughout the civilized world is analogous to the practice of clergymen used to donate rulers in local churches. We find prēstwmoi (presbiteroi), prōstos (prostatai), proostēs (prostatai, presbiteroi) in various writings, where the last was used as late as the middle of the 2d cent. to denote ministry in the Rom church (Rom 12:8; 16:2; 1 Thess 5:12; Hermas, Pastor, Viz., 2, 4; Justin, Apol., 1:65). (c) The Rom empire was honeycombed with "clerk," some recognized by the priestess rule without legal recognition and liable to suppression. These confraternities were very varied character, trade unions, burial clubs, etc., but a large proportion were for the purpose of practising special religious rites. The introduction of the Dispensation seemed to have enrolled among these confraternities, and certainly appeared to many heathen neighbors to be one kind of private associations in the practice of a religion which had been legalized. Many scholars have insisted that the gentile Christian churches simply copied the organization of such confraternities (Renan, Les Apoptres; Heini, Zeitsschrift f. wissenschaft. Theol., 1879, 777); Hachter, Organisation of Early Christian Churches, there must have been some external resemblances. Pilin believed that the Christian churches of Bithynia were illicit confraternities (Ep., 69: Cuchian, Perpoxos Patrois). They had, in common with such societies, a democratic constitution; they shared a "common meal" at stated times; they made a mistake to be elected to the leadership; they were elected by a committee of office-bearers; and they exercised a certain amount of discipline over their members. Multitudes of Christian confraternities were the same, and many continued to be so after accepting Christianly (Cyprian, Ep., xlvii. 6).

But while the Christian churches may have learned much about the general principles of associated life from all these varied forms of social organization, it cannot be said that they copied any one of them. The primitive Christian societies organized themselves independently in virtue of the new moral and social life implanted within them; and though they may have come to it by various paths, they all in the end arrived at one common form—a society ruled by a body of office-bearers who possessed the "gifts" of government and of subordinate service embodied in the offices of presbyter and deacon.

III. The Threefold Congregational Ministry.—During the 2d cent. the ministry was subject to a change. The ruling body of office-bearers in every congregation received a permanent president, who was a presbyter or bishop, the latter being the commoner. The change came gradually. It provoked no strong opposition. By the beginning of the 3d cent. it was everywhere accepted.

When we seek to trace the causes why the college of elders received a president, we have to consider that of all the ecclesiastical life in the local church and the one potent office-bearer, we are reduced to conjecture. This can only be said with confidence in the East and gradually spread to the West, and that there are hints of a gradual change even in the "Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries," 150, 153–55), Scholars have brought forward many reasons for the change; the necessity under the circumstances of times from danger from external persecution or from the introduction of ecclesiastical service, the embodiment of faith of the members; the convenience of being represented to other local churches by one man who could claim himself with the administration of external affairs of the congregation; the need of one man to preside at the solemn and crowning act of worship, the administration of the Lord's Supper; the sense of congregational unity implied in the possession of one center to which all or any probable ways in which the church were influenced in making this change in their ministry.

This threefold congregational ministry is best seen in the Epp. of Ignatius of Antioch. They portray a Christian community having at its head a presbyter or bishop, the latter being a body of deacons. These form the ministry or office-bearers of the congregation to whom obedience is due. Nothing is to be done without the consent of the bishop, neither love-feast, nor sacrament, nor any thing, whether internal or external. The ruling body is a court where the bishop presides, surrounded by his council or session of elders; and the one is helpless without the other, for if the bishop be the lyre, the elders are the chords, and both are needful. And so Ignatius compares the bishop to Jesus, and the elders to the apostles who surrounded Him. There is no trace of ascetical polity, apostolic succession, one-man government, i.e., a minister of one man's rule in these letters of Ignatius; and yet what he portrays is unlike any form of diocesan episcopacy.

It is interesting to remark how all throughout the 3d cent. and later every body of Christians, even if consisting of fewer than twelve families, is instructed to organize itself into a church under a ministry of office-bearers, consisting of a bishop or pastor, at least two elders and at least three deacons. Should the bishop be illiterate—character more than erudition determined his choice—the congregation was told to elect a reader, and provision was made for a ministry of women. It was possible to obey such instructions, because the ministry of the early church received no stipends. The ministry were office-bearers, to whom they were elected by a committee of office-bearers, and they exercised a certain amount of discipline over their members. Multitudes of Christian confraternities must have been like the confraternities of the 3d cent. and many continued to be so after accepting Christianly (Cyprian, Ep., xlvii. 6).

1. Insistence on Organizational Ministry

...
secular callings, and supported themselves. Buildings, set apart for public worship, did not exist until the very close of the 2d cent., and then only in a few populous centers in towns which had felt persecution but slightly. The only property which a church possessed in such cases was its congregational records and perhaps a place of burial, were the offerings which were presented by members of the congregation, mostly in kind, after the Eucharist; and these offerings were distributed to the poor of the congregation. If office-bearers received a share, it was only on account of their poverty and because they were on the roll of widows, orphans and helpless poor.

This threefold congregational ministry has been called by some scholars "monarchical episcopacy," a title as high-sounding as it is misleading. The kingdom over which these so-called monarchs presided might and often did consist of less than twelve families, and their rule was fenced in with many restrictions. We can collect from the Epistles of Ignatius that within the powers and the limitations of the Church (Epp. to Polycarp, Ephesus, et al.) the bishop administered the finances of the church; he was president of the court of Elders; he had the right to call and presumably to preside over the court of discipline; and he had the regulation of the sacraments, especially in his hands. On the other hand, it is more than likely that he, or even he in conjunction with the elders, could excommunicate; that appears to have remained in the hands of the congregational meeting. The bishop might convolve the congregational meeting for the purpose, but it belonged to the meeting and not to the bishop to appoint delegates and messengers to other churches; and the meeting had the power to order the bishop to go on such a mission.

(1) Aid given in selecting a bishop.—From what has been said it is plain that the selection of a bishop became one of the most important acts a congregation was called upon to perform. Accordingly, provision was made for its assistance. It is declared in the Apostolic Canons that if a congregation contains fewer than twelve members competent to vote at the election of a bishop, neighboring, "well-established" churches are to be written to in order that three men may be sent to assist the congregation in selecting their pastor (Sources of the Apostolic Canons, 2:1). This is evidently the origin of what afterward became the custom and later a law, that the consecration of a bishop required the presence of three neighboring bishops—a rule which has given occasion to the saying that "all Christendom becomes Presbyterian on a consecration day." This custom and rule, which in its beginnings was simply practical assistance given to a weak by stronger congregations, came to bear the meaning that the bishop thus consecrated was an office-bearer in the church universal as well as the pastor of a particular congregation. It is also more than probable that this practice of seeking assistance in an emergency is the germ out of which grew the Synod—the earliest recorded synods being congregational meetings assisted in times of difficulty by advice of experienced persons from other churches.

(2) Bishops and presbyters.—When a small group of villagers had been won to Christianity through the efforts of the Christian congregation in a neighboring town, they commonly were disinclined to send a group from their village into town to join in the public worship. "On the day called Sunday," says Justin Martyr, "all who live in the city and in the country gather together into one place" (Ap., 1:67). The earliest collections of canons show that the bishop was able in time of absence or sickness to delegate his duties to elders or even to deacons; and this enabled him, when occasion for it arose, to be, through his office-bearers, the pastor of several congregations. We can see the same process at work more clearly in large towns where the Scriptural provision for a church in the Scriptures was reduced, through the process of the recording of the spiritual history of the church, to a small place. The result was that the bishop became very large. The bishop was always held to be the head of the Christian community, however large, in one place. He was the pastor; he baptized; he presided at the Holy Supper; he admitted catechumens to the full communion of the church. By the middle of the 3d cent., the work in most large towns was more than one man could do. No record exists of the number of members belonging to the Rom church at this time, but some idea of its size may be obtained from the fact that it had more than 1,500 persons on its poor-roll; and before the close of the century the Rom Christians worshiped in over 40 separate places of meeting. It is obvious that one man could not perform the whole pastoral duties for such a multitude, and that most of the pastoral work must have been delegated to the elders or presbyters. The unity of the pastorate was for long strictly preserved by the custom that the bishop consecrated the communion elements in one church, and these were carried round to the other congregations. The bishop even performed the function of the pastor in every congregation; the elders and deacons belonged to the whole Christian community; they served all the congregations and were not attached to one distinctively. In Alexandria, on the other hand, something of the type of the Synod of St. Paul, we do not find a common to every church, for we do not know the former class until the beginning of the 3d cent. In the West the word was ordi, and in the east clerus, from which come our "orders" and "clergy." The admission for the municipality in towns or for the committees which presided over a confraternity, and clerus denoted rank or class. The introduction of monarchical stipends and the implication that a paid ministry was expected to give its whole time to the service of the church made the distinction between clergy and laity more emphatic. When we investigate the matter, it is evident that the fact that the clergy are paid complicates the question; for the earliest lists are evidently those who are entitled to share in the funds of the church. Hence the first officers figure as members of the ordi or clerus. Setting this disturbing element aside we find that the earliest division of the ministry in the 3d cent. was into the orders of bishops, presbyters and deacons (all congregational); but bishops and presbyters are sometimes said to form the special clerus ecclesiasticus. The earliest addition to these three orders is the reader, and there follows soon the sub-deacon. Then come such persons as the minor orders. Our readers, as we have seen, were needed at first to assist illiterate bishops or presbyters; their retention was inseration of exercise or it has been plausibly accounted for by the idea that they represented the absorption of the old prophetic ministry. The term "minor orders" is sometimes applied to the minor orders of the Christian church evidently copied the pagan temple usages where persons who performed corresponding services were included in the ministry and had due share of the temple revenues. In the institution of a graded hierarchy including metropolitan...
and patriarchs, the churches probably followed the example of the great pagan organization called forth by the imperial cult of the Divi et Divas (Lindsay, The Church and the Minnith, 335 f). As Mommsen remarks, "The Christian church took its hierarchical weapons from the arsenal of the enemy."

IV. Synods.—Synods to begin with were essentially democratic assemblies. They were, in their primitive form, congregational in character assisted in time of emergency by delegates (not necessarily bishops) from "well-established churches," and they grew to be the instrument by which churches grouped around one center became united into one compact organization. The times were not democratic, and gradually the presence of the laity and even of presbyters and deacons and their combined efforts to the decisions of the assembly became more and more a matter of form and gradually almost altogether. The synods consisted exclusively of bishops and became councils for registering their decisions; and this implied that each local church was fully and completely represented by its pastor or bishop, who had become very much of an autocrat, responsible, not to his congregation nor even to a synod, but to God alone. Before the end of the 3d cent. and onward, synods or councils had become a regular part of the organization of the whole church, and the membership was confined to the bishops of the several churches included in the group. It was natural that such assemblies should meet in the provincial capitals, for the roads converged to the cities which were the seats of the Roman provincial administration. A synod required a chairman, and various usages obtained about the natural chairmanship, the first of the bishops present was placed in the chair, and this continued long to be the practice in several parts of the empire. Gradually it became the habit to put into the chair the bishop of the town in which the council met, and this grew to a prescriptive right. It was then that the bishops of the towns which were the meeting-places of synods came to be called metropolitans. The title was for long one of courtesy only and did not carry with it any ecclesiastical rank and authority. But by the middle of the 4th cent. the metropolitans had acquired the right to summon the synods and even to exercise some authority over the bishops of the bounds, esp. in the matter of election and consecration. When Christianity was thoroughly established as the religion of the empire, the more important bishops secured for themselves the civil precedence and privileges which had belonged to the higher priests of the abandoned Imperial Cult, and the higher ranks of the Christian ministry came gradually in a lordship strangely in variance with their earlier position of service.

LITERATURE.—C. Vitringa, De synagoge verete libri tres, Leucoinetrae (Weissenfeld), 1726; Bingham, Antiquity of the Christian Church, 1768-32; Bannermann, The Scripture Doctrine of the Church; Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Lightfoot, Comm. on the Ep. to the Phil (dissertation on the ministry); Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Church, and arts. on "Orders" in Smith's Dict. of Christian Antiquities; Harnack, Εἴσοδοι for January to June, 1887, and En- sätze der Kirchengeschichte; zwei ersten Jahrhunderten (1910) (ET The Constitution and Law of the Church); Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries; Schmiedel, ed. "Ministry" in EB; Gayford, ed. "Church," in HDB.

MINNITH, min'th (μίννιθ, minnāth; B, ἀξίων 'Αρπών, dēchra Aρνόν, A, eis Σωμαίθ, eis Se- mōēθ): After Jephthah defeated the Ammonites, he is said to have smitten them from Aroer "until thou come to Minnith" (Jgs 11 33). Omn mentions a place called Manath, 4 Rom miles from Heshbon, on the road to Philadelphia ("Ammān"), and locates Abel-cheramim, which is mentioned with Minnith, 7 miles from Philadelphia, without indicating the direction. Some travelers have spoken of a Menjah, 7 miles E. of Heshbon, but of this place Trastram (Land of Moab, 140) could find no trace. The same place appears to be mentioned in Ezk 27 17 as supplying wheat, which figures in the trade between Judah and Tyre. There are really no reliable data on which to suggest an identification, while there are grave reasons to suspect the integrity of the text. W. EWING

MINSTREL, min'stre. See MUSIC.

MINT, mint (minster, hēdāsumon): Mentioned (Mt 23 23; Lk 11 42) as one of the small things which were tithed. The cultivated variety (Menētha piperita), "peppermint," was doubtless primarily intended, but the wild M. silvestris or horsemint, which flourishes all over the mountains of Pal, is probably included.

MIPHKAD, mîph'kad, GATE OF (מְפִּקֵד, sha'ar ha-miphkād; RV "Hamiphkad") (Neh 3:31): A gate in, or near, the north end of the east wall of Jerus, rebuilt under Nehemiah. Its exact position is uncertain. See JERUSALEM.


MIRACLE IN WORKS OF GRACE

LISTERATURE.—C. Vitringa, De synagoge verete libri tres, Leucoinetrae (Weissenfeld), 1726; Bingham, Antiquity of the Christian Church, 1768-32; Bannermann, The Scripture Doctrine of the Church; Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Lightfoot, Comm. on the Ep. to the Phil (dissertation on the ministry); Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Church, and arts. on "Orders" in Smith's Dict. of Christian Antiquities; Harnack, Εἴσοδοι for January to June, 1887, and En- sätze der Kirchengeschichte; zwei ersten Jahrhunderten (1910) (ET The Constitution and Law of the Church); Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries; Schmiedel, ed. "Minis- try" in EB; Gayford, ed. "Church," in HDB.

MINNIT, min’it (μίννίτ, minnīth; B, ἀξίων 'Αρπών, dēchra Aρνόν, A, eis Σωμαίθ, eis Se- mōēθ): After Jephthah defeated the Ammonites, he is said to have smitten them from Aroer "until
II. Miracle in the NT.—The subject of miracles has given rise to much abstract discussion; but it is best approached by considering the
1. Miracles actual facts involved, and it is best in Gospel to begin with the facts nearest to us: History those which are recorded in the NT.

Our Lord's ministry was attended from first to last by events entirely beyond the ordinary course of Nature. He was born of a Virgin, and His birth was announced by angels, both to His mother, and to the man to whom she was betrothed (Mt and Lk). He suffered death on the cross as an ordinary man, but on the third day after His crucifixion He rose from the tomb in which He was buried, and lived with His disciples for 40 days (Acts 1), and drinking with them, He had a body superior to ordinary physical conditions. At length He ascended to the heavens, and a cloud received Him out of their sight. But besides these two great miracles of His birth and His resurrection, Jesus was continually performing miracles during His ministry. His own words furnish the best description of the facts. In reply to the question of John the Baptist, His predecessor, He said, "Go and tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them" (Mt 11.4.5). Specimens of these miracles are given in detail in the Gospel narratives; but it is a mistake to consider the latter as too often done, though these particular miracles were the only ones in question. Even if they could be explained away, as has often been attempted, there would remain reiterated statements of the evangelists that He worked them the greater, as He had told the people. (4.23), or St. Luke's "And a great number of the people from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed. And all the multitude sought to touch him; for power went forth from him, and healed them all" (6.17-19).

It must be borne in mind that if there is any assured result of modern criticism, it is that these accounts proceed from contemporaries and eyewitnesses, and with respect to the third evangelist there is one unique consideration of great import.

The researches of Dr. HOBART have proved to the satisfaction of a scholar like HARNACK, that St. Luke was a trained physician. His testimony to the miracles is therefore the nearest to the evidence which has often been desired—that of a man of science. When St. Luke, e.g., tells us of the healing of a fever (4.38.39), he uses the technical term for a violent fever recognized in his time (cf MEYER, in loc.); his testimony is therefore that of one who knew what fevers and the healing of them meant. This consideration is especially valuable in reference to the miracles recorded of St. Paul in the latter part of Acts. It should always be borne in mind that they are recorded by a physician, who was an eyewitness of them.

It seems to follow from these considerations that the working of miracles by Our Lord, and by St. Paul in innumerable cases, cannot be questioned without attributing to the evangelists a whole untrustworthiness of evidence, due either to willful, or to superstitious misconception and this is a supposition which will certainly never commend itself to a fair and competent judgment. It would involve, in fact, such a sweeping condemnation of the evangelists, that it could never be entertained at all except under one presupposition, viz. that such miraculous occurrences, as being incompatible with the established laws of Nature, could not possibly have happened, and that consequently any allegations of them must of necessity be attributed to illusion or fraud.

III. Miracle and Laws of Nature.—This, in fact, is the prejudgment or prejudice which has prompted, either avowedly or tacitly, the great mass of negative criticism on this subject, and if it could be substantiated, we should be confronted, in the Gospels, with a problem of portentous difficulty.

On this question of the abstract possibility of miracles, it seems sufficient to quote the following passage from the Gifford Lectures for 1891 of the late eminent man of science, Professor Sir George Stokes.

On p. 23 Professor Stokes says: "We know very well that a miracle, an extraordinary act uniformly according to a certain rule, and yet for a special reason may on a particular occasion act quite differently. We cannot refuse to admit the possibility of something analogous taking place as regards the action of the Supreme Being. If we think of the laws of Nature as self-existent and uncaused, then we cannot admit any deviation from them. But if we think of them as designed by a Supreme Will, then we must allow the possibility of their being on some particular occasion suspended. Nor is it even necessary in order that some result out of the ordinary course of Nature should be brought about, that they should even be suspended; it may be that some difference, though brought into action, whereby the result in question is brought about, St. Matthew gives us instances, laws by which the ordinary course of Nature is regulated. . . . It may be that the event which we call a miracle was brought about, not by suspending the laws in ordinary operation, but by the superaddition of something not ordinarily in operation, of such a nature that its operation is not perceived."

Only one consideration need be added to this decisive scientific statement, viz. that if there be agencies and forces in existence outside the ordinary world of Nature, and if they can under certain circumstances interfere in it, they must necessarily produce effects inconsistent with the processes of that world when left to itself. Life under the surface of the water has a certain course of its own, independent of ours; but if a man standing on the bank of a river throws a stone into it, effects are produced which must be as unexpected and as accountable as a miracle to the creatures who live in the stream. The nearness of two worlds which are so distinct from one another receives, indeed, a striking illustration from the juxtaposition of the world above the water and the world below its surface. There is no barrier between them; they are actually in contact; yet the life in them is perfectly distinct. The spiritual world may be as close to us as the air is to the water, and the angels, or other ministers
of God's will, may as easily, at His word, interpose in it as a man can throw a stone into the water. When a stone is thus thrown, there is no suspension of or modification of any law, but simply that it is as if Sir George Stokes supposes in the case of a miracle, a new agency has interposed.

This, indeed, is the main fact of which miracles are irrefutable evidence. They show that some power outside Nature, some supernatural power, has intervened.

4. Agreement with Biblical Ideas and Terms - All are exactly described by the three words in the NT already mentioned. "They are terata, "prodigies" or "wonders"; they are also dynamata, virtutes, powers," or "manifestation of powers;" and finally they are a semia, "signs."

The three conceptions are combined, and the source of such manifestations stated with them, in a pregnant verse of H.: "God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Spirit, according to His own will." (Rom. 1:20)

The words of J. S. Mill on the question of the possibility of miracles may also be quoted: "Dealing with the question in his "Essays on Meta-Physic," Mill observes: "In order that any one should be a counteracting to the law of cause and effect, it is a new effect, supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause. Of the adequacy of that cause, if present, there can be no doubt; and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle is the improbability that any such cause existed." (System of Logic, II, 161-62.)

There is, however, one other important characteristic of miracles at least with which we are concerned — viz. that they occur at the command, or at the prayer, of the person to whom they are attributed. This is really their most significant feature, and the one upon which their whole evidential value depends. One critic has estimated the fall of the fortresses of Jaffalabab, on a critical occasion, with the fall of the walls of Jericho, as though the one was no more a miracle than the other. But the fall of the walls of Jericho, though it may well have been produced by some natural force, such as an earthquake, bears the character of a miracle because it was predicted, and was thus commanded by God to occur in pursuance of the acts prescribed to Joshua. Similarly the whole significance of Our Lord's miracles is that they occur at His word and in obedience to Him. "What manner of man is this," exclaimed the disciples, "that even the winds and the sea obey Him?" (Matt. 8:27.)

IV. Evidential Value of Miracle. — This leads us to the true view of the value of miracles as proofs of a revelation. This is one of the 1. Miracles as proofs far too abstract a manner. Argument of Reve- lation must have been strung to show that there can be no real revelation without miracles, that miracles are the proper proof of a revelation, and so on. It is always a perilous method of argument, perhaps a presumptuous one, to attempt to determine whether God could produce a given result in any other way than the one which He has actually adopted. The only safe, and the sufficient, method of proceeding is to consider whether as a matter of fact, and in what way, the miracles which are actually recorded do guarantee the particular revelation in question.

Consider Our Lord's miracles in this light. Assuming, on the grounds already indicated, that they actually occurred, they prove 2. Miracles beyond doubt that He had supreme power, and that what He actually said was not only true, but true in the striking words of the Eng. service for the Visitation of the Sick, that He was "Lord of life and death, and of all things, saving, as youth, strength, health, age, weakness and sickness." This is the grand fact which the miracles establish. They are not like external evidence, performed in attestation of a doctrine. They are direct and eloquent evidence of the cardinal truth of our faith, that Our Lord possessed powers which belong to God Himself. But they are not less direct evidence of the special office He claimed toward the human race — that of a Saviour. He did much more than merely impress the human mind with the thought that He was a Saviour by doing the works of a Saviour, by healing men and performing miracles. He was revealed as the man of God's own Word, the Mediator of our salvation, the Man Christ Jesus. He was the Saviour, with His words — virtutes — were direct evidence of their truth. He proved that He was the Saviour by doing the works of a Saviour, by revealing the truth from the very nature of God s body and soul. It is well known that salvation in the true sense, viz. saving men out of evils and corruptions into which they have fallen, is an idea which was actually introduced into the world by the gospel. There was no word for this in the Roman tongue. The ancients knew of a servator, but not of a salvator. The essential message of the miracles is that they exhibit Our Lord in this character — that of one who has alike the will and the power to save. Such is Our Lord's own application of them in His answer, already quoted, to the disciples of John the Baptist (Matt.11:4,5.)

It is therefore an extraordinary mistake to suppose that the evidence for our faith would not be damaged if the miracles were set aside. 3. Miracles We should lose the positive evidence Part of Our Lord's saving Revelation power. In this view, the miracles are not the mere proofs of a revelation; they are themselves the revelation, like the revelation of a Saviour from all human ills, and there has been no other revelation in the world of such a power. The miracles recorded of the apostles have a like effect. They are wrought, like St. Peter's and the impotent man, as evidence of the living power of the Saviour (Acts 3,4). "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in him doth this man stand here before you and all. . . . And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." (Acts 4:10,12.) In a word, the miracles of the NT, whether wrought by Our Lord or by His apostles, reveal a new source of power, in the person of Our Lord, for the salvation of men. Whatever interference they involve with the usual order of Nature is due, not to any modification of that order, but to the intervention of a new force in it. The nature of that force is revealed by them, and can only be ascertained by observation of them. A man is known by his words and by his deeds, and to these two sources of revelation, respecting His person and character, Our Lord expressly appealed. If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that
Miracle

ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father” (Jn 10:37-38).

It is therefore a mistake to try to put the evidence of the miracles into a logically demonstrative argument. Palestrina put the case too much in this almost anathematized form.

"It is idle," he said, "to say that a future state had been discovered already. It had been discovered as the Copernican system was; it was as much a matter of necessity. He alone discovers who proves; and no man can prove this point but the teacher who testifies by miracles that he has the grace come from God” (Moral and Politi. Philos.oy, book V, ch. ix, close).

Colleridge, in the Aids to Reflection, criticizes the above and puts the argument in a juster and more human form.

"Most fervently do I contend, that the miracles worked by Christ, both as miracles and as fulfillments of prophecy, both as signs and as wonders, made plain discovery, and gave unquestionable proof, of His Divine character and authority: that they were to the whole Jewish nation true and appropriate evidences, that He was indeed come who had been confidently and declared, by His fathers, "Behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense He will come and save you. I receive of them, or prove, for the truth of every word which He taught who was Himself the Word: and as I have stretched forth the end of the life to come, in that they were manifestations of Him who said: "I am the resurrection and the life!” (note prefixed to Aphorism CXXXI).

This seems the fittest manner in which to contemplate the evidence afforded by miracles.

V. Miracles in the OT.—If the miracles ascribed to Our Lord and His apostles are established on the grounds now stated, and are of the same character and purpose with NT Miracles as credible and applying the miracles of the OT. They also are obviously wrought as manifestations of a Divine Being, and as evidences of His character and will.

This, e.g., was the great purpose of the miracles wrought for the deliverance of the people of Israel out of Egypt. The critical theories which treat the narrative of those events as ‘unhistorical’ are, I am convinced, unsound. If they could be established, they would deprive us of some of the most precious evidences we possess of the character of God. But, in any case, the purpose to which the alleged miracles are ascribed is of the same character as in the case of the NT miracles. "For ask now," says Moses, "of the days that are past... whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever a people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live? Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by an outstretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that Jehovah thy God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? Unto thee it was showed, that thou mightest know that Jehovah is God; there is none else besides him" (Dt 4:32–35). The God of the Jews was, and is, the God manifested in these miracles. Accordingly, the Ten Commandments are introduced with the declaration: "I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," and on this follows: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Ex 20:3). Without these miracles, the God of the Jews would be an abstraction. As manifested in them, He is the living God, with a known character, “a just God and a Saviour” (Isa 45:21), who can be loved with all the heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.

The subsequent miracles of Jewish history, like those wrought by Elijah, serve the same great end, and reveal more and more both of the will and the power of God. They are signs, portents, not mere portents but ex- temporary testimony to a doctrine. They are the acts of a living Being wrought through His ministers, or with their cooperation, and He is revealed by them. If the miracles of the NT were possible, those of the OT were possible, and as those of the NT reveal the nature and will of Christ, by word and deed, so those of the OT reveal the existence, the nature, and the will of God. Nature, indeed, reveals God, but the miracles reveal new and momentous acts of God; and the whole religious life of the Jews, as the Ps show, is indissolubly bound up with them. The evidence for them is, in fact, the historic consciousness of a great and tenacious nation.

It should be added that the Jewish Scriptures embody one of the greatest of miracles—that of prophecy. It is obvious that the prophecy of the Jewish people is pre-as Miracle from the commencement, in the midst of the life of Abraham and onward. There can, moreover, be no question that the office of the Christ had been so distinctly foreshadowed in the Scriptures of the OT that the people, as a whole, expected a Messiah before He appeared. Our Lord did not, like Buddha or Mohammed, create a new office; He came to fill an office which had been described by the prophets, and of which they had predicted the functions and powers. We are told of the behaviour, "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Lk 24:27). That, again, is a revelation of God’s nature, for it reveals Him as ‘knowing the end from the beginning,’ and as the Ruler of human life and history.

VI. Ecclesiastical Miracles.—Some notice, finally, must be taken of the question of what are called ecclesiastical miracles. There seems no sufficient reason for assuming that miracles ceased with the apostles, and there is much evidence that in the early church miraculous cures, both of body and soul, were sometimes vouchedsafed. There were occasions and circumstances of the manifestation of such miraculous power was as appropriate as testimony of the living power of Christ, as in the scenes in the Acts. But they were not recorded under inspired guidance, like the miracles of the Apostolic Age, and they have in many cases been overlaid by legend.

The observation in Pascal’s Thoughts eminently applies to this class of miracles: "It has appeared to me that the real cause [that there are so many false miracles, false revelations, etc] is that there are true ones, for it would not be possible that there should be so many false miracles unless there were true, nor so many false miracles unless there were one that is true. For if all this had never been, it is impossible that so many others should have believed it... Thus instead of concluding that there are no true miracles since there are so many false, we must, on the contrary say that there are true miracles since there are so many false, and that false miracles exist only for the reason that there are true; so also that there are false religions only because there is one that is true" (Oeuvres, p. 41).

VII. Miracle in Works of Grace.—It has lately been argued with much earnestness and force in Germany, particularly by J. Wendland, in his Miracles and Christianity, that belief in miracles is indispensable to our apprehension of a real living God, and to our trust in His saving work in our own souls. The work of grace, indeed, is so far miraculous that it requires the influence upon our nature of a living power above
that nature. It is not strictly correct to call it miraculous, as these operations of God's Spirit are not the established part of His kingdom of grace. But they none the less involve the exercise of a like supernatural power to that exhibited in Our Lord's miracles of healing and casting out of devils; and in proportion to the depths of man's Christian life will he be compelled to believe in the gracious operation on his soul of this Divine interposition.

On the whole, it is perhaps increasingly realized that miracles, so far from being an excrescence on Christian faith, are indissolubly bound up with it, and that there is a complete unity in the manifestation of the Divine nature, which is recorded in the Scriptures.

LITERATURE.—Trench, Notes on the Miracles; Mosley, Bampton Lectures (Mosley's argument is perhaps somewhat too positive and controversial a tone, but, if the notes be read as well as the Lectures, the reader will obtain a comprehensive view of the main controversies on the subject): A. B. Bruce, The Miraculous Element in the Gospels. For modern German views see J. Wendland, Miracles and Christianity; Christleben, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief; Paley's Evidences and his Analogies may profitably be consulted. On continuance of miracles, see Bushnell, Nature and the Supernatural, ch. xiv, and Christleben, as above, Lecture V. H. Wace

MIRACLES, GIFT OF. See Spiritual Gifts: Miracle.

MIRAGE, mɛ-ʀaɡɛ (מַגָּרֶה, ṣhârebû, "heat-mirage"; Arab. سَرْطْب, sarîb, from vb. سَرْطَب, to go forth, "to flow"; hence "flowing of water"): The glowing sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty ground springs of water (Isa 35 7); AV has "parched ground" and RV "mirage." The same Heb word is also used in Isa 49 10, "Neither shall the heat [in "mirage"] nor sun smite them." These are the only uses of the word in the Scriptures, although mirages are very common in the drier parts of the country. However, the context in both cases seems to justify the tr usually given, rather than "mirage."—Alfred H. Joy

MIRE, mɪr. See Chalkstone; Clay; Marsh.

MIRIAM, mɪrɪ-əm (מִרְיָם, mîryâm; LXX and the NT Ἄννα, Ἄνδρια; NV of the NT "Mary").

(1) Daughter of Amram and Jochebed, and sister of Aaron and Moses. It is probable that it was she who watched the ark of bulrushes in which the child Moses was laid (Ex 2; 25). She associated herself with her brothers in the exodus, was called the "prophetess," and led the choir of maidens who sang the triumph-song after the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 15 21). Along with Aaron, she opposed Moses at Hazeroth (Nu 12 1-5). She was smitten with leprous in punishment, but on Aaron's intercession was pardoned and healed (Nu 12 10-15). She died and was buried at Kadesh (Nu 20 1). In the Deuteronomic Law respecting leprosy, Miriam is mentioned as a warning to the Israelites (Dt 24 8 f.). In Mic 6 4, she is referred to along with Moses and Aaron as a leader of God's people.

(2) Son (or daughter) of Jether (1 Ch 4 17). The latter half of the verse in its present situation unintelligible; it should probably follow ver 18 (see Curtis, "Chron.," in loc.).—John A. Lees

MIRMAH, mɪr-ma (מִרְמָה, mîrmâh, "deceit"): A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 10).

MIRROR, mɪr-ɹ. See Looking-glass.


(2) In Three ver 66 (LXX Dn 3 88), for "Mishaël," one of Daniel's companions in captivity.

MISIAIS, mɪs-ə-ɛs, mɪs-ə-sɛ: RVm = "Masiaus."

MISCHIEF, mɪs-ʃɛf: The word, in the sense of "hurt" or "evil" befalling, plotted against, or done to, anyone, represents a variety of Heb terms (e.g., 'ṣənom, AV Gen 42 4; 44 29; Ex 21 22; ra, 1 S 16 17; 2 S 16 8; 1 K 11 19; Amâdû, Ps 71 14; 16; 10 7 14; Prov 24 2, etc). Sometimes RV changes the word, as to "evil" (Ex 32 12 22); in Acts 13 10, to "villany" (falsehood, falsehood). In RV Apoc the word is used for ekâd, kâkâ, "evil," Ad Est 13 5 (cf Sir 19 28); saâza, kâkô, "evil," 1 Mac 7 23; and Lat malam, "evil," 2 Esd 15 66. "Mischievous" is used, Ad Est 14 19, for scumpê, scumpê, "to be evil." The use in AV Apoc is considerably more extended (Sir 11 35; 19 27; 27 27, etc).—James Orr

MISGAB, mɪs-gɛb (מִסְגָּב, ha-ningsâb; B, ὁ ῥήσυς, ὁ ῥήσυς; C, ὁ ἀνάγκης): Named with Nebo and Kiriathaim in the denunciation of doom against Moab (Jer 48 1). No trace of any name resembling this has been found. Possibly we should take it, not as a place-name, but as an appellation of some strong fortress, perhaps of Kir-moab itself. The term is elsewhere trd "high fortress" (Isa 25 12, etc).

MISHAEL, mɪs-hɛ-sl, mɪs-hɛ-sl (מֵישָאֵל, mishâ'el, perhaps = "who is equal to God"): (1) A Kohathite, 4th in descent from Levi (Ex 6 22). He and his brother Elzaphan carried out Moses' order to remove from the sanctuary and the camp the corpses of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10 4 f).

(2) A supporter of Ezra at the reading of the Law (Neh 8 4).

(3) The Heb name of one of Daniel's 3 companions (Dnl 1 6 7 11.19; 2 17). His Bab name was Meshach (q.v.).

MISHAL, mɪs-hɛl, mɪs-hɛl (מִשָּל, mishâl): A town in the territory of Asher (Josh 19 26, AV "Mishael," Messia, Misaèl), assigned to the Gershonite Levites (Num 31 30; B, Baârârûm, Baârârûm, C, Misaèla, Misaèla = "Mishal") of 1 Ch 6 74).—Onam (q.v., "Ma-

MISHAM, mɪs-ham (מִשָּה, mishâ): A Benjamite, son of Elpaal (1 Ch 8 12).

MISHAL, mɪs-hɛ-sl. See Mishal.

MISHMA, mɪs-ma (מִשְׁמָה, mishma'): (1) A son of Ishmael (Gen 25 14; 1 Ch 1 30).

(2) A Simeonite (1 Ch 4 25).

MISHMANNAH, mɪs-ma-ɛnə (מִשְׁמַנָּה, mishmanâ): A Gadite warrior who joined David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12 10).

MISHNA, mɪsh-nə. See Talmod.

MISHNEH, mɪsh-nɛ (מִשְׁנֵה, ha-mishneh; 2 K 22 14; 2 Ch 34 22, AV "college," RV "second quarter") m "Heb Mishneh"); Zeph 1 10, AV "the second," RV "second quarter," m "Heb Mishneh.") A part of Jesus, apparently not far from the First Gate (q.v.) and the Makkesh (q.v.). The tr "college" is due to Tg Jon on 2 K 22 14. The
RV interpretation of Misheah is connected with the belief that Hezekiah, when he built "the other wall without" (1 Ch 22:5), made the second wall on the N. There seems little evidence of this (see Jer 31:11, 16), and the "second" may refer to the district of the city on the west hill or perhaps to the hill itself. See COLLEGE.

E. W. G. Masterman

MISHOR, mi'shór. See PLAIN, and also in HDB, II, 309.

MISHRAITES, mish'-rā'tēs (מִשְׁרָאֵל, ha-mish-rā'ā): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim (1 Ch 2 53).

MISPAR, mis'pâr (מִסְפָּר, mispâr): An exile who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 2). AV spells the name "Mispar." In the | verse of Neh it appears as "Mispereth" (Neh 7 7).

MISPERETH, mis'pè-reth (מִסְפֶּר, mispereth). See MISPAR.

MISREPHOTH-MAIM, mis-ré-fōth-mā'îm (מִסְרֶפֶּת הַמָּיִם, misphōth mā'îm; LXX Μασερόν, Maserôn, Māṣerē Memphōth-maim): A place to which Joshua chased the various tribes which were confederated under Jabin, after their defeat at the waters of Merom (Josh 11 8). It follows the mention of great Sidon, as though it was a place in the same region but farther from the point of departure. In Josh 13 6, it is also mentioned in connection with the Sidonians, as though it was included in their territory, so it must have been in the coast district, or Phoenicia, which was in that period dominated by Sidon. The Canaanites who were among the tribes forming the hosts of Jabin would naturally seek refuge among the brethren in Sidon and its territory. They fled across the hill country which lies between the waters of Merom and the coast, but as Sidon is situated considerably to the N. of Merom, some would seek the coast by a more southerly route, and we may look for Misrephoth-maim there. Dr. Thomson (LB, II, 266-67, ed 1882) locates it at Ras el-Museiref, some 13 miles S. of Tyre, where there was a stronghold, and where the fugitives might find refuge (see LADDERS OF TYRE). Though the name is suggestive Misrephoth-maim, the identification may be accepted until some better one is found.

H. Porter

MIST (מָיס, 'adḥ; ἀήμασ, achłís, ἄφικαθ, homíchā): Mist is caused by particles of water vapor filling the air until it is only partially transparent. Mist and haze produce much the same effect, the one being due to moisture in the atmosphere and the other to dust particles. Mist or fog is not common on the plains of Pal and Syria at sea-level, but of almost daily occurrence in the mountain valleys, coming up at night and disappearing with the morning sun (Wisd 2 4). It is nothing else than a cloud touching the land. In the account of creation, "there went up a mist from the earth," giving a description of the warm humid atmosphere of the carboniferous ages which agrees remarkably with the teaching of modern science (Gen 2 6). The word is used fig. in Acts 13 11 to describe the shutting-out of light. Those who bring confusion and uncertainty are compared to "mists driven by a storm" (2 Pet 2 17). See VAPOR. 

Alfred H. Joy

MISTRESS, mis'tres (מִיסְרֵס, bo'āḏāh, בּוּאַדָּה, g'bereth): Is the tr of bo'āḏāh, "lady," "owner" (1 K 17 17; Nah 3 4); in 1 S 28 7, "a woman that hath a familiar spirit" is lit. "the mistress of a familiar spirit"; of g'bereth (Gen 16 4-8.9; 2 K 5 3; Ps 125 2; Prov 30 23; Isa 24 2); in Isa 47 5,7, we have AV and ERV "lady," ARV "mistress."

MITE, mit (םיֵטָה, lepôtān): The smallest copper or bronze coin current among the Jews. They were first struck by the Maccean princes with Heb legends, and afterward by the Herods and the Roman procurators with Gr legends. The "widow's mite" mentioned in Mk 12 42 and Lk 21 2 was probably of the first kind, since those with Gr legends were regarded as unlawful in the temple service. According to Mk, the lepton was only half a kodrântâs (Lat quadrans), which would indicate a value of about one-fourth of a cent or half an Eng. farthing. See MONEY. H. Porter

MITHKAH, mith'ka (מִיתָּךְ, mithkāh, "sweetness"); AV Mitthiah): Name given owing to sweetness of pasture or water. A desert camp of the Israelites between Terah and Hashmonah (Nu 33 28). See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MITHINITE, mith'ínīt (מִיתִינִיָּה, ha-mithinē): Designation of Jehoshaphat, one of David's officers (1 Ch 11 43).

MITHRADATES, mith-rá-dä'tēs (A, Mêrhoa-rēth, Mithreddates, B, Mêrho-rāth, Mithridates; AV Mithridates): (1) The treasurer of Cyrus to whom the king committed the vessels which had been taken from the temple and who delivered them to the governor, Sanballas (1 Esd 2 11 = "Mithredath" of Ezr 1 8).

(2) Apparently another person of the same name—one of the commissioners stationed in Samaria who wrote a letter to Artaxerxes persuading him to put a stop to the rebuilding of Jerus (1 Esd 2 16 = "Mithredath" of Ezr 4 7). See S. Angus

MITHREDATH, mith-rē-dâth (מִיתֶרְדָּתָה, mith-rē-dāth; Pers = "gift of Mithra" or "consecrated to Mithra"): (1) The Pers treasurer through whom Cyrus restored the sacred vessels to the returning Jewish exiles (Ezr 1 8).

(2) A Persian, perhaps an official, who was associated with Bishlam and Tabeel in corresponding with Artaxerxes concerning the restoration of Jerus (Ezr 4 7). In 1 Esd 2 11-16, the name is written Mithridates (q.v.).

MITRE, mi'tér: In AV this word renders two Heb words, both of which, however, come from the same stem, viz. מִשְׁרֵס, g'bereth, "to coil" or "to wrap round." In Ex 28, a mitre (RVM "turban") is enumerated among Aaron's articles of dress, which were to be made by tailors of recognized skill. On the forefront of the mitre was a "plate of pure gold" with the words "Holy to Jehovah" (i.e. consecrated to Jehovah) inscribed upon it. This gold plate was fastened to the mitre by a blue ribbon. The material of the mitre was fine linen or silk. The word for the headtire (AV "bonnet") of the ordinary priest was a different word. Ezekiel uses the word in connection with Zedekiah (21 26); the prophet associated regal and priestly functions with the throne. It is possible, however, that the two sentences—"remove the mitre," and "take off the crown"—refer to the degradation of the priesthood and of the throne which the downfall of Jerus will involve. The LXX varies between kidaris and mitra, the former word being used in Sir 45 12. 

T. Lewis
Mitylene, Moab, Moabites

MITYLENE, mit-i-lē'nyē, mit-i-lē'nyūs (Μίτυληνη, Mītūlēnē, or Μιτυλήνη, Mītulēnē, as usually on coins): In antiquity the most important city of the Asiatic Aeolians and of the island of Lesbos. It had 2 harbors and strong fortresses. The city was besieged by the Athenians and finally taken. The island and city of Mitylene were treated with great severity; the walls were dismantled, and the city was deprived of its power on the sea. In the time of Alexander the Great, Mitylene suffered most through the Persians, and later by the occupation of the Macedonians, but afterward regained its power and prosperity, and still later was favored by the Roman emperors, being made a free city by Pompey. In the Middle Ages, the name Mitylene was applied to the whole island. The present town, often called simply Choston, is a large castle built on the site of the ancient acropolis (in 1373). The city was conquered by the Turks in 1571. It contains 14 mosques, 7 churches, and has a population of about 15,000.

On his third missionary journey, Paul traveled to the Hellepont from Philippi, thence through the Troad by land to Assos on the southern side—where extensive excavations were carried on in 1881 by an American archaeological expedition—thence by ship to Mitylene (Acts 20 14), where he spent the night. Leaving Lesbos, he sailed southward to a point opposite the island of Chios (Acts 20 15). There is no record that a Christian church had been established in Mitylene at this time.

LITERATURE.—Tozer, Islands of the Aegean, 121, 134 f., 136; Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 201 f.

MIXED, mikst, MULTITUDE, mu't-i-tūd. See MINGLED PEOPLE.

MIZAR, mīzār, THE HILL (מִזָּר, j̄, har mīz'ār; Ḍōs mika'-rōs, Ḍōs mīkārōs): The name of a mountain found only in Ps 42 6; “I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons, from the hill Mizar.” The term may be taken as an appellative meaning “littleness,” and the phrase meḥār mīzār would then mean “from the little mountain,” i.e. the little mountain of Zion. Some scholars think that the Hermons in meḥār may have arisen from dittography, and that we should read, “from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons, O thou little mountain [of Zion].” G. A. Smith discusses the question in a note (HGLH, 477). He suggests that certain names found in the district (za’ārah, wádî za’ārah, and Khirbet Mazār) may be a reminiscence of the name of a hill in the district called Mi’zār; and surely none other would have been put by the Psalmist in apposition to the Hermons. Cheyne says: “To me this appendage to Hermon seems a poetic loss. Unless the little mountain has a symbolic meaning I could wish it away.” I cannot see this: the symbolic meanings suggested for Hermonim and Mi’zār are all forced, and even if we got a natural one, it would be out of place after the literal land of Jordan. To employ all as proper names is suitable to a lyric. No identification is at present possible. W. EWING

MIZPAH, mīz'pāh, MIZPEH, mīz'pē: This name is pointed both ways in the Heb, and is found usually with the article. The meaning seems to be “outlook” or “watchtower.” It is natural, therefore, to look for the places so named in high positions, commanding wide prospects.

(1) (מִצְפָּה, ha-mīz̄pāh) [Gen 31 49; Jgs 11 11-34, מִצְפָּה, mīz̄pāh [Hos 5 1], מִצְפָּה, mīz̄pāh ghîlâd [Jgs 11 29]; Maṣōnâyâ, Masōsphâth, הַיּוֹ מִצְפָּה, ḥēn mīz̄pāh, and other forms]: It seems probable that the same place is intended in all these passages, and that it is identical with Ramath-mizpah of Josh 13 26. It is a place where Jacob and Laban parted in Mt. Gilad; consequently it lay to the N. of Mahanaim. Here was the home of Jephthah, to which he returned after the defeat of the Ammonites, only to realize how his rash vow had brought desolation to his house. It was taken by Judas Maccabaeus, who destroyed the inhabitants and burned the city (1 Macc 5 35). Identifications have been suggested with Ṣaf, Jerash, and Kal‘at er-Rabad; but these seem all to lie S. of any possible site for Mahanaim. A ruined site was discovered by Dr. Schumacher (M and NPVD, 1897, 86), with the name Maṣîlā, which is just the Arab. equivalent of the Heb Mîz̄pāh. It lies some distance to the N.W. of Jerash and claims consideration in any attempt to fix the site of Mizpah.

(2) (מִצְפָּה, mīz̄pāh; Maṣ̄āfâ, Maṣ̄afâh): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Dilan, Joktheel and Lachish (Tell el-Hesy). Onom mentions a Maṣâfâ in the neighborhood of Eleutheropolis, to the N. The identification proposed by Van de Velde and Guérin would suit this description. They would locate Mizpah at Tell es-Sâbïyeh, about 7½ miles N.W. of Bet Jîlîm, “a conspicuous hill with a glittering white cliff rising like an isolated block above the adjacent country” (PEFS, 1903, 276). Many identify this site with Gath, but the name and character of the place point rather to its identification with Mîzphâ, the “hillock of Gibeon” in the fanne Gauri or Alba Specula of the Middle Ages.

(3) (מִצְפָּה, mīz̄pāh; Maṣōnâyâ, Maṣōmâth, Maṣ̄âfâh): A town in the territory of Benjamin (Josh 18 26). Hither came the men of Israel to deal with the Benjamites after the outrage on the Levite’s concubine (Jgs 20 13; 21 1-5), at Mizpah, Samuel gathered his countrymen. While there crying to God in their distress, they were attacked by the Philis, whom they defeated with great slaughter (1 S 7 5, etc). Here also Saul, the son of Kish, was chosen king, after which Samuel told the people the “manner of the kingdom” (10 17, etc). Mizpah was fortified by Asa, king of Judah, with materials which Baasha, king of Israel, had used to fortify Ramah (1 K 15 22; 2 Ch 16 6). When Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem and made Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, governor of the remnant of the people left in the land of Judah, the governor’s residence was fixed at Mizpah (2 K 25 23). Here he was joined by Jeremiah, whom Nebuzaradan, captain of the Bodyguard, had set free. At Mizpah, Jair, son of Nathaniel, treacherously slew Gedaliah and many who were with him. Two days later he murdered a company of pilgrims, throwing their dead bodies into the great cistern which Asa had made when
strengthening the place against possible attack by Baasha of Samaria. He then made prisoners of the people, including the king's daughters, and attempted to convey them away to the Amorites, an attempt that was frustrated by Jehosh, son of Karoah (Jer 40, 41). Mizpah was the scene of

memorable assembly in a day of sore anxiety for Judah, when Judas Maccabaeus called the warriors of Judah together for counsel and prayer (1 Macc 3 46). From this passage we also learn that the place was an ancient sanctuary—for in Mizpah there was a place of prayer aforesight for Israel.'

It has been proposed to identify Mizpah with Tell Nasbeh, a site on the watershed S. of Bireh. The Abbé Raboisson established the fact that Jerus can be seen from this point. In this respect it agrees with Maundeville's description. "It is a very fair and delicious place, and it is called Mt. Joy because it gives joy to pilgrims' hearts, for from that place men first see Jerusalem." But Jer 41 10 may be taken as decisive against this identification. Ishmael departed to go east. From Tell Nasbeh this would never have brought him to the great waters that are in Gibeon, el-Jeb (Gibeon) being only a mile and a quarter distant.

A town in Moab to which David took his parents for safety during Saul's pursuit of him (1 S 22 3). It is possibly to be identified with Kir-moab, the modern Kerak, whither David would naturally go to interview the king. But there is no certainty. Possibly we should read "Mizpah" instead of "the hold" in ver 5.

In 2 Ch 20 24, probably we should read "Mizpah" instead of "watch-tower": ha-mizpeh la-middibbər would then point to a Mizpah of the Wilderness to be sought in the district of Tekoa (ver 20).

MIZPAR, mis'pər. See MISPAR.

MIZRAIM, mis'ri-am (מִצְרָיִם), Mizrayim: (1) A son of Ham, and ancestor of various peoples, Ludim, Ananim, etc (Gen 10 6; 1 Ch 1 8). See Table of Table of Nations.

(2) The name of Egypt. See Egypt.

The land of Ham—בָּר, bər, was another name for the land of Egypt. It occurs only in Ps 105 22, 37; 106 22; Ps 78 51 probably refers to that Ham, though it may refer to the children of Ham. The origin and etymology of this name are involved in mystery. Two improbable etymologies and one probable etymology for Ham as a name of Egypt have been proposed, and the improbable ones very much urged: (1) Ham is often thought to be a Heb appropriation of the Egypt name "Hem," a name for the "black land" as distinguished from "dessert," the red land of the desert which surrounded it. This etymology is very attractive, but phonetically very improbable to say the least. (2) Ham has sometimes been connected directly with בָּר, bər, the second son of Noah whose descendants under the name Mieszram occupied a part of Northeastern Africa. But as there is no trace of this name among the Egyptians and no use of it in the historical books of the OT, this can hardly be said to be a probable derivation of the word. (3) There is a third proposed etymology for Ham which connects it ultimately but indirectly with Ham, the second son of Noah. Some of the earliest sculptures yet found in Egypt represent the god Min. (MoCar, of Tepies by Professor Petrie). This god seems to have been called Khem, a very exact Egypt equivalent for בָּר, bər, the second son of Noah and the ancestor of the Hamitic people of Egypt. That Ham the son of Noah should be depicted in the Egypt pantheon is not surprising. The seminadv of this god Min or Khem also accords well with the reputation for licentiousness borne by Ham the son of Noah. These facts suggest very strongly a trace in Egypt mythology of the actual style of the Hamitic people. (4) While the preceding division (3) probably states the real explanation of the early name of Egypt, it still remains to be noted that the use of the name Ham by the Psalmist may be entirely poetic. Until it be found that the name Khem was applied to Egypt, the other writers of that period it will ever be in some measure unlikely that the Psalmist was acquainted with the mythological use of the name Ham and so, in equal measure, probable that he meant nothing more than to speak of the land of the Ewings of Ham. See also Ham, Land of.

M. G. KYLE

MIZZAH, mis'a (מִצְזָה), Mizzah, "strong," "firm":

Grandson of Easu, one of the "dukes" of Edom (Gen 36 15 17; 1 Ch 1 37).

MNASON, nā'sōn, m'nā'sōn (Μνάσων, Mnāsōn): All that we know of Mnason is found in Acts 21 16. (1) He accompanied Paul and his party from Caesarea on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem; he was a Cyprian; (2) "an early disciple," an early convert to Christianity, and (4) the one with whom Paul's company was to lodge. The "Western" text of this passage is very interesting. Blas, following D, Syr, reads, for "bringing," etc. (2) "bring us to those with whom one should lodge, and when we had come into a certain village we stayed with Mnason a Cyprian, an early disciple, and having departed thence we came to Jerus and the brethren," etc. (3) "and" Meyer-Wendt, Page and Rendell render the accepted text, "bringing us to the house of Mnason," etc. However, giving the imperf. trans. of anabainomen, "we were going up" to Jerus (ver 15), we might understand that the company lodged with Mnason on the 1st night of their journey to Jerus, and not at the city itself. "Ver 15, they set about the journey; ver 16, they lodged with Mnason on the introduction of the Caesareans disciples; ver 17, they came to Jerus ("Epres Gr Text", in loc.).

MOAB, mō'ab, MOABITES, mō'ab-its (Moab, מואב, mō'ab, Moabite Stone, 2 M; Gr [LXX] Moab, Μωάβ, Μωάβ, Moabīteēs, Μωάβιτες, Μωαβιτείς, Hebrew, -beitis, -beis, -beis; Moabite, מֹאָבִי, Moab, מֹאָב, Mōáb, Mōaib, Mōaib; Mo'avites, מֹאָבִים, Moabite, Moabites, מֹאָב, מֹאָב, מֹאָב; brānā mo'āḇāh): Moab was the district E. of the Dead Sea, extending from a point some distance N. of it to its southern end. The eastern boundary was indefinite, being the border of the desert which is irregular. The length of the
with a very precipitous frontage, but the elevation of this ridge above the interior is very slight. Deep chasms lead down from the tableland to the Dead Sea shore, the principal one being the gorge of the river Arnon, which is about 1,700 ft. deep and 2 or more miles in width at the level of the tableland, but very narrow at the bottom and with exceedingly precipitous banks. About 13 miles back from the mouth of the river the gorge divides, and farther back it subdivides, so that several valleys are formed of diminishing depth as they approach the desert border. These are referred to in Nu 21 14 as the "valleys of the Arnon." The "valley of Zered" (Nu 21 12), which was on the southern border, drops down to the southern end of the Dead Sea, and although not so long or deep as the Arnon, is of the same nature in its lower reaches, very difficult to cross, dividing into two branches, but at a point much nearer the sea. The stream is not so large as the Arnon, but is quite copious, even in summer. These gorges have such precipitous sides that it would be very difficult for an army to cross them, except in their upper courses near the desert where they become shallow. The Israelites passed them in that region, probably along the present Huj road and the line of the Mecca Railway. The tableland is fertile but lacks water. The fountains and streams in the valleys and on the slopes toward the Dead Sea are abundant, but the uplands are almost destitute of flowing water. The inhabitants supply themselves by means of cisterns, many of which are ancient, but many of those used in ancient times are ruined. The population must have been far greater formerly than now. The rainfall is usually sufficient to mature the crops, although the rain falls in winter only. The fertility of the country in ancient times is indicated by the numerous towns and villages known to have existed there, mentioned in Scripture and on the M S, the latter giving some not found elsewhere. The principal of these were: Ar (Nu 21 15); Ataroth, Dibon, Jazer, Nimrah, Nebo (32 3); Beth-peor (Dt 3 29);

The Moabites were of Sem stock and of kin to the Hebrews, as is indicated by their descent from Lot, the nephew of Abraham (Gen 19 30–37), and by their language which is practically the same as the Heb. This is clear from the inscription on the M S, a monument of Mesha, king of Moab, erected about 850 BC, and discovered among the ruins of Dibon in 1868. It contains 34 lines of about 9 words each, written in the old Phoen. and Heb. characters corresponding to the Siloam inscription and those found in Phoenicia, showing that it is a dialect of the Sem tongue prevailing in Pal. The original inhabitants of Moab were the Emim (Dt 2 10), "a people great ..., and tall, as the Anakim." When these were deposed by the Moabites we do not know. The latter are not mentioned in the Am. Tab. and do not appear on the Egyptian monuments before the 14th cent. BC, when they seem to be referred to under the name of Duten, or native Lotan, i.e. Lot (Paton, Syria and Pal); Moab appears in a list of names on a monument of Ramesses III of the XXth Dynasty. The country lay outside the line of march of the Egyptian armies, and this accounts for the silence of its monuments in regard to them.

The chief deity of Moab was Chemosh (חֵמוֹשׁ, Ḫmōš), frequently mentioned in the OT and on the M S, where King Mesha speaks of building a high place in his honor because he was saved by him (Nu 21 11). He represents the oppression of Moab by Omri as the result of the anger of Chemosh, and Mesha made war against Israel by command of Chemosh. He was the national god of Moab, as Molech was of Ammon, and it is pretty certain that he was propitiated by human sacrifices (2 K 3 27). But he was not the only god of Moab, as is clear from the account in Nu 25, where it is also clear that their idolatrous worship was corrupt. They had their Baalim like the nations around, as may be inferred from the place-names compounded with Baal, such as Bamoath-baal, Beth-baal-meon and Baal-peor.

We know scarcely anything of the history of the Moabites after the account of their origin in Gen 19 until the time of the exodus. It would seem, however, that they had suffered from the invasions of the Amorites, who, under their king Sihon, had subjugated the northern part of Moab as far as the Arnon (Nu 21 21–31). This conquest was a result of the movement of the Amorites southward, when they were pressed by the great wave of Hittite invasion that overran Northern Syria at the end of the 15th and the early part of the 14th centa. BC. The Amorites were forced to seek homes in Pal, and it would seem that a portion of them crossed the Jordan and occupied Northern Moab, and here the Israelites found them as they approached the

**Bedawin of Moab.**
Promised Land. They did not at first disturb the Moabites in the S., but passed around on the eastern border (Dt. 2:8,9) and came into conflict with the Amorites in the N. (Deut. 21-26), defeating them and occupying the territory (vs 31-32). But when Balak, son of Zippor, king of Moab, saw what a powerful people was settling on his border, he made alliance with the Midianites against them and called in the aid of Balaam, but as he could not induce the latter to curse them he refrained from attacking the Israelites (Nu 22, 24). The latter, however, suffered disaster from the people of Moab through their intercourse with them (Nu 25).

Some time before the establishment of the kingdom in Israel the Midianites overran Moab, as would appear from the passage in Gen. 36:35, but the conquest was not permanent, for Moab recovered its lost territory and became strong enough to encroach upon Israel across the Jordan. Eglon of Moab oppressed Israel with the aid of Ammon and Amalek (Jgs 3:13-14), but Eglon was assassinated by Ehud, and the Moabite yoke was cast off after 18 years. Saul smote Moab, but did not subdue it (1 S 14:47), for we find David putting his father and mother under the protection of the king of Moab when persecuted by Saul (1 S 22:3.4). But this friendship between David and Moab did not continue. When David became king he made war upon Moab and completely subjugated it (2 S 8:2). On the division of the kingdom between Rehoboam and Jeroboam the latter probably obtained possession of Moab (1 K 12:20), but it revolted and Omri had to reconquer it (M S), and it was tributary to Ahab (2 K 1:1). It revolted again in the reign of Ahaziah (2 K 1:1; 3:5), and Moab and Ammon made war on Jehoshaphat and Mt. Seir and destroyed the latter, but they afterward fell out among themselves and destroyed each other (2 Ch 20). Jehoshaphat and Jehoram together made an expedition into Moab and defeated the Moabites with great slaughter (2 K 3). But Mesha, king of Moab, was not subdued (ver 27), and afterward completely freed his land from the dominion of Israel (M S).

This was probably at the time when Israel and Judah were at war with Hazael of Damascus (2 K 13:20). Bands of Moabites ventured to raid the land of Israel when weakened by the conflict with Hazael (2 K 13:20), but Moab was probably subdued again by Jeroboam II (2 K 14:25), which may be the disaster to Moab recounted in Isa 15. After Mesha we find a king of the name of Salamanu and another called Chemosh-nadab, the latter being subject to Sargon of Assyria. He revolted against Sennacherib, in alliance with other kings of Syria and Pal and Egypt, but was subdued by him, and another king, Mutsuri, was subject to Earsahaddon. These items come to us from the Assyrian monuments.

When Babylon took the place of Assyria in the suzerainty, Moab joined other tribes in urging Judah to revolt, but seems to have come to terms with Nebuchadnezzar before Judas was taken, as we hear nothing of any expedition of that king against her. On the war described in Jh, in which Moab (1:12, etc) plays a part, see JUDITH.

At a later date Moab was overrun by the Nabataean Arabs who ruled in Petra and extended their authority on the east side of Jordan even as far as Damascus (Jos, Ant, XIII, xv, 1,2). The Moabites lost their identity as a nation and were afterward confounded with the Arabs, as we see in the statement of Jos (XIII, xiii, 5), where he says that Alexander (Jannaeus) overcame the Arabsians, such as the Moabites and the Gileadites. Alexander built the famous stronghold of Machaerus in Moab, on a hill overlooking the Dead Sea, which afterward became the scene of the imprisonment and tragic death of John the Baptist (Jos, BJ, VII, vi, 2; Ant, XVIII, v, 2; Mk 6:21-28). It was afterward destroyed by the Romans.

Khir became a fortress of the Crusaders under the name of Krak (Kerak), which held out against the Moslems until the time of Saladin, who captured it in 1188 AD.

LITERATURE.—Comna, on the passages in the OT relating to Moab, and histories of Israel; Paton, Early History of Syria and Pal; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, esp. Assyria and Babylonia; Conder, Heth and Moab; G. A. Smith, HGL; the Moabite Stone; Josephus.

MOABITE STONE: A monument erected at Dibon (Dhibdib) by Mesha, king of Moab (2 K 3:45), to commemorate his successful revolt from Israel and his conquest of Israeliteh territory. It was discovered, August 19, 1868, by a German mis-

H. PORTER

Moabite Stone.

(KEF Photo.)
Moadiah, mōā-dîäh. See MOADIAH.

MOCHMUR, mok'mur, THE BROOK (אַרְתָּק מַחְמוּר, ha chełmarrhs Hosochmôd). The torrent bed in a valley on which stood Chusi, not far from Ekrebîl (Jth 7 18). The latter may be identified with "Aḅrahèb, E. of Nîbûs. Wady Makhfrîyék runs to the S. of Ṭârebèb, and probably represents the ancient Mochmur.

MOCK, mok, MOCKER, mok'ër, MOCKING, mok'ing (מַחְמָר, makhîmar, מַחְמָרָה, makhîmarâ, מַחְמָרָה מְאָדוֹסְיָה, makhîmarâ mədaôsīyâ), To mock is the "banter, "mock," "deride" (Jgs 16 10.13.15; K 18 27; Job 13 9 bis, RV "deceiveth," "deceive," m "mocketh," "mock"); of lā'āgh, "to stammer" or "hobble in maimery," "to mock" or "scorn" (2 Ch 26 18; 1 Kg 11 3; 21 3; Prov 1 26; 17 5; 30 17; Jer 20 7). Other words are cābâk, "to laugh," etc (Gen 19 14; 21 9; 39 14.17); kālās, "to call out," or "cry after," "to scoff" or "mock at" (2 K 23 22; Ezek 22 5); sēḇōh, "to laugh," "mock" (Job 39 22; Lam 1 7); lēc, "to scorn" (Prov 14 9; sēḇāk, "laughter," "derision" (Job 12 4);施肥, "to treat as a child," "mock" (Mt 2 16; 20 19; 27 29.31.41; Lk 14 29, etc); dā'âhîmâzîd, "to mock," "laug. etc (Acts 2 13; 17 32); mûkârîthâ, "to sneer at," "mock" lit. "to mock the nose" (Gen 6 7; "God is not mocked," "will not let himself be mocked"); [endnotes 19.20.32], "crying," "epipâlād, "laugh" (Job 2 8; 1 Mac 7 34; 2 Mac 7 39; 8 17).

Mocker, hâlôthîm, "deceivers," "mockers" (Job 17 23); lēc (Prov 20 1; Isa 29 22; AV); lēk, "stammering," "mocking" (Ps 35 16; Lk 21 28; sēḇōh (Jer 15 17);施肥, "a mocker," "scoffer," lit. "sporting as children" (Jude ver 18; 2 Pet 3 3).

Mocking is the tr of kālîghâd, "mocking," "derision" (xxxx 23 2); of施肥, "a mocker, "mockery"; 2 Mac 7 7, "mocking-stock," RV "the mocking"; ver
MODAB, BOOK OF ELDAD AND. See ELDAD and MODAB, BOOK OF.

MODERATELY, modér-at-li (Gä, ríd-dhahákh): "Moderately" is the AV tr of ríd-dhákh, "righteousness" (Job 25 3), "for he hath given you the former rain moderately," m "according to righteousness," RV "in just measure," m "in [or for] righteousness"). In Phil 4 5 AV, the pseiekt is tr 4e moderation: "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand," RV "forbearance," "for gentleness," of 2 Cor 10 1. The proper meaning of this word has been the subject of considerable discussion; pseiekt is tr 4e "elemency (Acts 24 4), "gentleness" (of Christ) (2 Cor 10 1); pseiekt is "gentle" (1 Tim 3 3; Tit 3 2; 2 Tim 2 18). Trench says (Synonyma of the NT, 151): "It expresses exactly that moderation which recognizes the impossibility cleaving to formal law, of anticipating and providing for all cases that will emerge and present themselves to it for decision: which, with this, recognizes the decision even without the assertion of legal right, lest they should be pushed into moral wrongs, lest the 'summa jus' should in practice prove the 'summa sunturta,' which therefore pushes not its own rights to the uttermost, but going back in part or in the whole from these theories and ideas the highest of justice. It is thus more truly just than strict justice would have; no Latin word exactly and adequately renders it; elementa seta forth one side of it, accepot another; and perhaps modestia (by which the Vulg ert to its) 2 Cor 10 1) a third; but the word is wanting which should set forth all these excellence reconciles is a single and higher one." Its archetype and pattern, he points out, is found in God, who does not stand upon or assert strict rights in His relations to men.

Lightfoot has "forbearance": "Let your gentle and forbearing spirit be recognized by all men. The judgment is drawing nigh." Hastings prefers "considerateness" or "sweet reasonableness" (HDB, 111, 423) and "forbearance" are two passages which are saying the 'considerateness' of the Bible, whether applied to God or man, is an active virtue. It is the Spirit of the Messiah Himself, who will not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax, and it is the follower who realizes that the Lord is at hand." The want of this "considerateness" too often mars our religious life and spoils its influence.

W. L. WALKER

MODERATION, modér-á-shún (Gá, TR, pseiektód): The word occurs once in AV, Phil 4 5.

MODIN, mód-in (Modán, Moldein, Mado, Mod, Madin, Madsim, and other forms; in the Talm it is called 2נש, madinnim, and 2מג, modinnish [Neubauer, Geographie du Talm, 99]): This place owes its interest to the part it played in the history of the Maccabees. It was the ancestral home of their family (1 Macc 2 17, 70). Hither Mattathias, a priest of the sons of Iarib, retired when he was with a burning heart "the blasphemies that were committed in Judah and in Jerusalem" under the orders of Antiochus Epiphanes. But the king's officer followed him, and by offers of the king's friendship and great rewards sought to secure his conversion. Instead of the indignation of Mattathias, and when a Jew went forward to sacrifice, Mattathias slew him on the altar together with the king's officer. Thus began the patriotic uprising which led to the downfall of the priest's heroic sons, was destined to make illustrious the closing days of the nation's life (1 Macc 2 1 ff; Ant, VI, i, 2; BJ, i, i, 3). Mattathias, his wife and sons were all buried in Modin (1 Macc 2 70; 9 19; 13 25–30). Near Modin Judas pitched his camp, whence issuing by night with the watchword "Victory is God," he and a chosen band of warriors overthrew the army of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 13 14). In Modin Judas and John, the sons of Simon, slept before the battle in which they defeated Cendebeacus (1 Macc 16 4).

Of the impressive monument erected by Simon over the tombs of his parents and brethren Stanley (Hist of the Jewish Church, 319) gives the following account. It was a square structure surrounded by colonnades of monolithic pillars, of which the front and back were of white polished stone. Seven pyramids were erected by Simon on the summit, for the father and mother and four brothers who now lay there, with the seventh for himself when his time should come. On the faces of the monuments were bas-reliefs, representing the achievements of avarice and sparsity. The latter memorial of their many battles. There were also sculptures of ships—no doubt to indicate that long seashore of the Philist, which they were the first to use for their country's good. A monument at once so Jewish in idea and so powerful to the worthy of the combination of patriotic fervor and high philosophic enlargement of soul, that "scorns" the few heroes so high above their age." Guérin (La Samarre, 11, 401; Galilée, 1, 47) thought he had discovered the remains of this monument at Khirbet el-Gharbûwi near Medîyeh, in 1870. In this, however, he was mistaken, the remains being of Christian origin.

Various identifications have been proposed. Sóba, about 6 miles W. of Jerus, was for a time generally accepted. Robinson (Bible Dictionary, s.v. Lâḏrân) gives this as the identification. There is now a consensus of opinion in favor of el-Medîyeh, a village to the E of Wâdy Muâlik, 13 miles W. of Bethel. It occupies a strong position in the hills 6 miles E of Lydda, thus meeting the condition of Onom which places it near Lydda. The identification was suggested by Dr. Sandrecezi of Jerus in 1869. From el-Medîyeh itself the sea is not visible; but to the S rises a rocky height, er-Râs, which commands a wide view, including the plain and the sea; the distance is 16 miles distant. If the monument of Simon stood on er-Râs, which from the rock cuttings seems not improbable, it would be seen very clearly by overlooking the sea, esp. toward sunset (1 Macc 3 28). About 2 mile W. of el-Medîyeh, known as Kubûr el-Yehâdû, one bearing the name of Shekh el-Gharbûwi, whose name attaches to the ruins. This is the tomb referred to above.

MOETH, mō’eth (Mādāh, Mādāh): Called "son of Sabanus," one of the Levites to whom, with the priest Meremoth, the silver and gold brought by Ezra from Babylon were committed (1 Esd 8 63) as "Noadah" of Ezra 8 33, but there styled "son of Binnulli."

MOLADAH, mol’a-da, mō-lādāh (airie, mō-lādāh; Moladāh, Moladah): A place in the far south (Negeb) of Judah, toward Edom (Josh 15 26), reckoned to Simon (19 2; 1 Ch 4 28). It was repopulated after the captivity ( Neh 11 26). It is generally considered one of the Jorbas of Jos, Ant, XVIII, vi, 2. The site of this latter city has by Robinson and others been identified with the ruins of Tell el-Muâd, some 13 miles to the E of Beersheba and some 7 miles S.W. of Arad. The chief difficulty is the statement of Eusebius and Jerome that Malathia
was "by Jattir," i.e. 'Attir; if this is correct the Tell el-Milh is impossible, as it is 10 miles from "Attir, and we have no light at all on the site. See SALT. CITY OF. For Tell el-Milh see PEF, III, 415-16, 3h XXV.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

MOLE, mōl (Gr. μύλος, tinemathem, AV "mole," RV "chameleon"; LXX ἀσπάλαξ, ἀσπαλάξ=sπαλάς, spalax, "mole," Vulg talpa, "mole" [Lev 11 30]; [2] ὑβγη, heldeth, EV "weasel"; LXX γαλάς, gālā, "weasel" or "pole-cat"; cf. Arab. ἀγάλ, ἀγαλ, "herbivorous creature." E. LXX ἄσπαλάξ, ἀσπαλάξ, "mole." [3] ἕβαρτορ, ἕβαρτορ, "to dig"; cf. Arab. ẖaf, ḥafar, "to dig," and מָעָה, "mole" or "rat," for מָעָה, מָעָה, from מָעָה, מָעָה, or מָעָה, מָעָה, מָעָה, מָעָה, מָעָה, מָעָה, "to dig." LXX τῶν μακριάς, τῶν μακριάς, "vain, idle, or profane persons" [Isa 20]; (1) Tinemathem is the last of 8 unclean "creeping things" in Lev 11 29-30. The word occurs also in Lev in 18 and Dt 14 16, trv AV "swan," RV "horned owl," viz. "harpCGRects," harpĥerōth, "coot" or "heron." See CHAMELEON. (2) Ὑβγη is the first in the same list. The word occurs nowhere else, and is trv "weasel" in EV, but in comparison with the Arab. ῥαλ, ῥαλ, has led to the suggestion that "mole- rat" would be a better tr. See WAERUS. (3) In Isa 2 20, "In that day shall men cast away their idols . . . to the mole and to the bats," ἕβαρτορ, ἕβαρτορ, variously written as one word or two, is trv "mole" in EV, but has given rise to much conjecture.

The European "mole" Telpa europaea, is extensively distributed in the temperate parts of Europe and Asia, but is absent from Syria and Fal, its place being taken by the mole-rat, Spalax typhlus. The true mole belongs to the Insectivora, and feeds on earth-worms and insect larvae, but in making its tunnels and nests, it incidentally injures gardens and lawns. The mole-rat belongs to the Rodentia, and has teeth of the same general type as those of a rat or squirrel, large, chief-shaped miisors behind which is a large vacant space, no canines, and praemolars and molars with three or four points of contact instead of two, the last root being much larger than the mole, but of the same color, and, like the mole, is blind. It makes tunnels much like those of the mole. It is herbivorous, and has been observed to seize growing plants and draw them down into its hole. In one of its burrows a central chamber has been found filled with entire plants of the hummus or chick-pea, and two side chambers containing pods plucked from the plants in the central chamber. While the mole-rat digs with its powerful and peculiarly shaped front feet, the mole-rat digs with its nose, its feet being normal in shape. See LEZARD.

ALFRED ELY DAY

MOLECH, mōlek, MOLOC, mōlek (נולאיך, ho-molekh, always with the art., except in 1 K 11 7; LXX ὁ Μόλοχ, ὁ Μολόχ, sometimes also Μολοχοῖς, Μολοχῶν, Molochōn, Molochál, Molochl, Vulg Moloch): 30 31; cf Jer 49 1.3; Zeph 1 5, where RV reads "their king"). The use of אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, and אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, as a tr of the name by the LXX suggests that it may have been originally the name for "king, melek." Molech is obtained from melek by the substitution of the vowel points of Heb bōsheth, signifying "shame." The name was popular, but less frequent, than Molech in the Bible. Am 5 26, RV has removed "your Moloch" and given "your king," but LXX had here trd ("Moloch," and from the LXX it found its way into the Acts (7 43), the only occurrence of the name in the NT.

In the Levitical ordinances delivered to the Israelites by Moses there are stern prohibitions against Moloch-worship (Lev 18 20; 20 2-5). Parallel to these prohibitions, although the Worship in name of the god is not mentioned, OT History are those of the Deuteronomic Code where the abominations of the Canaanites are forbidden, and the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire (to Moloch) is condemned as the climax of their wickedness (Dt 12 31; 18 10-13).

The references to Malcam, and to David's building a temple to Malcam with Ammon, are not supported by the brick kiln (2 S 12 30.31), and are not sufficiently clear to found upon, because of the uncertainty of the readings. Solomon, under the influence of his idolatrous wives, built high places for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon. See CHEMOSH. Because of this apostasy it was intimated by the prophet Ahijah, that the kingdom would be rent out of the hand of Solomon, and ten tribes given to Jeroboam (1 K 12 1-3). The high places survived to the time of Josiah, who, among his other works of religious reformation, destroyed and defiled them, filling their places with the bones of men (2 K 23 12-14). Molech-worship has evidently received a great impulse from Ahaz, who, like Ahab of Israel, was a supporter of foreign religions (2 K 16 12 ff). He also "made his son pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the nations, whom Jehezekiah had destroyed and defiled them, filling their places with the bones of men (2 K 23 12-14). His grandson Manasseh, so far from following in the footsteps of his father Hezekiah, who had made great reforms in the worship, reared altars for Baal, and besides other abominations which he practised, made his son to pass through the fire. The chief site of this worship, of which Ahaz and Manasseh were the promoters, was Topeth in the Valley of Hinnom, or, as it is also called, the Valley of the Children, or of the Son of Hinnom, lying to the S.W. of Jerusalem (see GIDEON). Topeth is said that "he defiled Topeth... that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech." (2 K 23 10).

Even Josiah's thorough reformation failed to extirpate the Molech-worship, and it revived and continued till the destruction of Jerusalem.

3. The Worship. As we learn from the prophets of the Worship time. From the beginning, the prophets maintained against it a loud and persistent protest. The testimony of Amos (1 5; 5 26) is ambiguous, but most of the ancient VSS for malkān, "their king," in the former passage, read milkām, the national god of Ammon (see Davidson). Isaiah was acquainted with Topeth and its abominations (Isa 30 23; 37 5). Over against his beautiful and lofty description of spiritual religion, Micah sets the exaggerated zeal of those who ask in the spirit of the Molech-worshipper: "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" (Mic 6 6). That Molech-worship had increased in the interval may account
for the frequency and the clearness of the references to it in the later Prophets. In Jer we find the popular cult of daughters through the fire prevailing (11:2 9). Molech associated with the building of "the high places of Baal, which are in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom" (32:30; 21:3); 19:5). In his oracle against the children of Ammon, the same prophet, denouncing evil against their land, predicts (almost in the very words of Amos above) that Molech shall go into captivity, his priests and his princes together (49:13). Ezekiel, speaking to the exiles in Babylon, refers to the practice of burning children through the fire to heathen divinities as long established, and he proclaims the wrath of God against it (Ezk 16:20; 20:26.31; 23:37). That this prophet regarded the practice as among the 'statutes that were not good, and ordinances wherein they should not live' (20:23) given by God to His people, by way of deception and judicial punishment, as some hold, is highly improbable and inconsistent with the whole prophetic attitude toward it. Zephaniah, who prophesied to the men who saw the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah, denounced upon the worshippers of false gods (Zeph 1:5). He does not directly charge his countrymen with having forsaken Jeh for Molech, but blames them, because worshipping Him they also swear to Molech, the idol of the Assyr ejected who feared Jeh and served their own gods, or like those of whom Ezekiel elsewhere speaks who, the same day on which they had slain their children to their idols, entered the sanctuary of Jeh to profane it (Ezk 23:39). The captivity of Babylon put an end to Molech-worship, since it weakened the people from all their idolatries. We do not hear of it in the post-exile Prophets, and, in the great historical poem of Isaiah's rebelliousness and God's deliverances (Ps 106), it is only referred to in retrospect (vs 37-38).

When we come to consider the nature of this worship it is remarkable how few details are given regarding it in Scripture. The place where it was practised from the days of Judah to the end of the monarchy is not clearly assigned. Such an altar-pyre for the burning of the sacrificial victims. There is no evidence connecting the worship with the temple in Jerusalem. Ezekiel's view seems to be that the temple is purely a place of sacrifice. The temple was, indeed, the temple is put forth by God as an ideal (Ezk 8). A priesthood is spoken of as attached to the services (Jer 49:3; of Zeph 1:4-5). The victims offered to the divinity were not burnt alive, but were killed as sacrifices, and then presented as burnt offerings. "To pass through the fire" has been taken to mean a justification or purification of the child by fire, not involving death. But the prophets clearly speak of slaughter and sacrifice, and of high places built to burn the children in the fire as burnt offerings (Jer 19:5; Ezek 16:20.21).

The popular conception, moulded for Eng. readers largely by Milton's "Moloch, horrid king" as described in Paradise Lost, Book I, is derived from the accounts given in late LXX and Or, writers, esp. the account which Diodorus Siculus gives in his History of the Carthaginian Krones or Moloch. The image of Moloch was a human figure with a bull's head or, with outstretched arms, ready to receive the children destined for sacrifice. The image of metal was heated red hot by a fire kindled within, and the children by the hot image were rolled off into the fire. In order to drown the cries of the victims, flutes were played, and everyone was heated; and mothers stood by without tears or sobs, to give the impression of the voluntary character of the offering (see Rawlinson's Phoenicia, 113 f. for fuller details).

On the question of the origin of this worship there is great variety of views. Of a non-Semitic origin there is no evidence; and there is no trace of human sacrifices in the old Bab religion. That it prevailed widely among Sem peoples is clear. While Milkom or Molech is peculiarly the national god of the Ammonites, as is Chemosh of the Moabites, the name Moloch or and Extent Molech was recognized among the Phoenicians, the Philis, the Aramaeans, and other Sem peoples, as a name for the divinity they worshipped as a very early time. That it was common among the Canaanites when the Israelites entered the land is evident from the fact that it was among the abominations from which they were to keep themselves free. That it was identical at first with the worship of Jehovah, and the prophets and the best men of the nation ever regarded it as the national worship of Israel, is a modern theory which does not appear to the present writer to have been substantiated. It has been inferred from Abraham's readiness to offer up Isaac at the command of God, from the story of Jephthah and his daughter, and even from the sacrifice of Hiel the Bethelite (1 K 16:34), that human sacrifice to Jeh was an original custom in Israel, and that therefore the God of Israel was no other than Molech, or at all events a deity of similar character. But these incidents are surely too slender a foundation to support such a theory. "The fundamental idea of the heathen rite was the same as that which lay at the foundation of Beit to God's people. "The writer, while presenting to us this story of the offering of Isaac, and by presenting it in this precise form, the writer simply teaches the truth, taught by all the prophets, that to obey is better than sacrifice—in other words that the God worshipped in Abraham's time was a God who did not delight in destroying life, but in saving and sanctifying it" (Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 254). While there is no ground for identifying Jeh with Moloch, there are good grounds for seeing a community of origin between Moloch and Baal. The name, the worship, and the general characteristics are so similar that it is natural to assign them a common place of origin in Phoenicia. The fact that Moloch-worship reached the climax of its abominable cruelty in the Phoen colonies of which Carthage was the center shows that it had found among that people a soil suited to its peculiar genius.

LITERATURE.—Wolf Baudissin, "Moloch" in PEB; C. F. Moore, "Moloch" in EB; Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 241-65; Robertson Smith, Religion of the Ancient Israelites, 352 ff; Buchanan Gray, Hebrew Proper Names, 138 ff.

7. MOLI, mōlī. See Mooli.

8. MOLID, mōlid (מוֹליד, mollid): A Judahite (1 Ch 2:29).

9. MOLLIFY, mōl'ft (מִולָב, mōlabhkah, "to be soft"): "To make soft," used in modern Eng. only figuratively, as "His anger was mollified." EV, however, uses the word lit. in its two occurrences: Isa 1:6, "wounds, and bruises: . . . neither bound up, neither mollified with oil"; Wisd 18:12, "mollifying plaster." Neither occurrence of the word is changed by RV.

10. MOLOCH, mō'lok: A deity of the Ammonites, like the planet Saturn, a representative of the sun-god in the particular aspect of a god of time. See ASTROLOGY, 8; MOLCH.

11. MOLTEN, mōlt'ın, IMAGE. See IMAGES.

12. MOLTEN SEA. See LAVER.

13. MOMDIS, mom'dis (יוֹמְדִיס, Momeleth, B, Mopētōs, Momdelos): One of those who had taken
MONEY, mun'i: Various terms are used for money in the Bible, but the most common are the Heb 003, keçeiph, and Gr áργυριον, áργαρίων, both meaning silver. We find also 002, keçeiph, éstíath, rendered by LXX “lamb,” probably referring to money in a particular form; χαλκός, chalkos, is used for money in Mt 20 10; Mk 6 8; 12 41. It was also a name of a small coin of Agrippa II (Madden, Coins of the Jews); χρυσά, chrusa, “price,” is rendered money in Acts 4 37; 8 18 20; 24 26; κέρμα, kérma, “piece,” i.e. piece of money (Jn 2 15; 5 16); ἄργαρίων, “tribute money” (Mt 17 24 AV, RV “half-shekel”); κόνως, kónos, “censor,” “tribute money” (Mt 21 19).

Gold and silver were the common medium of exchange in Syriac and Pal in the early times of which we have any historical record. The period of mere barter had passed. The connection of the country with the two great civilized centers of antiquity, Egypt and Babylon, had led to the introduction of a currency for the purposes of trade. We have abundant evidence of the use of these metals in the Bib. records, and we know from the monuments that they were used as money before the time of Abraham. The patriarch came back from his visit to Egypt “rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold” (Gen 13 2). There was no system of coinage, but they had these metals cast in a convenient form for use in exchange, such as bars or rings, the latter being a common form and often represented or mentioned on the monuments of Egypt. In Babylonia the more common form seems to have been the former, such as the bar, or wedge, that Achan found in the sack of Jericho (Josh 7 21). This might indicate that the pieces were too large for ordinary use, but we have indications of the use of small portions also (2 K 12 9; Job 42 11). But the pieces were not so accurately divided as to pass for money without weighing, as we see in the case of the transaction between Abraham and the children of Heth for the purchase of the field of Machpelah (Gen 23). This transaction indicates also the common use of silver as currency, for it was “current money with the merchant,” and earlier than this we have mention of the use of silver by Abraham as money: “In that is thy house and he that is bought with thy money” (Gen 17 13).

Jewels of silver and gold were probably made to conform to the shekel weight, so that they might be used for money in case of necessity. Thus Abraham’s servant gave 420 talents of gold for half a shekel weight and bracelets of ten shekels weight (Gen 24 22). The bundles of money carried by the sons of Jacob to Egypt for the purchase of corn (Gen 42 35) were probably silver rings tied together in bundles. The Heb for “silver” (kikkor) signifies something round or circular, suggesting a ring of this weight to be used as money. The ordinary term for money was keçeiph, “silver,” and this word preceded by a numeral always refers to money, either with or without “shekel,” which we are probably to supply when it is not mentioned after the numeral, at least wherever value is involved, as the shekel (shekel) was the standard of value as well as of weight (see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES). Thus the value of the field of Ephron was in shekels, as was also the estimation of offerings (Lev 5 15; 27, passion). Solomon purchased chariots at 600 (shekels) each and horses at 150 (1 K 10 29). Large sums were expressed in talents, which were a multiple of the shekel. Thus Menahem gave Pul 1,000 talents of silver (2 K 15 19), which was made up by the exaction of 50 shekels from each rich man. Hezekiah paid the war indemnity to Sennacherib with 300 talents of silver and 30 of gold (2 K 18 14). The Assyr account gives 800 talents of silver, and the discrepancy may not be an error in the Heb text, as some would explain it, but probably a different kind of talent (see Marden, Coins of the Jews, 4). Solomon’s revenue is stated in talents (1 K 10 14), and the amount (666 of gold) indicates that money was abundant, for this is more than what he obtained from the vassal states and by trade. His partnership with the Phoenicians in commerce brought him large amounts of the precious metals, so that silver was said to have been plentiful in Jerusalem as soon as 1 K 10 17.

Besides the forms of rings and bars, in which the precious metals were cast for commercial use, some other forms were perhaps current. Thus the term 8stah is the long-used word for money, and the LXX tr has “lamb.” It is not expressed in what he obtained from the vassal states and by trade. His partnership with the Phoenicians in commerce brought him large amounts of the precious metals, so that silver was said to have been plentiful in Jerusalem as soon as 1 K 10 17.

Another word joined with silver in monetary use is 6ághóðq (γεωργή), the term being “a piece of silver” in 1 S 2 36. "Ághorath is cognate with the Arab. áfrat, which means "to divide exactly" or "justly," and the noun áfrat means "a portion" or "a measure."

Another word used in a similar way is rác, from rác, “to break in pieces,” hence rác is "a piece" or "fragment of silver" used as money. These terms were in use before the introduction of coined money and continued after coins became common. After the exile we begin to find references to coined money. It was invented in Lydia or perhaps in Aegina. Herodotus assigns the invention to the Lydians (1.94).

Money The earliest Lydian coins were struck by Gyges in the 7th cent. BC. These coins were of electrum and elliptical in form, smooth on the reverse but deeply stamped with incuse impressions on the obverse. They were called staters, but were of two standards; one for coined in the Babylonia and Egypt, the other about 164.4 grains, and the other of 224 grains (see Marden, op. cit.). Later, gold was coined, and, by the time of Croesus, gold and silver. The Persians adopted the Lydian type, and coined both gold and silver daries, the name being derived from Darius Hystaspis (521-485 BC) who is reputed to have
introduced the system into his empire. But the stater of Lydia was current there under Cyrus (Madden, op. cit.), and it was perhaps with these that the Jews first became acquainted in Babylon. Ezra states (2 69) that "they [the Jews] gave after their ability into the treasury of the work three-score and one thousand darics [RV] of gold, and five thousand pounds of silver." The term here rendered "daric" is δαρίων, and this word is used in three passages in Neh (7 70–72), and τάξαρκον in 1 Ch 29 7 and Ezr 8 27. Both are of the same origin as the Gr drachma, probably, though some derive both from Darius (a Phoen inscription from the Piraicus tells us that δαρίων corresponds to drachma). At all events they refer to the gold coins which we know as darics. The weight of the daric was 130 grains, though double darics were struck.

Besides the gold daric there was a silver coin circulating in Persia that must have been known to the Jews. This was the σίγλος (σίγλοι), supposed to be referred to in Neh 5 15, where it is τρεῖ (“shekel.” These were the so-called silver darics, of which were equivalent to the gold daric. Besides these Persian coins the Jews must have used others derived from their intercourse with the Phoen cities, which were allowed to strike coins under the suzerainty of the Persians. These coins were of both silver and bronze, the suzerain not permitting them to coin gold. We have abundant examples of these coins and trade must have made them familiar to the Jews.

The issues of Aradus, Sidon and Tyre were esp. noteworthy, and were of various types and sizes suited to the commercial transactions of the Phoenicians. The Tyran traders were established in Jerus as early as the time of Nehemiah (13 16), and their coins date back to that period. Among the finest specimens we have of early coinage are the tetradrachms of Tyre, and the double shekels or stater of Sidon. The latter represent the Pers king, as he rides in his chariot, driven by his charioteer and followed by an attendant. On the reverse is a Phoen galley. The weight of these coins is from 380 to 430 grains, and they are assigned to the 4th and 5th cents. BC. From Tyre we have a tetradrachm which corresponds to the shekel of the Phoen standard of about 220 grains, which represents, on the obverse, the god Melkarth, the Tyrian Hercules, riding on a sea-horse, and, beneath, a dolphin. The reverse bears an owl with the Egyp crook and a flail, symbols of Osiris. The early coins of Aradus bear, on the obverse, the head of Baal or Dagon, and on the reverse a galley, above which is the legend ΜΕΛΕΚ ΑΡΑΔΟΤΩΝ, or ΜΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΑΡΑΔΟΤΩΝ, i.e. "king of Aradus." When Alexander overthrew the Pers empire in 331 BC, a new coinage, on the Attic standard, was introduced, and the silver drachms and tetradrachms struck by him circulated in large numbers, as is attested by the large number of examples still in existence. After his death, these coins, the tetradrachms esp., continued to be struck in the provinces, with his name and type, in his honor. We have examples of these struck at Aradus, Tyre, Sidon, Damascus and Acre, bearing the mint marks of these towns. They bear on the obverse the head of Alexander as Hercules, and, on the reverse, Zeus seated on his throne holding an eagle in the extended right hand and a scepter in the left. The legend is ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, or ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, only, with various symbols of the towns or districts where they were struck, together with mint marks.

The successors of Alexander established kingdoms with a coinage of their own, such as the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria, and these coins, as well as those of Alexander, circulated among the Jews. The Ptolemies of Egypt controlled Pal for about a century after Alexander, and struck coins, not only in Egypt, but in some of the Phoen towns, esp. at Acre, which was, from that time, known as Ptolemais. Their coins were based upon the Phoen standard. But the Seleucid kings of Syria had the most influence in Phoenicia and Pal, and their monetary issues are very various and widely distributed, bearing the names and types of the kings, and the symbols and mint marks of the different towns where they were struck, and are on the Alexandrine or Attic standard in contrast to those of the Ptolemies. They are both silver and bronze, gold being struck in the capital, Antioch, usually. The coins of Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, are esp. interesting on account of his connection with Jewish affairs. It was he who made the futile attempt to hellenize the Jews, which led to the revolt that resulted, under his successors,
in the independence of the country of Syrian control, and the institution of a native coinage in the time of the Maccabees.

The struggle caused by the persecution of Antiochus commenced in 165 BC and continued more than 20 years. Judas, the son of Mattathias, defeated Antiochus, who died in 164, but the war was continued by his successors until dynastic dissensions among them led to treaties with the Jews to gain their support. At last Simon, who espoused the cause of Demetrius II, obtained from him, as a reward, the right to rule Judaea under the title of high priest, with practical independence, 142–143 BC. In 141, Simon VII, his successor, confirmed Simon in his position and added some privileges, and among them the right to coin money (138-139 BC). Both silver and bronze coins exist and are preserved, but some numismatists have recently doubted this, and have assigned them to another Simon in the time of the first revolt of the Jews under the Romans. The coins in question are the shekels and half-shekels with the legend in Heb., shekel yirēdî'el and yrēshālem kdrōshōkhaḥ ("Jerusalem the holy"), bearing dates ranging from the 1st to the 5th year, as well as bronze pieces of the 4th (see illustrations).

The reason for denying the ascription of these coins to Simon the Maccabee is the difficulty in finding room for the years indicated in his reign which closed in 135 BC. He received the commission to coin in 139-138, which would allow only 4 years for his coinage, whereas we have coins of the 5th year. Moreover, no shekels and half-shekels of any of the Maccabees later than Simon have come to light, which is, at least, singular since we should have supposed that all would have been coined then as long as the remained independent, even if they coined in bronze, examples of the latter being quite abundant. The fact also that they bore the title of king, while Simon was high priest only, would seem to have furnished an additional reason for claiming the prerogative of coinage in silver as well as bronze. But this argument is negative only, and such coins may have existed but have not come to light, and there are reasons which seem to the present writer sufficient to assign them to Simon the Maccabee. In the first place, the chronological difficulty is removed if we consider that Simon was practically independent for three or four years before he obtained the explicit commission to coin money. We learn from Jos (1:31, Lev. vi, 7) and from 1 Mac (13:41-42) that in the 170th year of the Seleucid era, that is, 143-142 BC, the Jews began to use the era of Simon in their contracts and public records. Now it would not have been strange if Simon, seeing the anarchy that prevailed in the kingdom of Syria, should have assumed some prerogatives of an independent ruler before they were distinctly granted to him, and among them that of coinage money. If he had commenced in the latter part of 139 BC, he would have been able to strike coins of the 5th year before he died, and this would satisfy the conditions (see Madden’s Jewish Coinage). There is a difficulty quite as great in attributing these coins to Simon of the first revolt under the Romans. That broke out in 66 AD, and was suppressed by the taking of Jerusalem in 70. This would allow a date of the 5th year, but it is hardly supposable that in the terrible distress and anarchy that prevailed in the city during that last year any silver coins would have been struck. There is another fact bearing upon this question which is worthy of notice. The coins of the first revolt bear personal appellations, such as “Eleazar the priest,” and “Simon,” while those assigned to Simon the Maccabee bear no personal designation whatever. This is significant, for it is not likely that Eleazar and Simon would have commenced coining silver shekels and half-shekels with their names inscribed upon them in the 1st year of their reign and then have omitted them on later issues. Another point which has some force is: We find mention, in the NT, of money-changers in connection with the temple, whose business it was to change the current coin, which was Rom or Gr, and bore heathen type and legends, for Jewish coins, which the strict Pharisaic rules then in force required from worshippers paying money into the temple treasury. It is inferred that they could furnish the shekels and half-shekels required for the yearly dues from every adult male (cf. Mt 17:24–27). Now the only shekels and half-shekels bearing Jewish emblems and legends, that at that time, must have been issued by the Maccabean princes, that is, such as we have under discussion. In view of these facts the Maccabean origin of these pieces seems probable.

The shekels under discussion have on one side a cup, or chalice (supposed to represent the pot of manna), with the legend in Heb around the margin, רְנָת הָעַלְפָּם, shekel giyrādî’el, with a letter above the cup indicating the year of the reign. The reverse bears the sprig of a plant (conjectured to be Aaron’s rod) having three buds or fruits, and on the margin the legend, והָעַלְפָּמ הָאָרֶהָה יִשָּׁמֵל, yrēshālem ha-arē’ah, "Jerusalem the holy." The half-shekel has the same type, but the reverse bears the legend, הָעַלְפֶּפָה, בֹּדָד shekel (half-shekel). The letters indicating the year have a ש (shnath, ‘year’)

prefix, except for the first. This also omits the מ from kdrōshōhah and the second מ from yrēshālem. The term ‘holy’ for Jerusalem is found in Isa 48:2 and other passages of the 61, and is still preserved in the Arab. ḫudus by which the city is known today in Syria.

Copper, or bronze, half- and quarter-shekels are also attributed to Simon, bearing date of the 4th year. The obverse of the half-shekel has two bundles of thick-leaved branches with a citron between, and on the reverse a palm tree with two baskets filled with fruit. The legend on the obverse is יִשָּׁמֵל תְּלָנָם, shnath ’arba’ haḵĕt, “the fourth
year a half," and on the reverse, "li-ghšā'ullath evyōn, "the redemption of Zion." The quarter-shekels has a similar type, except that the obverse lacks the baskets and the reverse has the citron on it, and bears the legend, "ribbā", "quarter," instead of "half." Another type is a cup with a margin of jewels on the obverse and a single bunch of branches with two citrons on the reverse.

The palm is a very common type on the coins of Judaea, and a very appropriate one, since it is grown there. Jericho was called the city of palms. The branches of trees in bundles illustrate the custom of carrying branches at the Feast of Tabernacles and the erection of booths made of branches for use during this feast (see Lev 23:40). The baskets of fruit may refer to the offerings of first-fruits (Dt 28:2). One of the above series of coins published by Madden bears the countermark of an elephant, which was a symbol adopted by the Seleucid kings, and this is an evidence of its early date. But whatever doubts there may be as to the coins of Simon, there can be none as to those of his successor, John Hyrcanus, who reigned 135-106 BC, since they bear his name. They are all of bronze and bear the following legend with a great number of variations, " photoshop，“Johan the high priest and scribe of the Jews.” The reverse has a two-branched cornucopia with a poppy head rising from the center. There is no doubt as to the meaning of the word "Heb her" (ד"ה) as the above. It is commonly rendered "safety," "taking it in common" seems to bear in Hos 6:9, "a company" or "band," here the company of elders representing the people. Judas Aristobulus (106-105 BC) issued similar coins with Heb legends, but with the accession of Alexander Jannaeus (105-78 BC) we find bilingual inscriptions on the coins, Heb and Gr. The obverse bears the words " photoshop, "Johan than the king," and the reverse, " Photoshop ALEXANDPOY, BASILEOS ALEXANDROU," "King Alexander." Most of his coins, however, bear Heb inscriptions only. All are of copper or bronze, like those of Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, and are of the denomination known to us in the NT as "mites," weighing from 25 to 35 grains.

When the Romans took possession of Pal in 63 BC, the independent rule of the Hasmonaeans came to an end, but Pompey confirmed John Hyrcanus as governor of Judaea under the title of high priest. Dissensions between him and other members of his family called for interference several times on the part of the Romans. Hyrcanus was again confirmed by Julius Caesar in 47 and continued in authority until 40. It is uncertain what coins he issued, but whatever they were, they bore the type found on those of Alexander Jannaeus. In 40 BC, the Parthians temporarily overthrew the Roman authority in Syria and Pal, and set Antigonus on the throne of the latter, and he reigned until 37. The coins he issued bore bilingual inscriptions like the bilinguals of Alexander. He calls himself Antigonus in Gr, and Mattathias in Heb, the type being a wreath on the obverse and a double cornucopia on the reverse, though some have it single. They are much heavier coins than the preceding issue. The legends are: obverse, BACIAEΩC ANTIGONOU, BASILEOS ANTIGONOU, "of King Antigonus"; reverse, (נְהוֹדָדָד, maccathiyah ha-kenen gadhol ha-yarēh%mâm), "Mattathias the high priest of the Jews."

The Hasmonaean dynasty ended with Antigonus and that of the Herods followed. Herod the Great was the first to attempt the title of king, and his coins are numerous and bear only Greek legends, and are all of bronze. The earliest have the type of a helmet with cheek pieces on the obverse and the legend: BACIAEΩC ΗΡΩΔΟΥ, BASILEOS ΗΡΩΔΟΥ, and in the field to the left Γ (year 3), and on the right the monogram Φ. The reverse has a Macedonian shield with rays. The coin here illustrated is another type: a rude tripod on the obverse, and a cross within a wreath on the reverse, the legend being the same as given above.

Herod Archelaus, who reigned from 4 BC to 6 AD, issued coins with the title of ethnarch, the only coins of Pal to bear this title. They are all of small size and some of them have the type of a galley, indicating his sovereignty over some of the coast cities, such as Caesarea and Joppa.

The coins of Herod Antipas (4 BC-40 AD) bear the title of tetrarch, many of them being struck at Tiberias, which he founded on the Sea of Galilee and named after the emperor Tiberius. The following is an example: obverse HP, ΤΕΤ(ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ), ΗΕΡ. ΤΕΤΕΡΟΣ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ, with the type of a palm branch; reverse, TIBERIAC, TIBERIAS, within a wreath.

Others have a palm tree entire with the date 38 and 44 AD, which is somewhat rare, but those of Agrippa, 37-44 AD, are numerous, considering the shortness of his reign. The most common type is a small coin ("mite") with an umbrella having a tassel-like border, on the obverse, and three ears of wheat on one stalk on the reverse. The legend reads: Basileos Agrippa, and the date is LIX (year 6). Larger coins of Agrippa bear the head of the emperor (Caligula or Claudius) with the title of Caesar (Augustus) in Gr.

Agrippa II was the last of the Herodian line to strike coins (49-100 AD). They were issued under Nero, whose head they sometimes bear with his name as well as that of Agrippa. They are all of the denomination of the mite (λεπτόν).

In 6 AD, Judaea was made a Rom province and was governed by procurators, and their coins are numerous, being issued during the reigns of Augus-
tus, Titus, Claudius and Nero. They are all small and bear on the obverse the legends: KAI-
CAPOC (Caesar), or IOYAI (Julia), or the emperor’s name joined with Caesar. The coins of the Jews struck during the first and second revolts, 66-
70 AD, and 132-135 AD, have already been alluded to with the difficulty of distin-
guishing them, and some have been described. They all have the type common to the purely Jewish issues; the date palm, the vine, bunches of fruit, the laurel or olive wreath, the cup or chalice, the lyre and a temple with columns. Types of animals or men they regarded as forbidden by their law. Most of them are bronze, but some are silver shekels and half-shekels, dated in the 1st, 2d and 3d years, if we assign those of higher date to Simon the Maccabee. Those of the 1st year bear the name of Ele-
azar the priest, on the obverse, and on the reverse the date “first year of the redemption of Israel,” נוֹמַי אָבָט אֶלֶּה, sh-
nath 'abath is-gh'ulath yard’s. Others bear the name of Simon and some that of “Simon N’st Israel” (“Simon Prince of Israel”). The coins of the 2d and 3d years are rare. They have the type of the cup and vine leaf, or temple and lulabh. Those supposed to belong to the second revolt bear the name of Simon without N’st Israel, and are therefore assigned to Simon Bar-Cochba. The example here given has the type of the temple on the obverse with what is

thought to be a representation of the “beautiful gate,” between the columns, and a star above. The name Simon is on the margin, the first two letters on the right of the temple and the others on the left. The legend of the reverse is: יִרְדְּנָה יְרֵשַׁלְיָם, יִרְדְּנָה יְרֵשַׁלְיָם (“the deliverance of Jerus”).

Some of the coins struck by the Romans to com-
memorate their victory over the Jews were struck in Pal and some at Rome, and all bear the head of the Rom emperor on the obverse, but the reverse often exhibits J udaean as a weeping captive woman, seated at the foot of a palm tree or of a Rom stand-

ard bearing a trophy. The legend is sometimes
Judaean capta and sometimes Judaean victors. The example given has the inscription in Gr: ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟ
ΕΛΩΝΧΙΑΣ, ΙΟΥΔΙΑΙΟ ΕΑΛΟΧΙΑΙ, Judaean capta. The

There are coins of Agrippa II (the “king Agrippa” of Acts 25, 26), struck in the reign of Ver-
pasian, with his name and title on the obverse and with a deity on the reverse, holding ears of
wheat in the right hand and a cornucopia in the left. The inscription reads:

ETOY K2BA ETOU K2BA
ΑΓΡΙ ΠΙΤΑ ΑΓΡΙ ΠΙΑ

(year 26, King Agrippa) in two lines.

After the revolt of Bar-Cochba and the final sub-
jugation of the Jews by Hadrian, Jesus was made a Rom colony and the name was changed to Aelia Capitolina. A series of coins was struck, having

denarii and tetrodrachms, the former being about one-fourth the weight of the latter which were known as staters (Mt 17 27). The piece referred to was the amount of tribute for two persons, and as the amount paid by one was the half-shekel (ver 24), this piece must have been the equivalent of the shekel or tetrodrachm.

H. FOSTER

MONEY-CHANGERS, chאַנְּנָיִר (kolla'ssion), kollhiasia, from κολλύβος, kollubos, “a small coin,” so “a money-changer,” or “banker” (Mt 21 12; Mk 11 15; “changers” in Jn 2 15; cf ver 14, where κερματισσι, kermaatia, “a dealer in small
bits,” or “change,” is also rendered “changers”); cf τραπεζης, trapezites, “one who sits at a table, “a money-changer,” “a banker” or “broker”; one who both exchanges money for a small fee and pays interest on deposits [Mt 25 27, AV “exchangers,” ARV “bankers”]): The profession of money-
changer in Pal was made necessary by the law re-
quiring every male Israelite who had reached the age of 20 years to pay into the treasury of the sanctuary a half-shekel at every numbering of the people, an offering to Jah, not even the poor being exempt. It seems to have become an annual tax, and was to be paid in the regular Jewish half-shekel (Ex 30 11-15). Since the Jews, coming up to the feasts,
would need to exchange the various coins in common circulation for this Jewish piece, there were money-changers who exacted a premium for the exchange. This fee was a *kollubos* (about 31 cents in U.S. money), hence the name *kollubistas*. The Jews of Christ's day came from many parts of the world, and the business of exchanging foreign coins for various purposes became a lucrative one, the exchangers exacting whatever fee they might. Because of their greed and impiety, Jesus drove them from the courts of the temple.

**Edward Bagby Pollard**

**MONEY, CURRENT.** "κόρον, "öber, "passing," Gen 23 16; 2 K 12 4 [Heb 5]: The text and tr in 2 K 12 4 are uncertain and difficult. See RVm. The reference is probably not to a money standard, but to a poll tax which was levied in addition to the free-will offering. Gen 23 16 implies the existence of a standard shekel and also probably the use of the precious metals in stamped bars or ingots of an approximately fixed weight or value, a primitive coinage. CH presupposes these pieces, and records in cuneiform writing discovered in Cappadocia indicate that shekel pieces with a seal stamp were in use in Asia Minor in the time of Hammurabi (Sayce, "Contemporary Review," August, 1907, XCII, 259 ff.). The existence of these pieces did not do away with the custom of weighing money, a practice which obtained in Israel down to the time of the exile (Jer 32 10)

**Walter R. Betteredge**

**MONEY, LOVE OF (φιλαργυρία, philarguria), 1 Tim 6 10, lit. "love of silver"; cf corresponding "lovers of money" [Lk 16 14; 2 Tim 3 3], equivalent to "avarice": The vice that seeks to retain and hoard all that is acquired (Trench, *Synonymes of the NT*, xxiv); described as "a root of all kinds of evil." See also COVETOUSNESS.

**Walter R. Betteredge**

**MONEY, SIN.** See SIN MONEY; SIN OFFERING.

**MONSTER, mon'ster.** See DRAGON; SEA MONSTER.

**MONTH, mth (מֵשֶׁת, ḫōdēsh, מַתָּה, yerah; μήν, mēn): ḫōdēsh is strictly the "new moon," the appearance of which marked the beginning of the month, commonly indicated by rō'sh ha-ḵōdēsh. Yerah is derived from yārāb, "moon," which comes from the vb. that means "to wander," "to make a circuit," thus the month was lunar, the period of the moon's circuit. The Gr mēn also meant "moon," from the Sanskrit ma, "to measure," the Lat mensis and our "moon" being derived from the same root (see Calendar, Time; Astronomy).

 rapper (or rō'sh ha-ḵōdēsh), was observed as a festival (1 S 20 5; 18; 1 S 13 1). H. Porter

**MONTHLY, mth'li, PROGNOSTICATORS, prog-nos'-ti-kā-ter's.** See Astrology, I, 6.

**MONUMENT, mon'um-ent (Isa 65 4 AV).** See VAULT.

**MOOOLI, mō'-ol-i (A, Mōol, Mooli, B, Mōoli, Mool; AV Mooli): Son of Merari and grandson of Levi (1 Efd 4 47) — "Mahli" in Ezr 8 18 (see Ex 6 16-19).

**MOON, mōn (מַט), yārēḏ;" meaning obscure —probably "wanderer:" by some given as "pale:" *σελήνη, selēnē*): The moon was very early worshiped by the nations, largely due to its divinity or the representative of one or more deities. These deities were both masculine and feminine. In Assyria and Babylonia the most common name for the moon-god was Sin or Se. In Babylonia he was also called Aku and Namara. In Egypt the moon was represented as a ram or jackal, feminine and masculine. The chief of these was Thoth the god of knowledge, so called because the moon was the measurer of time. Babylonia has, also, As, the goddess of the moon, as the consort of the sun, whose equivalent as known in Phoenicia as Ashtaroth-karnaim. This personification and worship of the moon among the nations who were neighbors to Pal was but part of an elaborate Nature-worship found among these people. Nor was this worship always separated from Pal by geographical lines. It crept into the thought and customs of the Hebrews and in a sense affected their religious conceptions and ceremonies. They fell into the habit of making direct homage to sun, moon and stars, as is evidenced by Job 31 26; Jer 44 17, and even Isa 3 18 (see CRESCENTS). Moses seems to have forewarned his people against the danger of this form of worship (Dt 4 19).

**C. E. Schenk**

**MOON, NEW.** See Astrology, I, 6; Astronomy, I, 3, (1); FASTS AND FEASTS.

**MOOSSIAS, mō-os'i-as (B, Mōorσίας, Moossias, A, Mōs Sias, Mōos Sias; AV Moosias, mō'-sias): One of those who had taken a "strange wife" (1 Eed 9 31) — "Maaseiah" in Ezr 10 30.

**MOPH, mof.** See MEMPHIS.

**MORALITY, mō-ral'i-ti.** See ETHICS.

**MORASTHITE, mō-rash'-tīt (מֹרָשִׁית, ha-mōrāshīt; AV Morasthite, mō-ras'-thēt): Gentile designation of the prophet Micah (Jer 26 18; Mic 1 1). See also MORSHEITHI-GATH.

**MORDECAI, mōr'dē-ki, mōr-de-kā'i (מֹרְדְכָי, mor'dhkay; Măr'šēths, Marochoels): An Israel- ite of the tribe of Benjamin, whose fate it has been to occupy a distinguished place in the annals of his people. His great-grandfather, Kish, had been carried to Babylon along with Jeconiah, king of Judah (Est 2 5-6). For the main representation of several deities, all the scenes narrated in Est, in which Mordecai was greatly concerned, took place, the way to Pal had been open to the Israelites; but neither his father, Jair, nor afterward himself chose to return
to the ancient heritage. This seems to have been the case also with the rest of his house, as it was with the vast majority of the Israelite people; for his uncle died in Persia leaving his motherless daughter, Hadassah, to the care of Mordecai. Employed in the royal palace at Susa, he attracted the notice of the timely discovery of a plot to assassinate the king, the favorable notice of Xerxes, and in a short time became the grand vizier of the Persian empire. He has been believed by many to have been the author of the Book of Esther. As in the case of known notices of the Feast of Purim, outside of the book just mentioned, that festival is closely associated with his name. It is called "the day of Mordecai" (2 Mac. 15:30). The apocryphal additions to Est expatiate upon his greatness, and are eloquent of the deep impression which his personality and power had made upon the Jewish people.

Lord Arthur Hervey has suggested the identification of Mordecai with Matoa, or Natea, the powerful favorite and minister of Xerxes, who is spoken of by Ctesias, the Gr historian. Few have done more to earn a nation's lasting gratitude than Mordecai, to whom, under God, the Jewish people owe their preservation.

John Urquhart

MOREH, mō'reh, HILL OF (ellaneous, mo'ρēē or mo'ρēē, "hill of the teacher"); B. Γαβαθά-
θαμάρ, Gebathamâr, A. θοι μομού τοῦ Ἄβαρ, toû bômóv toû Abôr): The Heb. mō'reh is derived from the vb. yârâh, "to teach," "to direct," and indicates one who directs, or gives oracle answers. We might therefore read "hill of the teacher," the height being associated with such a person who had his seat here. The hill is named only in describing the position of the Midianites before Gideon's attack (Jgs 7:1). If the identification of the Wall of Hazor with Ar 'Ain Jalut is correct, Gideon must have occupied the slopes to the E. of Jezreel. The Midianite camp was in the valley of Jezreel (6:33). The Heb text in 7:1, which has probably suffered some corruption, seems to mean that the Midianites lay N. of the position held by Gideon, their lines running from the hill of Moreh in the plain. The hill can hardly have been other than Jebel ed-Duby, often called Little Hermon, which rises boldly from the northern edge of the vale of Jezreel, with Slengeru as a remarkable scene wafting at its foot ("Judges," ICC, 200) would lay the scene in the neighborhood of Shechem, but there is no good reason to doubt the accuracy of the tradition which places it at the eastern end of the plain of Esdraelon.

W. EWING

MOREH, OAK OF (BIBLE THESAURUS, 'ἐλθὲν μορῆχ, "terebinth of the teacher"); τὸν δὲν τὴν ὕψηλην, τὸν δ wlan τὴν χυπασθεῖν; AV Plain of Moreh): It seems probable that the place here intended may be the same as that mentioned in Dt 11:30 ("Elon mō'reh, "terebinths of Moreh," AV "plains,"") RV oaks," RVm "terebinths"). Both are defined as near to Shechem. The position cannot be identified today. The trees or trees were evidently a place of resort for those who wished to consult a mō'reh. See Moreh, Hill of. To this day in Pal trees are often regarded with a certain religious awe as the habitation of spirits. Isolated terebinths receive much veneration. The present writer has often heard farmers with marvellous rags of all colors attached to them by the peasants as evidence of their homage. See MECONEM.

W. EWING

MORESHETH-GATH, mō'resheth-gath, mō'resheth-gath (פֵּרֶשֶׁת גַּת, mōresheth-gath, "inheritance or possession of Gath"); LXX κλήρονομαία Παθ, kleronomias Gath): A place mentioned only in Mic 1:4. It must have been in the vicinity of Gath as the meaning of the name would indicate, and was the home of the prophet Micah (Mic 1:1; Jer 26:18). It was probably in the vicinity of Mareshah (Mic 1:15). Jeroboam, in his protest to his work on Mount Moriah, places it a little to the E. of Eleutheropolis (Belit Jibrîn), and it would be natural to find it there if the latter place was Gath as some think. Robinson (BR, II, 68) found ruins of a village between one and two miles E. of Belt Jibrîn. It must have been among the foot-hills of Judah between the hill country and the Phili plain on the route from Jerus to Lachish, Gaza and Egypt. Mareshah was certainly in that region, and the prophecy of Micah mentions towns and villages in the Shephelah and the Phili country as though they were familiar to him (see HIGHL and G. A. Smith, "Micah," in his Minor Prophets).

H. PORTER

MORIAH, mō'-ri'ah, LAND OF (τὸ Ἄρχων, τὸ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον, τὸ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον; εἰς τὸν τόν τοῦ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον; εἰς τὸν τόν τὸν ἐργαθήν): Abraham was directed by God to take his son Isaac, to go into the land of Moriah, and there to offer him for a burnt offering (Gen 22:2) upon a mountain which God would show him. This land is mentioned only here, and there is little to guide us in trying to identify it. A late writer (2 Ch 3:1) applies the name of Moriah to the mount on which Solomon's Temple was built, possibly associating it with the sacrifice of Isaac. A similar association with this mountain may have been in the mind of the writer of Gen 22 (see ver 14), who, of course, wrote long after the events described (Driver). But in ver 2 no special mountain is indicated.

Abraham journeyed from the land of the Philis, and on the 6th day he saw the place afar off (ver 1). This naturally leads to assume a mountain or mountaintop farther N. than Jerus. The description could hardly apply to Jerus in any case, as it cannot be seen "afar off" by one approaching either from the S. or the W. The Samaritans lay the scene of sacrifice on Mt. Gerizim (q.v.).

Instead of "Moriah" in this passage Pesh reads "Amorites." This suggests a possible emendation of the text, which, if it be accepted, furnishes a more definite idea of the land within which that mem-

merable scene was lying at Jersu-"Jachers, Judges," ICC (200) would lay the scene in the neighborhood of Shechem, but there is no good reason to doubt the accuracy of the tradition which places it at the eastern end of the plain of Esdraelon.

W. EWING

MORESHETH-GATH, mō'resheth-gath, mō'resheth-gath (פֵּרֶשֶׁת גַּת, mōresheth-gath, "inheritance or possession of Gath"); LXX κλήρονομαία Παθ, kleronomias Gath): A place mentioned only in Mic 1:4. It must have been in the vicinity of Gath as the meaning of the name would indicate, and was the home of the prophet Micah (Mic 1:1; Jer 26:18). It was probably in the vicinity of Mareshah (Mic 1:15). Jeroboam, in his protest to his work on Mount Moriah, places it a little to the E. of Eleutheropolis (Belit Jibrîn), and it would be natural to find it there if the latter place was Gath as some think. Robinson (BR, II, 68) found ruins of a village between one and two miles E. of Belt Jibrîn. It must have been among the foot-hills of Judah between the hill country and the Phili plain on the route from Jerus to Lachish, Gaza and Egypt. Mareshah was certainly in that region, and the prophecy of Micah mentions towns and villages in the Shephelah and the Phili country as though they were familiar to him (see HIGHL and G. A. Smith, "Micah," in his Minor Prophets).

H. PORTER

MORIAH, mō'-ri'ah, LAND OF (τὸ Ἄρχων, τὸ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον, τὸ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον; εἰς τὸν τόν τοῦ ἐργα ἀρχαῖον; εἰς τὸν τόν τὸν ἐργαθήν): Abraham was directed by God to take his son Isaac, to go into the land of Moriah, and there to offer him for a burnt offering (Gen 22:2) upon a mountain which God would show him. This land is mentioned only here, and there is little to guide us in trying to identify it. A late writer (2 Ch 3:1) applies the name of Moriah to the mount on which Solomon's Temple was built, possibly associating it with the sacrifice of Isaac. A similar association with this mountain may have been in the mind of the writer of Gen 22 (see ver 14), who, of course, wrote long after the events described (Driver). But in ver 2 no special mountain is indicated.

Abraham journeyed from the land of the Philis, and on the 6th day he saw the place afar off (ver 1). This naturally leads to assume a mountain or mountaintop farther N. than Jerus. The description could hardly apply to Jerus in any case, as it cannot be seen "afar off" by one approaching either from the S. or the W. The Samaritans lay the scene of sacrifice on Mt. Gerizim (q.v.).

Instead of "Moriah" in this passage Pesh reads "Amorites." This suggests a possible emendation of the text, which, if it be accepted, furnishes a more definite idea of the land within which that mem-

merable scene was lying at Jersu-"Jachers, Judges," ICC (200) would lay the scene in the neighborhood of Shechem, but there is no good reason to doubt the accuracy of the tradition which places it at the eastern end of the plain of Esdraelon.

W. EWING

MORNING, mō'-rînìng: There are several Heb and Gr words which are rendered "morning," the most common in Heb being יָמָה, bôker, which occurs 150 t. It properly means "the breaking forth of the light," "the dawn," as in Gen 19:27; Jgs 19:8, 25, 27. Another word with the same meaning is יָמָא, shahar (Gen 19:13; Neh 4:21; Isa 66:8). יָמָא, mishkar ("womb of the m.,") Ps 110:3) is a poetical term derived from the same root. See HIND OF THE MORNING. יָמָא, nîghah, יָמָא, mutâghah (Dnl 6:19 [Heb 20]), mean "brightness, mercy, kâbhîm, com- kîm, "to load an animal" (for a journey), and as the nomads are accustomed to do this early in the morning it came to mean early morning (1 S 17:16). See BETIMES.

In the NT κῆπος, ὀρθρος, is properly "dawn," and is used for early morning (Jn 8:2; Acts 5:21), and
MORNING WATCH (מָוֶר תּוֹפָה, aš-mō-ārā (Ex 14:24; 1 S 11:11; in Jdh 12:5 for hešābān ḥa-chiḥ; cf. Sir 56:1; 1 Mac 6:30): The last portion of the night (see Watch).}

MORNING, WINGS OF. See Astronomy, I. 4.

MORROW, mōrō, TOMORROW, tōs-mōrō: Two words are used in the OT in this meaning: מֹרֹא, boker, which properly means “dawn,” or “morning,” and מֹרֹא, mōdar, properly the same, but used for the next morning and hence “tomorrow,” like the Ger. morgen. The derivative מֹרֶה, mōrēh, is “the following day,” all the next day, esp. after yom (“day”), but usually coupled with a noun following, as in Lev 23:11, mōrēh ha-shabbāḥ, “day after the Sabbath.” It is also used adverbially for “on the morrow,” as in Gen 19:34.

In the Gr. of the NT we find ἀγωρος, aurion (Mt 6:34, III, 3; commonly used, but ἀγωρον, ketos, also occurs (Acts 25:17 AV, where RV renders more exactly “the next day”); τραφίον, epaurion, is “on the morrow” (Acts 10:9.23.24). H. PORTER

MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH (מֹרֶה), mōrēh, or מֹרֶה רֹתָב, mōrēh rō-tāv, “the morrow,” or “tomorrow,” “the day following” מֹרֶה רֹתָב, mōrēh rō-tāv, “the day after the Sabbath,” i.e., the first day of the week. The first day of the week was designated for the formal offering of the first-fruits in the form of wave-sheaves (Lev 23:11), and of the wave-sheaves 50 days later (Lev 23:16. 17). This recognition of an after-Sabbath during festive periods has its counterpart in the later ecclesiastical practice of celebrating not only Easter Sunday, but also Easter Monday, etc., and undoubtedly was a factor in establishing the custom which transferred the sanctity of the Sabbath to the first day of the week after the resurrection of Our Lord.

FRANK E. HIRSCH

MORSEL, mōr-sēl (ἀγωρός, briis): Found only in He 12:16 AV, “For one morsel of meat [RV ‘mess of meat’] sold his birthright,” lit. “for one eating,” i.e. one meal. The Great Bible (Cranmer’s) has “for one meal of meat.”

MORTAL, mōr-tal, MORTALITY, mor-tal’-ti (נְתַנָּה, nēta-na, to nēτān, iō nētān): The meaning is “subject to death” (Rom 6:12; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:53.54; in 2 Cor 5:4 RV has “what is mortal”). In Job 4:17, the Heb word is nētāh, “mortal man.” See IMMORTAL.

MORTAR, mōr-tār (מָהְקִת, māhōkāth [Nu 11:8], Mōkāth, makhtēṣ [Prov 27:22]): A hollowed stone or vessel in which grain or other substance was pounded or beaten with a pestle. The Israelites used a mortar in which to beat the manna in the wilderness (Nu 11:8), and Prov 27:22 declares, “Though thou shouldst braze a fool in a mortar with a pestle . . . yet will not his foolishness depart from him.” It is incomprehensible. Some have supposed an allusion to an oriental mode of punishment by pounding the criminal to death in a mortar, but this is unlikely. In illustration of Prov 27:22 such proverbs are quoted as Though you beat that houseman in a mortar, she will not leave her place also. See also BRAY. For “mortar” (AV “morter”) see BITUMEN. JAMES ORR

MORTACE, mōr-tēs (מֹרָתָא, mōrātā, ‘arabah): To give or be security as a part of bartering, give pledges, become surety. In time of great need for food, "Some also there were that said, We are mortgaging [AV ‘have mortgaged’] our fields," etc (Neh 5:3). See Surety.

MORTIFY, mōr-ti-fi (Rom 8:13 AV and ERV, θανατάω, thanadō, ERVm “make to die,” and Col 3:5, νεκρόω, nekroō, ERVm “make dead”): This sense of mortify is obsolete in modern Eng., and ARV in both places substitutes “put to death,” with great advantage. The context in both passages goes to the heart of St. Paul’s doctrine of the union of the believer with Christ. This union has given the soul a new life, flowing (through the Spirit) from Christ in the heavenly world, so that the remnants of the old corrupt life-principle are now dangerous excrescences. Hence they are to be destroyed, just as a surgeon removes the remnants of a diseased condition after the reestablishment of healthy circulation. The interpreter must guard against weakening St. Paul’s language by some such phrase as “subdue all that is inconsistent with the highest ideals,” for St. Paul views the union with Christ as an intensely real, quasi-physical relation.

BURLINGTON EASTON

MOSEAH, mō-sē-ā, mōsē’s-ā (מְשֵׁה, mā-šērāh, “bond”): Perhaps Moser with He lokal, “to Moser” (Dt 10:6). See MOSEROTH.

MOSEROTH, mō-sē-roth, mōsē’s-roth, -roth (מְשָׁרָת, mā-šērāth, “bond”): A desert camp of the Israelites between Hashmonah and Bene-jaakan (Nu 33:30.31). It is probably the same as Moserah (Dt 10:6), though in that passage the name follows Bene-jaakan. There Aaron died and was buried. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MOSES, mōsēs, mō’sēs (מֹשֶׁה, mōšē; Egyptian mēs, "drawn out," "born"; LXX Μωυσῆ, Mōusēs): The great Heb national hero, leader, author, lawyer and prophet.

I. LIFE
1. Son of Levi
2. Founding Prince
3. Friend of the People
4. Refuge in Midian
5. Leader of Israel

II. WORK AND CHARACTER
1. The Author
2. The Lawyer
3. The Prophet

LITERATURE
The traditional view of the Jewish church and of the Christian church, that M. was a person and that the narrative with which his life-story is interwoven is real history, is in the main sustained by commentators and critics of all classes.

It is needless to mention the old writers among whom these questions were hardly under discussion. Among the advocates of the current radical criticism may be mentioned Stade and Renan, who minimize the historicity of the Biblical narrative at this point. Renan thinks the narrative “may be very probable.” Kwad, Wellhausen, Robertson Smith, and Driver, while finding many flaws in the story, make much generally of the historicity of the narrative.

The critical analysis of the Pent breaks up the narrative. It is recognized that there are difficulties in the story of M. In what ancient life-story are there not difficulties? If we can conceive of the ancient being obliged to ponder over ever a modern life-story, we can hardly believe that they would be still more “difficulty” with it. But it seems to very many that the critical
It was the time of the Ramesside dynasty, and the king on the throne was Rameses II. Thus the foundling adopted by Pharaoh's daughter would have the family name Mes or Moses. That it would be joined in the Egyptian to the name of the sun-god Ra is practically certain. His name at birth would be Moses. But the Hebrew mind a name must mean something. The usual meaning of this royal name was that the child was "born of" a princess through the intervention of the god Ra. But this child was not "born of the princess," and falling back upon the primary meaning of the word, "drawn out," she said, "because I drew him out of the water" (Ex 2 10). Thus Moses received his name. Pharaoh's daughter may have been the eldest daughter of Rameses II, but more probably was the daughter and eldest child of Seti Merenptah I, and sister of the king on the throne. She would be lineal heir to the crown but debarred by her sex. Instead, she bore the title "Pharaoh's Daughter," and, according to Egyptian custom, retained the right to the crown for herself.

Many curious things, whose value is doubtful, are told of M. by Jos and other ancient writers (Jos, Ant, Mt, ix, 7; xi: C. A. M.: for legends, see Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus, Appendix; for rabbinical and rabbinical traditions are not incredible but lack authentication. Others are absurd. Egyptologists have searched with very little success for some notice of the great Hebrew at the Egyptian court.

But the faith of which the Ep. to the Hebrews speaks (He 11 23-28) was at work. Moses "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter" (Ex 2 11). A Friend of the People. Whether he did so in word, by definite renunciation, or by his espousal of the cause of the slave against the oppressive policy of Pharaoh is of little importance. In either case he became practically and greatly impoverished his throne rights and probably his civil rights as well. During some intervention to ameliorate the condition of the state slaves, an alteration arose and he slew an Egyptian (Ex 2 11.12). Thus his constructive treason became an overt act. Discovering through the ungrateful reproaches of his own kinsmen (Acts 7 25) that his act was known, he quickly made decision, "choosing rather to share ill treatment with the people of God," casting in his lot with slaves of the empire, rather than to "enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season," amid the riotous living of the young princes at the Egyptian court; "accounting the reproach of Christ" (his humiliation, being accounted a nobody ("Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?")) as "greater riches than the treasures of Egypt" (He 11 25,26; Acts 7 25-28). He thought he was a nobody and do right better than to be a tyrant and rule Egypt.

M. fled, "not fearing the wrath of the king" (He 11 27), not crying before it or submitting to it, but defying it and braving all that it could bring upon him, degradation in Midian from his high position, deprivation of the privileges and comforts of the Egyptian court. He went out a poor wanderer (Ex...
2:15). We are told nothing of the escape and the journey, how he eluded the vigilance of the court guards and the frontier posts. The friend of slaves is strangely safe while within their territory. At last he reached the Sinai province of the empire and hid himself away among its mountain fastnesses (Ex 2:15). The romance of the wild and the shepherders and the grateful father and the future wife is all quite in accord with the simplicity of desert life (Ex 2:16-22). The “Egyptian” saw the rude, selfish herdsmen of the desert imposing upon the helpless shepherd girls, and partly by fortune, partly by man, partly, doubtless, by the authority of the Egyptian appearing in an age when “Egypt” was a word with which to frighten men in all that part of the world, he compelled them to give way. The “Egyptian” was called, thanked, given a home and eventually a wife. There in Midian, while the anguish of Israel continued under the taskmaster’s lash, and the weakening of Israel’s strength by the destruction of the male children went on, with what more or less vigor, we know not. M. was left by Providence to know, and M. S. was found of the Lord. “Instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,” he might be transformed into the wise, well- poised, masterful leader, statesman, legislator, poet, and prophet. God usually prepares His great ones in a contrivance or a scheme about some of the drearier places of earth, farthest away from the busy haunts of men and nearest to the “secret place of the Most High.” David keeping his father’s flocks, Elijah on the mountain slopes of Gilgal, the Baptist in the wilderness of Judea, Jesus in the shop of the Galilean carpenter; so M. a shepherd in the Bedouin country, in the “waste, howling wilderness.”

The commission.—One day Moses led the flock to “the back of the wilderness” (Ex 3:1-12; see BURNING BUSH). M. received his commission, the most appalling commission of all time ever given to a mere man (Ex 3:10)—a commission to a solitary man, and he a refugee—to go back home and deliver his kinsmen from a dreadful slavery at the hand of the most powerful nation on earth. Let not those who halt and stumble over the little difficulties of most ordinary lives think hardly of the faltering of Moses’ faith before such a task (Ex 3:11-15; 4:10-12). In this, all Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you” (Ex 3:14), was the encouragement God gave him. He gave him also Aaron for a spokesman (Ex 4:14-16), the return to the Mount of God as a sign (Ex 3:12), and the rod of power for working wonders (Ex 4:17).

One of the curious necessities into which the critical analysis drives its advocates is the opinion concerning Aaron that “he scarcely seems to have been a Israëtl and almost equal partner of Moses, perhaps not even a priest” (Bennett, HDB, III, 441). Interesting and curious speculations have been instituted concerning the work in which Israel and esp. Pharaoh were to understand this message. “At the request of the eldest brother of Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you” (Ex 3:14), was the encouragement God gave him. He gave him also Aaron for a spokesman (Ex 4:14-16), the return to the Mount of God as a sign (Ex 3:12), and the rod of power for working wonders (Ex 4:17).

With the signs for identification (Ex 4:1-10). M. was ready for his mission. He went down from the “holy ground” to obey the high summons and fulfill the great commission. After the long controversy with his wife, a controversy of stormy ending (Ex 4:24-26), he seems to have left his family to his father-in-law’s care while he went to respond to the call of God (Ex 18:22). He met Aaron, his brother, and together they returned to Egypt to collect the elders of Israel (Ex 4:29-31), who were easily won over to the scheme of emancipa-

tion. Was ever a slave people not ready to listen to plans for freedom?

(2) The conquest of Pharaoh.—The next move was the bold request to the king to allow the people to go into the wilderness to hold a feast unto Jehovah (Ex 5:1). How did Moses gain admittance past the jealous guards of an Egyptian court to the presence of the Pharaoh himself? And why was it that former traitorous refugee at once arrested? Egyptology affords a not too distinct answer. Rameses II was dead (Ex 4:19); Merenptah II was on the throne with an insecure tenure, for the times were troublous. Did some “Pharaoh’s daughter” who, had he remained loyal, would have been the Pharaoh? Probably so. Thus he would gain admittance, and thus, too, in the precarious condition of the throne, it might well not be safe to molest him. The original form of the request had to be treated with some slight modification, was continued throughout (Ex 8:27; 10:9), though God promised that the Egyptians should thrust them out altogether when the end should come, and it was so (Ex 11:1, 12:35-39). Yet Pharaoh foisted upon the king the worst duty in the easiest form and thus, also, his obstinacy appears as the greater heinousness. Then came the challenge of Pharaoh in his contemptuous demand, “Who is Jehovah?” (Ex 5:2), and Moses’ prompt acceptance of the challenge, in the beginning of the long series of plagues (see PLAGUES) Pharaoh, having made the issue, was justly required to afford full presentation of it. So Pharaoh’s heart was hardened (Ex 4:21; 7:3-5; 9:12-35; 10:1; 14:8; see PLAGUES) until the vindication of Jehovah was so conducted that the gods of Egypt were shown to be of no avail against Him, but that He was the only God, and until the faith of the people of Israel was confirmed (Ex 14:31).

(3) Institution of the Passover.—It was now time for the next step in revelation (Ex 12:1-16). At the burning bush God had declared His purpose to be a savior, the deliver of Israel. That deliverance was in Egypt, His absolute sovereignty was being established; and now the method of delivery came by Him. That He might not be a destroyer, was to be revealed. M. called the hardened elders (Ex 12:21-28) and instituted the Passover feast. As God always in revelation chooses the known and the familiar—the tree, the bow, circumcision, baptism, and the Supper—by which to convey the unknown, so the Passover was a combination of the household feast with the widespread idea of safety through blood-sacrifice, which, however it may have come into the world, was not new at that time. Some think there is evidence of an old Sem festival at that season which was utilized for the institution of the Passover.

The lamb was chosen and its use was kept up (Ex 12:3-6). On the appointed night it was killed and “roasted with fire” and eaten with bitter herbs (Ex 12:8), while they all stood ready girded, with their shoes on their feet and their staff in hand (Ex 12:11). They ate in safety and in hope, because the blood of the lamb was on the door (Ex 12:23).

That night the firstborn of Egypt were slain. Among the Egyptians “there was not a house where there was not both Egyptians and Israelites” (Ex 12:29). It was the front door of the maid-servant, who sat with her handmill before her, to the palace of the king that “sat on the throne,” and even among the cattle in the pasture.
If the plague was employed as the agency of the angel of Jehovah, as some think, its peculiarities is that it takes the strongest and the best and culminates in one great stunning blow and then immediately subsides (see LEV. viii). Who can tell the horror of it, when the Israelites were thrust out of the terror-stricken land (Ex 129)?

As they went out, they "asked," after the fashion of departing servants in the East, and God gave them favor in the sight of the over-awed Egyptians that they left gifts upon them as a mark of extravagance. Thus "they despoiled the Egyptians" (Ex 1236). "Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people" (Ex 115; 1235.36).

(Ex) The exodus went to the land of 500 years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the host of Jehovah went out from the land of Egypt." (Ex 12 41). The great oppressor was Rameses II, and the culmination and the revolution came, most probably, in connection with the building of Pithom and Rameses, as these are the works of Israel mentioned in the Bible narrative (Ex 111). Rameses said that he built Pithom at the "mouth of the east" (Budge, Hist. of Egypt, V, 123). All efforts to substantiate this statement have failed; and in the present, at least, it must be admitted that Israel built Pithom, Rameses built Pithom; there is a synchronism that cannot in the present knowledge of Egypt history even doubted, much less separated.

The true purpose which came to Egypt with the beginning of the reign of Merenptah II was the right and psychological moment for the return of the "son of Pharaoh's daughter" and his access to the royal court. The presence and power of Jehovah vindicated His claim to be the Lord of all the earth, and Merenptah let the children of Israel go.

A little later when Israel turned back from the border of Khar (Pal) into the wilderness and disappeared, and Moses and his people passed over into the sea, they set up the usual boastful tablet claiming as his own many of the victories of his royal ancestors, added a few which he himself could truly boast, and inserted, near the end, an exultation over Israel's discomfiture, accounting himself as having finally won the victory: "Tehenu is devastation. Kheta peace, the Canaan the prisoner of all lands; God the People of Israel is ruined, his posterity is not; Khar is become as the widows of Egypt." The synchronisms of this period are well established and, if they should ever be, other facts of Egypt history shall be obtained to change them. Yet there is no more practical the precise event from which the descent into Egypt should be reckoned, or to fix the date of such, Rameses and Merenptah, and the building of Pithom and of Merenptah II, as did "the date of the exodus and of all the patriarchal matters from the moment when Moses was concerned about the order of events, their perspective and their synchronisms than about any epochal date. For the present we must be content with these chronological uncertainties. Astronomical science may sometimes fix the epochal dates for these events; otherwise there is little likelihood that they will ever be known.

They went out from Succoth (Egypt "Thothu," Budge, History of Egypt, V, 122, 129), carrying the bones of Joseph with them as he had commanded (Ex 13 19; Gen 50 25). The northeast route was the direct way to the promised land, but it was guarded. Pithom itself was built at "the mouth of the East," as a part of the great frontier defences (Budge, op. cit., V, 123). The "wall" on this frontier was well guarded (Ex 14), and attempts might be made to stop them. So they went not "by the way of the land of the Philistines, but the way of the wilderness for the fear of the inhabitants of the earth which were between the Red Sea and the wilderness of Zin, (Ex 13 17). The Lord Himself took the leadership and went ahead of the host of Israel in a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night (Ex 13 21). He led the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Ex 13 18). They pitched before Pi-hahiroth, over against Raal-zephon between Migdol and the sea (Ex 14 2). Not one of these places has been positively identified. But the journeys before and after the crossing, the time, and the configuration of the land and the coast-line of the sea, together with all the necessity imposed by the narrative, are best met by a crossing near the modern town of Suez (Naville, Route of the Exodus; Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus), where Ras Attika comes down to the sea, upon whose heights is a ruined (orEdward tower) as the southern outpost of the eastern line of Egypt defences, which was probably erected.

Word was carried from the frontier to Pharaoh, probably at Tanis, that the Israelites had "fled" (Ex 14 5), had taken the impassioned thrusting out by the frenzied people of Egypt in good faith and had gone never to return. Pharaoh took immediate steps to arrest and bring back the fugitives. The troops at hand (Ex 14 6) and the chariot corps, including 600 "chosen chariots," were sent after once in pursuit. Pharaoh going out in person at least to start the expedition (Ex 14 6.7). The Israelites seemed to be "entangled in the land," and, since "the wilderness [had] shut them in" (Ex 14 8), must easily fall a prey to the Egyptian army. The Israelites did not answer and commanded the pillar of cloud to turn back from its place before the host of Israel and stand between them and the approaching Egyptians, so that while the Egyptians were in the darkness, Israel had the light. The mountain came down on their right, the sea on the left to meet the foot of the mountain in front of them; the Egyptians were hastening on after them and the pillar of cloud and fire was their rearward. M. with the rod of God stood at the head of the camp. Then God wroth. M. stretched out the rod of God over the sea and "Jeh then caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night" (Ex 14 16-21). A path way was before them and the sea on the right hand, and on the left was a "wall unto them," and they passed through (Ex 14 21.22). Such heaping up of the waters by the wind is well known and sometimes amounts to 7 or 8 ft. in Lake Erie (Wright, Scientific Confirmations of the OT, 106). No clearer statement could possibly be made of the means used and of the miraculous timing of God's providence with the obedience of the people to His command to M. The host of Egypt passed over on the hard, sandy bottom of the sea. The Egyptians coming up in pursuit, and finding it impossible to tell exactly where the coastline had been on this beach, and where the point of safety would lie when the wind should abate and the tide come in again, impetuously rushed on after the fleeing slaves. In the morning, Jeh looked forth and troubled the Egyptians "and took off their chariot wheels, and they drove them heavily" (Ex 14 24.25). The wind had abated, the tide was returning and the inflation that goes before the tide made the beach like a quagmire. The Egyptians found that they had gone too far and tried to escape (Ex 14 27), but it was too late. The rushing tide caught them (Ex 14 28). When the way had come, "horse and rider" were but the subject of a minstrel's song of triumph (Ex 15 1-19; Ps 106 9-12) which Miriam led with her timbrel (Ex 15 20). The Bible does not say, and there is no reason to believe, that Pharaoh led the Egyptian hosts in person further than at the setting off and for the giving of general directions to the campaign (Ex 15 4). Pharaoh and his host were overthrown in the Red Sea (Ps 136 15). So Napoleon and his host were overthrown at Waterloo, but Napoleon lived to die at St. Helena. And Merenptah lived to cect his boastful inscription con-
cerning the failure of Israel, when turned back from Kadesh-barnea, and their disappearance in the wilderness of Paran. His mummy, identified by the outstanding Professor Grof, lies among the royal mummies in the Cairo Museum. Thus at the Red Sea was wrought the final victory of Jeh over Pharaoh; and the people believed (Ex 14 31).

(5) Special providences.—Now proceeded that long course of special providences, miraculous timing, and multiplying of natural agencies which began with the crossing of the Red Sea and ended only when they "did eat of the fruit of the land" (Josh 5 12). God promised freedom from the diseases of the Egyptians (Ex 16 26) at the bitter waters of Marah, on the condition of obedience. M. was directed to a tree, the wood of which should counteract the alkaline character of the water (Ex 15 23-25). A little later they were at Elim (Wady Gharandel, in present-day geography), where were "twelve springs of water and three score and ten palm trees" (Ex 15 27). The enumeration of the trees signifies nothing but their scarcity, and is understood by everyone who has traveled in that desert and counted, again and again, every little clump of trees that has appeared. The course of the wilderness here is a blotted page to the pen, and come out again at the Red Sea in order to pass around the point of the plateau into the wilderness of Sin. This is the course travel takes now, and it took the same course then (Ex 16 1). Here Israel murmured (Ex 16 2), and every traveler who crosses this blistering, dusty, wearsome, hungry wilderness joins in the murmuring, and wishes, at least a little, that he had stayed in the land of Egypt (Ex 16 3). Provisions brought from Egypt were about exhausted and the land supplied but little. Judging from the complaints of the people about the barrenness of the land, it was not much different then from what it is now (Nu 20 1-6). Now special providential provision began. "At even... the quails came up, and covered the camp," and in the morning, after the dew, the manna was found (Ex 16 4-36; see Manna; Quails).

At Rephidim was the first of the instances when Moses resorted to using water. The rock with the rod of God, and there came forth an abundant supply of water (Ex 17 1-6). There is plenty of water in the wady near this point now. The Amalekites, considering the mass of people following, had probably shut the Israelites off from the springs, so God opened some hidden source in the mountain side. "Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel" (Ex 17 8). Whether the hand which M. lifted up during the battle was his own hand or a symmetrical hand (Ex 17 9-12), thought to have been carried in battle then, as sometimes even yet by the Bedouin, is of no importance. It was in either case a hand stretched up to God in prayer and allegiance, and the battle with Amalek, then as now, fluctuates according as the hand is lifted up or lowered (Ex 17 8-16).

Here Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, met him and brought his wife and children to him (Ex 18 5-6; cf Nu 10 29). A sacrificial feast was held with the distinguished guest (Ex 15 7-12). In the wise counsel of this great despot-priest we see one of the many natural sources of supply for Moses' legal lore and statecraft. A suggestion of Jethro gave rise to one of the wisest and most far-reaching elements in the civil institutions turn a little later, the elaborate framework of civil courts (Ex 18 13-20).

(6) Receiving the Law.—At Sinai M. reached the pinnacle of his career, though perhaps not the pinnacle of his faith. (For a discussion of the location of Sinai, see SINAI; EXODUS.) It is useless to speculate about the nature of the flames in the theophany by fire at Sinai. Some say there was a thunderstorm (HDB); others think a volcanic eruption. The time, the stages of the journey, the description of hiss and thunder at the Red Sea, its admirable adaptability to be the cathedral of Jeh upon earth, and, above all, the collocation of all the events of the narrative along this route to this spot and to no other—all these exercise an overwhelming influence upon one (cf Palmes, The Desert of the Exodus). If they do not conclusively prove, they convincingly persuade, that here the greatest event between Creation and Calvary took place.

Here the people assembled. "And Mount Sinai, the whole of it, smoked," and above appeared the glory of God. Bounds were set about the mountain to keep the people back (Ex 19 12-13). God was upon the mountain: "Under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for cleanness." (Ex 19 10-19; 24 10, 16, 17), "and God spake all these words" (Ex 20 1-17). Back over the summit of the plain between these two mountain ridges in front, the people fled in terror to the place "far off" (Ex 20 18), and somewhere almost at the foot of another mountain the later the tabernacle of grace was set up (Ex 40 17). At this place the affairs of M. mounted up to such a pinnacle of greatness in the religious history of the world as none other among men has attained unto. He gave formal announcement of the perfect law of God as a rule of life, and the redeeming mercy of God as the hope through repentance for a world of sinners that "fall short." Other men have sought God and taught men to seek God, some by the words of the Law and some by the way of imitation, but where else in the history of the world has any one man caught sight of both great truths and given them out?

M. gathered the people together to make the covenant (Ex 24 1-8), and the nobles of Israel ate a covenant meal there before God (Ex 24 11). God called M. again to the mountain with the elders of Israel (Ex 24 12). There M. was with God, fasting 40 days (Ex 34 28). Joshua probably accompanied M. (cf the people God was changed to the builder. We can only learn what the pattern was by studying the tabernacle (see Tabernacle). It was an Egyptian plan (cf Bible Student, January, 1902). While M. was engaged in his study of the things of the tabernacle on the mount, the people grew restless and appealed to Aaron (Ex 32 1). In weakness Aaron yielded to them and made them a golden calf and they said, "These are thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (32 2-6; cf Calk: Golden). This was probably, like the later worship at Bethel and Dan, ancient Sem bull-worship and a violation of the second commandment (20 5; cf Bible Student, August, 1902). The judgment of God was swift and terrible (32 7-35), and Levi was made the Divine agent (32 25-29). Here first the "tent of meeting" comes into prominence as the official headquarters of the leader of Israel (33 7-11). Henceforth independent and distinct from the tabernacle, though on account of the similarity of names and ideas. But as the tabernacle, that building, it holds its place and purpose all through the wanderings to the plains of Moab by Jordan (Dt 31 14). M. is given a vision of God to strengthen his own faith (Ex 33 12-23; 34 1-35). On his return from communion with God, he had
such glory within that it shone out through his face to the terror of the multitude, an adumbration of that other and more glorious transfiguration at which M. should also appear, and that reflection of it which is sometimes seen in the life of many godly persons (Mt 17 1-13; Mk 9 2-10; Lk 9 28-36).

Rationalistic attempts to account for the phenomena at Sinai have been frequent, but usually along certain lines. The favorite hypothesis is that of volcanic action. Geologists have often used natural agencies in His revelations, and in His miracles, and there is no necessary obstacle to this. But there are two seemingly insuperable difficulties in the way of this naturalistic explanation: one, that since geologic time this has not happened on the region; the other, that volcanic eruptions are not conducive to literary inspiration. It is almost impossible to get a same account from the builders of an eruption, much less has it a tendency to result in the greatest literature, the most perfect code of laws and the profoundest statemanship in the world. The human mind can easily believe that God could so speak from Sinai and direct the preparation of such works of wisdom as the Book of the Covenant. Not many will be able to think that M. could do so during a volcanic eruption at Sinai. For it must be kept in mind that the historical character of the narrative at this point, and the Mosaic authorship of the Book of the Covenant, are generally admitted by those who put forward this naturalistic explanation.

(7) Uncertainties of history.—From this time on to the end of Moses' life, the materials are scant, there are long stretches of silence, and a biographer may well trust the tabernacle. The last 14 years were spent at the foot of the "mountain of law" (Ex 40 17-19), and the world from that day to this has been able to find a mercy-seat at the foot of the mountain of law. Nadab and Abihu presumptuously offered strange fire and were smitten (Lev 10 1-7). The people were numbered (Nu 1 1 ff). The Passover was kept (Nu 9 1-5).

(8) Journey to Canaan resumed.—The journey to Canaan began again (Nu 10 11-13). From this time until near the close of the life of M. the events associated with his name belong for the most part to the story of the wanderings in the wilderness and other subjects, rather than to a biography of M. (cf WANDERINGS; AARON; MIHIM; JOSHUA; CALEB; BRAZEN SERPENT, etc.). The subjects and references are as follows:

The March (Nu 2 10-18; 9 15-23)
The Complaint (Nu 11 1-3)
The Lusting (Nu 14 4-9; 31-36)
The Prophets (Nu 11 16; Num 13 1-16)
The People of Miriam (Nu 12 1-16)

(9) The border of the land.—

Kadesh-barnea (Nu 13 3-25)
The Spies (Dt 1 32; 23 37-38: 33: 14 1-38)
The Plagues (Nu 14 36-37.40-45)

The wanderings:

Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Nu 16 1-35)
The Plague (Nu 16 41-50; 17)
Death of Miriam (Nu 20 1)
Sin of M. and Aaron (Nu 20 12-13; Ps 106 32)
Uncircumcision of Edom (Nu 20 14-21)
Death of Aaron (Nu 20 22-26)
Arad (Nu 21 1-3)
Canaanization of Edom (Nu 21 4)
Murmurings (Nu 21 5-7)
Balaam (Nu 21 8.9; Jn 3 14)

Edom.—

The Jordan (Nu 21 10-20)
Simon (Nu 21 21-30)
Og (Nu 21 33-35)
Balaam and Balaam (Nu 22 4; 24 25)
Pollution of the People (Nu 25 6-15)
Numbering of the People (Nu 26)
Joshua Chosen (Nu 27 1-20)
Meditanites Punished (Nu 31)

(12) Tribes east of Jordan (Nu 32).

(13) Moses' final acts.—M. was now ready for the final instruction of the people. They were assembled, and a great farewell address was given (Dt 31 10-30). Joshua was set apart for office (Dt 31 1-8), and to the priests was delivered a written copy of this last announcement of the Law now adapted to the progress made during 40 years (Dt 31 9-13; cf 31 24-29). M. then called Joshua into the tabernacle for a final charge (Dt 31 14-28), gave to the assembled elders of the people "the words of this song" (Dt 31 30; 32 1-43) and blessed the people (Dt 33). And then M., who by faith "had triumphed in Egypt, had been the great revelator at Sinai, had turned back to walk with the people of little faith for 40 years, reached the greatest triumph of his faith, when, from the top of Nebo, the towering pinnacle of Pisgah, he lifted up his eyes to the goody land of promise and gave way to Joshua to lead the people of God.

This biography of M. is the binding-thread of the Pent from the beginning of Ex to the end of Dt, without disastrous breaks or disturbing repetitions. There are, indeed, silences, but they occur where nothing great or important in the narrative is to be expected. And there are, in the eyes of some, repetitions, so-called, but they do not seem to be any more real than those of the narrative biography that is only incidental to the main purpose of the writer. No man can break apart this narrative of the books without putting into confusion this life-story; the one cannot be treated as independent of the other; any more than the narrative of the Eng. Commonwealth and the story of Cromwell, or the story of the American Revolution and the career of Washington.

Later references to M. as leader, lawgiver and prophet run all through the Bible: for instance, that be mentioned: Josh 5 30-35; 24 1-5; 1 S 6 6-8; 1 Ch 23 14-17; Ps 77 30; 99 6; 105; 106; Isa 63 11,12; Jer 15 1; Dan 9 11-13; Hos 12 15; Mal 4 4.

The place held by M. in the NT is as unique as in the OT, though far less prominent. Indeed, he holds the same place, though presented in a different light. In the OT he is the type of the Prophet to be raised up "like unto" him. It is the time of types, and M., the type, is most conspicuous. In the NT the Prophet 'like unto Moses' has come. He now stands out the greatest One in human history, while M., the type, fades away in the shadow. It is thus he appears in Christ's remarkable reference to him: "He wrote of me!" (Jn 5 40). The principal thing which M. wrote specifically of Christ is this passage: "Jeh thy God will raise up one from thee a prophet after the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me!" (Dt 18 15,18 f). Again in the Ep. to the He, which is the formal passing over from the types of the OT to the fulfilment in the NT, Jesus is made to stand out as the Moses of the new dispensation (He 12 24-29). Other most important NT references to M. are Mt 17 8; Mk 9 4; Lk 9 30; Jn 1 17,45; 2 14; Rom 5 14; Jude 9; Rev 11 3.

II. Work and Character.—So little is known of the private life of M. that his personal character can scarcely be separated from the part which he bore in public affairs. It is in the work he wrought for Israel and for mankind which fixes his place among the great ones of the earth. The life which we have just sketched as the life of the leader of Israel is also the life of the author, the lawgiver, and the prophet.

It is not within the province of this art. to discuss in full the great critical controversies concerning the authorship of M. which have been summed up against him thus: "It is doubtful whether we can regard M. as an author in the literary sense" (HDB, III, 446; see PENTATEUCH; DEUTERONOMY). It will only be in place here to present a brief statement of the evidence in the case for M. There
is no longer any question concerning the literary character of the age in which M. lived. That M. might have written in Persian is not in itself improbable, but did he write, and how much? What evidence bears at these points?

(1) "Moses wrote."—The idea of writing or of writing is found 60 times in the Pent. It is definitely recorded in writing purporting to be by M. 7 times (that M. wrote or was commanded to write (Ex 17:14; 34:27; 39:30; Nu 17:23; Dt 10:4; 31:24) and frequently of others in his times (Dt 6:9; 27:3; 31:19; Jos 8:32). Joshua at the great convocation before the taking of the covenant wrote "these words in the book of the law of God" (Josh 24:26). Thus is declared the existence of such a book but 25 years after the death of M. (cf. Bible Student, 1901, 269-74). It is thus clearly asserted by the Scriptures as a fact that M. in the wilderness a little after the exodus was "writing "books."

(2) Moses' library.—There are many library marks in the Pent, even in those portions which by nearly all, even the most radical, critics are allowed to be probably the writings of M. The Pent as a whole has such library marks all over it. On the one hand this is entirely consistent with the known literary character of the age in which M. lived. One who was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" might well have had in his possession Egypt records. And the author of this art. is of that class to whom Professor Clay refers, who believe "that Hebraic (or Amoraic) literature, as well as Aramaic, has a great antiquity prior to the 1st millennium B.C. (Clay, Amura, 32.)

On the other hand, the use of a library to the extent indicated by the abiding marks upon the Pent does not in the least militate against the claim of M. for authorship of the same. The real library marks, aside from the passages which are assigned by the critics to go with them, are far less numerous and narrower in scope than in Gibbon or in Kunitz. The use of a library no more necessarily endangers authorship in the one case than in the other.

(3) The Moses-tradition.—A tradition from the beginning universally held, and for a long time and without inherent absurdity, has very great weight. Such has been the M-tradition of authorship. Since M. is believed to have been such a person living at an age and upon a material as might suitably provide the situation and the occasion for such historical records, so that common sense does not question whether he could have written the Pent, but only whether he did write "the Pent. "Thus, it is a tradition concerning his authorship than to believe that such a tradition arose with nothing so known concerning his ability and circumstances. But such a tradition did arise concerning M. It existed in the time of Josiah. Without it, by no possibility could the people have been persuaded to receive with authority a book purporting to be by him. The question of the truthfulness of the claim of actually finding the Book of the Law altogether aside, there must have been such a national hero as M. known to the people and believed in by them, as well as a confident belief in an age of literature reaching back to his days, else the Book of the Law would not have been received by the people as from M. Archaeology does not supply such actual literary material from the late 8th century B.C. as was known much earlier than the time of Josiah, but the material shows a method of writing and a literary advancement of the people which reaches far back for its origin, and which goes far to justify the tradition in Josiah's day. Over and above all this, there is no archaeological evidence to cast doubt upon that tradition.

(4) The Pent in the Northern Kingdom.—The evidence of the Pent in the Northern Kingdom before the fall of Samaria is very strong—this is entirely aside from the Pent. Although some few insist upon an early date for that book, it is better to omit it altogether from this argument, as the time of its composition is not absolutely known and is probably not very far from the close of the Babylon exile of Judah. But the prophets supply indirect evidence of the Pent in the Northern Kingdom (Hos 10:1; 4:6; 8:1.3; 9:11; 12:9; Am 5:21.22; 8:5; of Green, Higher Criticism and the Pent, 56-58).

(5) Evidence for the Mosaic age.—Beyond the limit to which historical evidence reaches concerning authorship of the Pent, internal evidence for the Mosaic age as the time of its composition carries us back to the very days of M.'s existence, if it be quite supposed that later authors might have known Egyptian words, but because their employment of such marked peculiarities in meaning and history and of such absolute inaccuracy in use in the Pent, that their employment by later authors in such a way is incredible. The list of such words is a long one. Only a few can be mentioned here. For a complete list, the interested reader must consult the "Guide to Ancient Egyptian Words" (see Lieben, PSBA, May, 1898, 202-10; also The Bible Student, 1901, 36-40.)

(6) The obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Pent. —This obscurity has been urged against the Mosaic authorship of the Pent. Because of peculiar belief concerning the doctrine of the resurrection among the Egyptians, this objection becomes the most formidable of all the objections urged by critics. If the Pent, written by M. when Israel had just come out of Egypt, why does he leave the doctrine of the resurrection in such obscurity? The answer is very simple. The so-called Egyptian doctrine of the resurrection was not a doctrine of resurrection at all, but a doctrine of resurrection. The real resurrection is a doctrine which the Egyptians and all other nations had no knowledge of. The reason M. did not argue this is because he knew that the people had just come out of Egypt would have carried with them, when they arrived, the Mosaic belief in resurrection and the resurrection of Christ. The Pent, therefore, does not refer to anything that is strange and foreign to the mind of the Egyptian people. The obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Pent, therefore, is explained by the fact that the people just come out of Egypt would have carried with them, when they arrived, the Mosaic belief in resurrection and the resurrection of Christ.

(7) The unity of the Pent.—Unity in the Pent, abstractly considered, cannot be indicative of a particular time for its composition. Manifestly, unity can be given a book at any time. There is indisputably a certain appearance of unity in narrative in the Pent, and when this unity is examined somewhat carefully, it is found to have such peculiarity as is found to the Mosaic writer's work. The making of books which have running through them such a narrative as is contained in the Pent which, esp. from the end of Gen, is entangled
and interwoven with dates and routes and topographical notes, the history of experiences, all so accurately given that in large part to this day the route and the places intended can be identified, all this, no matter when the books were written, certainly calls for special familiarity with all the circumstances. And when the all the circumstances add to all this the life of a man without breaks or repetitions adverse to the purpose of a biography, and running through from beginning to end, and not a haphazard, unsymmetrical man such as might result from the piecing together of fragments, but a colossal and symmetrical man, the foremost man of the world until a greater than M. should appear, it demands to be written near the time and place of the events narrated. That a work of fiction, struck off at one time by one hand, might meet all these requirements at a later date, no one can doubt, but a scrap-book, even though made up of facts, cannot do so. In fact, the scraps culled out by the analysis of the Pent do not make a connected life-story at all, but the enactment of the grand and momentous, and turn a biography, which is the binding-thread of the books, into what is little better than nonsense.

The unity of the Law, which also can be well supposed to be the same as the unity of the narrative in certifying the narrative near to the time and place of the events narrated. The discussion of the unity of the Law, which involves nearly the whole critical controversy of the day, would be too much of a digression for an article on M. (see LAW; LEVITICUS; DEUTERONOMY; also Green, Higher Criticism and the Pent; Ott, POT; Wiener, Bib. Sac., 1909-10).

Neither criticism nor archaeology has yet produced the kind or degree of evidence which rational demands for the Mosaic authorship of the Pent. No trace has yet been found either of the broken tablets at Mt. Sinai or of the autograph copy of the Law of the Lord "by the hand of Moses brought out of the house of the Lord in the days of Josiah. Nor are the things likely to be found, nor anything else that will certify authorship like a transcription of the records in the copyright office. Such evidence is not reasonably demanded. The foregoing indications point very strongly to the production of the Pent in the Mosaic age by someone as familiar with the circumstances and as near the heart of the nation as M. was. That here and there a few slight additions may have been made and that, perhaps, a few explanations made by scribes may have slipped into the text from the margin are not unlikely (Nu 12 3; Dt 34), but this does not affect the general claim of authorship.

Pss 90 is also attributed to M., though attempts have been made to discredit this authorship here also (Deitsch, Comm. on the Pes). There are those who perhaps still hold to the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Job. But that view was never more than a speculation.

The character of M. as lawgiver is scarcely separable from that of M. as author, but calls for some separate consideration.

2. The Lawgiver in the Pent legislation has been so well estimated that for any adequate idea of the discussion the reader must consult not only other articles (LAW; BOOK OF THE COVENANT; PENTATEUCH) but special works on this subject. In accord with the reasons presented above for the authorship of the Pent in Mosaic times, the great statesman seems most naturally the author of the laws so interwoven with his life and leadership. M. first gave laws concerning the Passover (Ex 13). At Sinai, after the startling revelation from the summit of the mountain, it is most reasonable that M. should gather the people together to covenant and that M. should give the Mosaic code of laws known as the Book of the Covenant (Ex 24 7). This code contains the Moral Law (Ex 20 1-17) as fundamental, the constitution of the theocracy and of all ethical living. This is followed by a brief code suitable to their present condition and immediate prospects (Ex 20 24-26; 21-23). Considering the expectations of both leader and people that they would immediately proceed to the promised land and take possession, it is quite in order that there should be laws concerning vineyards and olive orchards (Ex 23 11), and harvests (Ex 23 10-16) and the first-fruits (Ex 23 19). Upon the completion of the tabernacle, a priest-code became a necessity. Accordingly, such a code follows with great minuteness of directions. This part of the Law is composed almost entirely of "laws of procedure" intended primarily for the priests, that they might know their own duties and give oral instruction to the people, and probably was never written by the people except in the most general way. When Israel was turned back into the wilderness, these two codes were quite sufficient for the simple life of the wanderings. But Israel developed. The rabble became a nation. Forty years of life undermine the unity of the narrative, and the Book of the Covenant in the moralities of life, the PC in their religious exercises, and the brief statutes of Lev for the simple life of the desert, prepared the people for a more elaborate code as they entered the promised land of a more complex life. Accordingly, in Dt that code was recorded and left for the guidance of the people. That these various codes contain some things not now understood is not at all surprising. It would be surprising if they did not. Would not Orientals of today find some things in Western laws quite incomprehensible without explanation?

That some few items of law may have been added at a later time, as some items of history were added to the narrative, is not at all unreasonable, and does in no way invalidate the claim of M. as the lawgiver, any more than later French legislation has invalidated the Coriscan's claim to the Napoleonic Code.

The essential value of the Mosaic legislation is beyond comparison. Some of the laws of the Pent did to passing problems, have themselves passed away; some of them were definitely abrogated by Christ and others explicitly fulfilled; but the moral, industrial, social, and political, is the warp and woof of the best in the great codes of the world to this day. The morality of the Decalogue is unapproached among collections of moral precepts. Its divinity, like the divinity of the teachings of Jesus, lies not only in what it includes, but also in what it omits. The precepts of Patah-botoh, of Contemplative Spectus, include many things found in the Decalogue; the Decalogue omits many things found among the maxims of these moralists. Thus in what it excludes, as well as in what it includes, the perfection of the Decalogue lies.

(3) It should be emphasized that the laws of M. were codes, not a collection of court decisions known to lawyers as common law, but codes given abstractly, not in view of any particular concrete case, and arranged in systematic order (Wiener, Bib. Sac., 1909-10). This agrees with the archaeological indications of the Mosaic and preceding ages. The CH, given at least 5 centuries before, is one of the most orderly, methodical and logical codes ever constructed (Lyon, JACOS, XXV, 254).

The career and the works and the character of M. culminate in the prophetic office. It was as
prophet that M. was essentially leader. It was as prophet that he held the place of highest eminence in the world until a greater than M. came.  

3. The Prophet  

1. The statesman-prophet framed a government which illustrated the kingdom of God upon earth. The theocracy did not simulate any government of earth, monarchy, republic or socialistic state. It combined the best elements in all of these and set up the most effective checks which have ever been devised against the evils of each.  

2. The lawyer-prophet inculcated maxims and laws which set the feet of the people in the way of life, so that, while failing as a law of life in a sinful world, these precepts ever remain as a rule of conduct.  

3. The priest-prophet prepared and gave to Israel a ritual of worship which most completely typified the redemptive mercy of God and which is so wonderfully unfolded in the Ep. to the He, as it has been more wonderfully fulfilled in the life and atoning death of Christ.  

4. In all the multiform activities of the prophetic career he was a type of Christ, the type of Christ whose work was a "tutor unto Christ."  

Like the revelation of God ever transcends the speculations of theologians about God as a sunrise transcends a treatise on the solar spectrum. While the speculations are cold and lifeless, the revelation is vital and glorious. As an analysis of Raphael's painting of the transfiguration belittles its impression upon the beholder, while a sight of the picture exalts that scene in the mind and heart, so the attempts of theologians to analyze God and bring Him within the grasp of the human mind belittle the conception of God, dwarf it to the capacity of the human intellect, while such a vision of Him as M. gives exalts and glorifies Him beyond expression. Thus while theologians of every school from Athanasius to Ritschl come and go, M. goes on forever; while they stand cold on library shelves, he lives warm in the hearts of men.  

Such was the Heb leader, lawgiver, prophet, poet; among mere men, "the foremost man of all this world."  

LITERATURE—Comes on the Pent; for rabbinical traditions, of Lauterbach in *Jew Enc*; for pseudographical books ascribed to M., see Charles, *Assumptions of M.*; for Mohammedan legends, cf *DB: Ebers, Ägypten und die Bücher Moses*; for critical partition of books of M., cf *Pentateuch Bible* and Bennett in *JQR*; for comprehensive discussion of the critical problems, cf *POT.*  

M. G. KYLE  

MOSES, ASSUMPTION, a-sump'abun, OF. See APOCYPTIC LITERATURE.  

MOSES, SONG OF: The name given to the song of triumph sung by Moses and the Israelites after the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of the hosts of Pharaoh (Ex 15 1-18). The sublimity of this noble ode is universally admitted. In magnificent strains it celebrates the deliverance just experienced, extolling the attributes of Jch revealed in the triumph (vs 1-12), then anticipates the astonishing effects which would flow from this deliverance in the immediate future and in aftertimes (vs 13-18). There seems no reason to doubt that at least the basis of the song—possibly the whole song—is genuinely Mosaic. In the allusions to the guidance of the people to God's holy habitation, and to the terror of the surrounding peoples and of the Canaanites (vs 13-18), it is thought that traces are manifest of a later revision and expansion. This, however, is by no means a necessary conclusion.  

Driver, who in *LOT*, 8th ed, 30, goes with the critics on this point, wrote more guardedly in the 1st ed (p. 27):  

—Probably, however, the greater part of the song is Mosaic, and the modification or expansion is limited to the closing vs: for the general style is antique, and the triumphant tone which pervades it is just such a tone which naturally have been inspired by the event which it celebrates."  

The song of Moses is made the model in the Apocalypse of "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb," which those standing by the sea of glass, who have "come off victorious from the beast, and from his image, and from the number of his name," sing to God's praise, "Great and marvellous are thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty," etc (Rev 16 2-4). The church having experienced a deliverance similar to that experienced by Israel at the Red Sea, but infinitely greater, the old song is recast, and its terms are reframed to express both victories, the lower and the higher, at once.  

JAMES OHR  

MOSOLLAMON, mō-sōl'a-mon. See MOSOLLAMUS.  

MOSOLLAMUS, mō-sōl'a-mus:  

1) AV "Mosollam" (Μοσολλαμος, Mosollamon), one of the three "assessors" appointed to the two commissioners in the inquiry made about "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 14) = "Meshullam" in Ezr 8 16 (B reads also Ἐσωλαμ/ Μοσουλάμ, in 1 Esd 8 44).  

Most High, Most Holy. See God, Names of.  

MOT, mōt (κόρφος, kophos): A minute piece of anything dry or light, as straw, chaff, a splinter of wood, that might enter the eye. Used by Jesus in Mt 7 3 ff; Lk 6 41 in contrast with "beam," to rebuke officiousness in correcting small faults of others, while cherishing greater ones of our own.  

MOTH, moth (םות, 'asheh; cf Arab. קֶשֶׁת, 'eshet, "worm" [Nas 51 8]; of Arab. מָועַס, sab, "worm," esp. an insect larva in flesh, wood or grain; ἔφα, ...  

Clothes-Moth (*Tinea pellionella*).  

α, larvae in case constructed out of substances on which it is feeding; β, case cut open by the larva for enlarging it; σ, the perfect insect.
they are generally nocturnal and that their antennae are not club-shaped. Further, the larva in many cases spins a cocoon for the protection of its pupa or chrysalis, which is never the case with butterflies. The Bib. references are to the clothesmoth, i.e. various species of the genus Tinea, tiny insects which lay their eggs in woolen clothes, upon which the larva later feeds. As the larva feeds it makes a cocoon of its silk together with fibers of the cloth on which it is feeding, so that the color of the cocoon depends upon the color of the fabric. The adult is only indirectly harmful, as it is only in the larval stage that it inflicts injury. Therefore in Isa 51:8, "For the moth [תֶּשֶׁ] shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm [שָׂרָ] shall eat them like wool," both words must refer to the larva, the distich demanding such a word as דֵּשֶׁ to balance דֵּשֶ in the first half. The word "moth" occurs in the OT, in Job, Isa, and Hos, always in figurative expressions, typifying either that which is destructive (Job 13 28; Ps 39 11; Isa 50 9; 51 8; Hos 5 12) or that which is frail (Job 4 19; 27 18). See Insects.

ALFRED ELY DAY

MOTHER, muthʾer (Hang. כּ, qem; "mother," "dau," "ancestress"); בָּרָ, בָּרָ: In vain do we look in the Scriptures for traces of the low position which woman occupies in the OT impression has been created by her present position in the East, esp. under Mohammedan rule. Her place as depicted in the Scriptures is a totally different one. Women there moved on the same social plane with men. They often occupy leading public positions (Ex 15 20; Jgs 4 4; 2 K 22 14). The love of offspring was deeply imbedded in the heart of Hb women, and thus motherhood was highly respected. Among the patriarchs women, and esp. mothers, occupy a prominent place. In Rebekah's marriage, her mother seems to have had equal voice with her father and Laban, her brother (Gen 24 28-50.53. 55). Jacob obeyed his father and his mother" (Gen 28 7), and his mother evidently was his chief counselor. The Law places the child under obligation of honoring father and mother alike (Ex 20 12). The child that strikes father or mother or curses father or mother is punished by death (Ex 21 15.17). The "mother" bears rule in the habitually disobedient (Dt 21 18-21).

In one place in the Law, the mother is even placed before the father as the object of filial reverence (Lev 19 3). The Psalmist depicts deepest grief as that of one whose mother for his mother (Ps 35 14). In the entire Book of Prov the duty of reverence, love and obedience of sons to their mothers is unceasingly inculcated. The greatest comfort imaginable is that wherewith a mother comforts her son (Jas 16 13).

And what is true of the OT is equally true of the NT. The same high type of womanhood, the same reverence for one's mother is in evidence in both books. The birth of Christ lifted motherhood to the highest possible plane and idealized it for all time. The last thing Jesus did on the Cross was to bestow his Mother on John "the beloved" as his special inheritance. What woman is today, what she is in particular in her motherhood, she owes wholly to the position in which the Scriptures have placed her. Sometimes the stepmother is spoken of as the real mother (Gen 37 10). Sometimes the grandmother or other female relative is thus spoken of (Gen 15 10; 3 20; 1 K 16 30; 11 45; 2).

Tropically the nation is spoken of as a mother and the people are her children (Isa 50 1; Jēr 50 12; Hos 2 4; 4 5). Large cities also are "mothers"...

2 S 20 19; cf Gal 4 26; 2 Eed 10 7), and Job even depicts the earth as such (Job 1 21).

MOTHER-IN-LAW. See Relationships, Family.

MOTION, mōshʾun: In 2 Eed 6 14, AV "motion" represents the Lat commotio, "commotion," "disturbance" (RV has revised entirely here). In Rom 7 5, "the motions of sins, which were by the law," "motion" is used in the sense of "impulse," and "impulses" would probably give the best tr. But the Gr noun (τὸνομον, παθηκός) is hard to translate exactly, and RV has preferred "passions," as in Gal 5 24. Sanday (ICC) paraphrases "the impressions of sense, suggestive of sin, stimulated into perverse activity by their legal prohibition." See Passion. "Motion" is found also in Wisd 5 11 (AV and RVm) and 7 24 (AV and RV) in a modern sense.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

MOUND, mound. See Siege, 4, (c).

MOUNT, mount, MOUNTAIN, moutʾin. See Hill, Mount, Mountain.

MOUNT EPHRAIM. See Ephraim, Mount.

MOUNT OF CONGREGATION, THE. See Congregation, Mount of.

MOUNT OF CORRUPTION. See Olives, Mount of.

MOUNT OF OLIVES. See Olives, Mount of JerusaleM.

MOUNT OF THE AMALEKITES ("hill-country of the Amalekites" [Jgs 15 15]). The Amalekites are usually connected with the valley (Nu 14 25; Jgs 7 12), but appear from this passage to have had a settlement in the hill country of Ephraim. See Amalekites.

MOUNT OF THE AMORITES ("hill-country of the Amorites" [Dt 7 20.24; cf Nu 13 29; Josh 10 6, etc.]): The region intended is that afterward known as the hill country of Judah and Ephraim, but sometimes "Amorites" is used as a general designation for all the inhabitants of Canaan (Gen 15 16; Josh 24 8.18, etc.). See Amorites.

MOUNT OF THE VALLEY: Zeresh-shahar is said to be situated in or on the "mount of the valley" (רֵץ לָעֵד, רֵץ לָעַד, cf Job 19 18). Cheyne (EB, s.v.) says "i.e. on one of the mountains E. of the Jordan valley (cf ver 27), and not impossibly on that described at length in BJ, VII, vi, 1-3." To the N.W. of this mountain is Wady Ṣūr, wherein there may be a reminiscence of Zeresh-shahar. There is no certainty.

MOURNING, mōrning. See Burial; Grief.

MOUSE, mous, MICE, mīs (מָיָשְׁנָ, akhbb; LXX μῶς, mās, "mouse"); cf Arab. עָקָב, עָקָב, "jerboa," not עָקָב, "akbar," "greater": of also proper noun, מַעָר, עָקָב, "Ashbor" [Gen 36 38]; 1 Ch 1 49; also 2 K 22 12.14; Jer 26 22; 36 12]: The word occurs in the list of unclean creeping things (Lev 11 29), in the account of the golden molten and tumors (AV and RVm "emerald") sent by the Philis (1 S 6 4-18), and in the phrase, "eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the
muse” (Isa 66:17). The cosmopolitan house- mouse, *Mus musculus*, is doubtless the species referred to. The jerboa or jumping mouse, Arab. *yarkāt*, is eaten by the Arabs of the Syrian desert, N.E. of Damascus. Possibly allied to *'akkāb* is the Arab, *'akbar* (generally in pl., *'akkāb*), used for the male of the jerboa.

**ALFRED ELY DAY**

**MOUTH,** mouth (יווח, yōkh, יָוָךְ, yāḵ, יַוָּךְ, yāḵ; יָוָךְ, yōkh; יָוָךְ, yāḵ; יָוָךְ, yōkh), gårūn [Ps 149:6]; Arab. *b̄ulb̄an*; *t̄ūl b̄alb̄an*; *'āl b̄alb̄an*; [Dan 3:20]; *ēyāma, stōma*, 71 t, once *īyōs, liyōs*, i.e., “word of mouth.” [Acts 16:37]; once I find the vb. *'ārūti* (ἐπιστομίζω, “to silence,” “to stop the mouth” [Tit 1:1]).

In addition to frequent references to man and animals, “their food was yet in their mouths” (Ps 76:30).

1. **Literal Sense**
   - Of the mouth of the ass (Nu 22:25): “Save me from the lion’s mouth” (Ps 22:21).
   - The term is often used in connection with inanimate things: mouth of a saek (Gen 42:27); of the earth (4:11; Nu 36:10); of a well (2 Kgs 2:25; 1 Kgs 18:22,27); of Sheol (Ps 141:7); of the abyss (Jer 48:28); of a furnace (Arab. *t̄arī*, Dan 3:26); of idols (Ps 115:5; 156:17). (1) The “mouth” denotes language, speech, declaration (םDefs, “tongue,” which see): “By the mouth of the king is by means of,” “on the declaration of” (Lk 1:70; Acts 1:16); “Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be slain at the mouth of witnesses” (Nu 35:30; Dt 17:6; Mt 15:18; He 10:28); “I will give you mouth and wisdom” (Lk 21:15); “fool’s mouth” (Prov 18:7).
   - (2) “Mouth” also denotes “spokesman”: “He shall be to thee a mouth” (Ex 4:16).

Numerous are the idiomatic phrases which have, in part, been introduced into English by means of the language of the Bible. “To put into the mouth,” if said of God, denotes Divine inspiration (Dt 18:18; Mic 3:5). “To have words put into the mouth” means to have instructions given (Dt 31:19; 2 S 14:3; Jer 1:9; Ex 4:11-16). “The fruit of the mouth,” (Prov 18:20) is synonymous with wisdom, the mature utterance of the wise. “To put one’s mouth into the dust” is equivalent with humbling one’s self (Lam 3:29; cf “to lay one’s horn in the dust,” Job 18:15). Silent submission is denoted by “laying the hand upon the mouth” (Jgs 18:19; Job 29:9; 40:4; Mic 7:16); cf to refrain the lips; see Lp. “To open the mouth wide against a person is to accuse him wildly and often wrongfully (Ps 36:21; Isa 57:4), otherwise to open one’s mouth wide,” “to have an enlarged mouth” means to have great confidence and joy in speaking or accepting good things (1 S 21; Ezk 33:22; 2 Cor 6:11; Eph 6:19). “To gape upon one with the mouth” means to threaten a person (Job 16:10). Divine rebuke is expressed by the “rod of God’s mouth” (Isa 11:4), and the Messiah declares “He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword” (Isa 49:2; cf Rev 2:16; 19:15). Great anguish, such as dying with thirst, is expressed by “the dryness of the root of the mouth” (Hab 3:6; Jer 29:10; Ps 137:6; cf 22:15).

**H. L. E. LUBERG**

**MOWING,** mowing, MOWN GRASS (גָּש, gāš, "a shearing," "cut grass"): In Ps 72:6 the good king’s rule is said to be “like rain upon the mown grass.” Now start the new growth (cf 2 S 23:4; Hos 6:3). “The king’s mowings” (Am 7:1) were the portion of the spring herbage taken as tribute by the kings of Israel to feed their horses (cf 1 S 8:15ff; 18:5). “After the king’s mowings” would denote the time when everybody else might turn to reap their greenstuff (BTP, II, 109). The term “mower” (יווחה, yōw̄āh, “to dock off,” “shorten”) in Ps 129:7 AV is rendered “reaper” in RV, and in Jas 5:4 RV has “mow” for ἄνδρον, andōn (AV “reap”). See HARVEST; REAPING.

**MOZA,** mōza (מֹזָה, mōzāh): (1) Son of Caleb and Ephah (1 Ch 2:46).
(2) A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 8:36:7; 9:42:43).

**MOZAH,** mōzā (מֹזָה, mōzāh); ha-mōzāh: B, *Amōq, Amōk, Amōk, A, Amōq, Amōq*; A town in the territory of Benjamin named after Miaphel and Chephirah (Josh 18:26). It may be represented by the modern Beth Misheh, the heavy y of the Heb passing into the light y of the Arab, a not unusual change. The name means “place of hard stone.” The village lies to the N. of Kulinahg (possibly Emmaus), about 4 miles N.W. of Jerus.

**MUFFLER,** muf′ler (ムフラー, mufūra): The name given to an article of woman’s dress in Isra. 19. It describes a veil more elaborate and costly than the ordinary. A cognate word in the sense of “veiled” is applied in the Mish (Shabbath, vi.6) to Jewesses from Arabia. See DRESS.

**MULBERRY,** māl′ber-i, TREES (מִרְבַּר, mīr̄bār; מִרְבָּר, mār̄bār; מְרָבָּר, mār̄bār), “pear trees” [2 S 6:23]; 1 Ch 14:14; m “balsam-trees”; Ps 84:6, AV “Baca,” m “mulberry trees,” RV “weeping,” m “balsam-trees”): According to Arab. writers the Baca tree is similar to the balsam (Butomodendron opobalsamum), and grows near Mecca; no such tree is, however, known in Pal. The name may, in Heb, have been applied to some species of Acacia (q.v.). The idea of “weeping” implied in the root, both in Heb and Arab., may be explained by the exudation of gum. “The sound of marching in the tops of the mulberry trees” has been explained to refer to the quivering of the leaves of poplars, but there is not much to support this view (see Poplar). The tr “mulberry trees” is, however, even more improbable, as this tree, though very plentiful today, had not been introduced into Pal in OT times.

Mulberry (מַבָּר, māḇār; [1 Mac 6:34]): The Syrians at Bathzecharai “to the end they might provoke the elephants to fight, they showed them the blood of grapes and mulberry.” This reference must be to the deep red juice of the black mulberry (Morus nigra), the tīt šāmī of Pal, a variety cultivated all over the land for its luscious, juicy fruit. See STOMACH. E. W. G. MASTERMAN

**MULCED,** mulk’ted (מָעַץ, mu‘äx, “ashash, to be punished,” “fined”): “The simple pass on, and are mulceted” (Prov 22:3 RVm, RV “suffer for,” AV “are punished”).

the mule, which have no understanding," need not be understood as singing out the horse and mule as more in need of guidance than the rest of the brute creation, but rather offering familiar examples to contrast with man who should use his intelligence.

At the present day mules are used as pack animals and for drawing freight wagons, rarely for riding. One does not often see mules used against the Jews as are convicts or exhaustion in Europe and America. This may be because most of the mares and many of the donkeys are small.

ALFRED ELY DAY

MULTITUDE, mult'i-tud, MIXED, mist. See MINGLED PEOPLE.

MUPPIM, mup'îm (םֵעֲפֵי, muppîm): A son of Benjamin (Gen 46 21), elsewhere called "Sheuppim" (1 Ch 7 12.15; 26 16), "Shephupham" (Nu 26 39), and "Shephuph" (1 Ch 8 5); of separate arts on these names.

MURDER, mûr'dër (מָוֶר, harâgh, "to smite, destroy," "kill," "slay" [Ps 10 8; Hos 13 19]; Gregory, "to dash to pieces," "kill"; phûnos, phônos, "criminal homicide," from phonî, phonitēs, "to kill," "slay"; phûnos, phônos, from *phûn, phênô, has the same meaning in Hebrew, adôphûnos, adelphóktonos, "man-slayer," "murderer," used to designate *Satan (Jn 8 44) and him that hates his brother (1 Jn 3 15); a matricide is designated as χιτταρίδας, metatraîbos; [1 Tim 1 9]; cf adelphóktonos, adelphóktonos, " fratricidal" [Wis 10 3]. The pl. of phûnos, phônos, "murders," occurs in Mt 15 19; Mt 27 21; Gal 5 21 AV; Rev 9 21; cf 2 Macc 4 3.38; 12 6): The Hebrew law recognized the distinction between willful murder and accidental or justifiable homicide (Nu 26 16); but in legal language no verbal distinction is made. Murder was always subject to capital punishment (Lev 24 17; cf Gen 9 6). Even if the criminal sought the protection of the sanctuary, he was to be arrested before the altar, and to be delivered up (Ex 21 17; cf Nu 15 16.18.21.31). The Mish says that a mortal blow intended for another than the victim is punishable with death; but such a provision is not found in the Law. No special mention is made of (a) child murder; (b) suicide, or (c) attempted murder, but the intention of the law is clear with reference to all these cases (Ex 21 15.17; 1 Tim 1 19; Mt 15 4). No punishment is mentioned for attempted suicide (cf 1 5 3.4; 1 K 16 18; Mt 27 5); yet Josays (LJ, III, viii, 5) that suicide was held criminal by the Jews (see also Ex 21 23). An animal known to be vicious must be confined, and if it caused the death of another, the animal was destroyed and the owner held guilty of murder (Ex 21 20.31). The executioner, according to the terms of the Law, was the "revenger of blood"; but the guilt must be previously determined by the Levitical tribunal. Strong protection was given by the requirement that at least two witnesses must concur in any capital question (Nu 35 19–30; Dt 17 6–12; 19 12.17). Under the monarchy the duty of executing justice on a murderer seems to have been assumed to some extent by the sovereign, who also had power to grant pardon (2 S 13 39; 14 7.11; 1 K 2 34). See MURDERS.

FRANK E. HIRSCH

MURDERS, mûrdër-érz (Acts 21 38 AV, RV "assassins"): Represents a word only once mentioned in the NT, the Gr word σκαρίας, sêkarías, Lat sicarius from sica, "a small sword," or "daggar." The word describes the hired assassin, of whom there were bands in the pay of agitators in Rome in the last days of the Roman Republic, who employed them to remove surreptitiously their political opponents. In the later days of the Jewish commonwealth, Judaea became infected with the same type of ruffian, and it is natural that the Rom commandant at Jerusalem should declare them by the name so well known in the imperial city. See ASSASSINS.

T. NICOL

MURMUR, mûr'mur, MURMURINGS, mûr'mur-ings: The Heb word (שׁוער, šûwr, or שׁוּר, šûr) denotes the semi-articulated mutterings of disfavored persons. It is used in connection with the complaints of the Israelites in the desert against Jeh on the one hand, and against Moses and Aaron on the other hand (Ex 16 7.8; Nu 14 27.36; 16 11; 17 5). In three places (Dt 1 27; Ps 106 25; Isa 29 24), "murmur" translates a Heb word (שַׁק, šâqān) which suggests the malicious whispering of slander.

In the NT "murmur" renders two different words, viz. γέγονεν, gogônen, and ὀμφαυμάτων, emphâumâtôn. The latter word suggests indignation and fault-finding (Mt 14 4 4). The former word (or group of words) usually used in connection with the complainers of the Psalms, and scribes (Mt 20 11; Lk 5 30; 16 2; 19 7). T. LEWIS

MURREN, mûr'en, mûrûn (םִין, deboker): This name is given to a fatal cattle-disease, which was the fifth of the plagues of Egypt (Ex 9 3), and which affected not only the flocks and herds, but also the camels, horses and asses. The record of its onset immediately after the plague of flies makes it probable that it was an epizootic, whose germ was carried by that insect as those of rinderpest or spleenic fever may be. Cattle plagues have in recent years been very destructive in Egypt; many writers have given descriptions of the great devastation wrought by the outbreak in 1842. In this case Wittmann noted that contact with the putrid carcasses caused severe boils, a condition also recorded in Ex as following the murrain. The very extensive spread of rinderpest within the last few years in many districts of Egypt has not yet been completed (Ex 24 21). It is not improbable, however, that the use of antitoxic serum and the most rigid isolation. The word "murrain" is probably a variant of the Old Fr. morine. It is used as an imprecation by Shakespeare and other Elizabethan writers, and is still applied by herdsmen to several forms of epidemic cattle sickness. Among early writers it was used as well for fatal plagues affecting men; thus Lydgate (1494) speaks of the people "slain by that morcyme."

ALEX. MACALISTER

MUSE, mûz, MUSING, mûz'ing: The word occurs twice in the OT, in the sense of "meditate" (Ps 39 3, hághgh; Ps 143 5, sâph); in the NT once (Lk 3 15, dialogizomai, where RV reads "reasoned").

Mushi, mû'shi (多种形式, mushî): Son of Merari (Ex 6 19; Nu 3 20; 1 Ch 6 19 [Heb 4]; 23 21; 24 26). There is found also the patronymic "Mushites" (Nu 3 33; 26 55).

MUSIC, mûs'ik:

I. IMPORTANCE
1. The Soul Art Cultivated
2. A Wide Vocabulary of Musical Terms
3. Place in Social and Personal Life
4. Universal Language of Emotions
5. Use in Divine Service
6. Part at Religious Reformations

II. THEORY OF MUSIC
1. Technical Terms. 'Alamâth, sheminith, solâh
2. Not Necessarily Unimpressive
III. Musical Instruments

1. Strings: קִנֶּף, נַחַל, מְדָר, שֵׁלָלָה, שׁלֶלֶה, הקַנֵּר, מַדְבַּבֶּדֶת, תַּכִּית

2. Winds: נַגִּיר, מָתַר, מַעֲבַדְתָה, מַעֲבַדְתָה, עֶמֶנֶשׁ, שִׁפְנֵי עַד, שִׁפְנֵי עַד, שִׁפְנֵי עַד

3. Percussion: תֹּכֶת, מַעֲבַדְתָה, עֶמֶנֶשׁ, מַעֲבַדְתָה, מַעֲבַדְתָה

Literature

1. Its Importance.—That the Hebrews were in ancient times, as they are at the present day, devoted to the study and practice of music is obvious to every reader of the OT. The references to it are numerous, and are frequently of such a nature as to emphasize its importance. They occur not only in the Psalter, where we might expect them, but in the Historical Books and the Prophets, in narratives and in declamations of the loftiest meaning and most intense seriousness. And the conclusion drawn from a cursory glance is confirmed by a closer study.

The place held by music in the OT is unique. Besides poetry, it is the only art that seems to have been cultivated to any extent in ancient Israel. Painting is entirely, sculpture almost entirely, ignored. This may have been due to the prohibition contained in the Second Commandment, but the fidelity with which that was obeyed is remarkable.

From the traces of it extant in the OT, we can infer that the vocabulary of musical terms was far from scanty. This is all the more significant when we consider the condensed and pregnant nature of Heb.

“Song” in our EV represents at least half a dozen words in the original.

The events, occasions, and occupations with which music was associated were extremely varied. It accompanied leave-taking with honored guests (Gen 31:27); it attended a signal triumph over the nation’s enemies (Ex 15:20); and welcomed conquerors returning from victory (Jgs 11:34; 15:18:6). It was employed to exercise an evil spirit (1 Ch 16:10), and to soothe the tempest, and excite the inspiration, of a prophet (2 K 3:18).

The words “Destroy not” in the titles of four of the Ps (of Ps 65:8) most probably are the beginning of a vintage-song, and the markedly rhythmic character of Heb music would indicate that it accompanied and lightened many kinds of work requiring combined and uniform exertion. Processions, as e.g. marriages (1 Macc 9:39) and funerals (2 Ch 35:25), were regulated in a similar way. The Ps bearded “Songs of Degrees” as probably the sacred marches sung by the pious as they journeyed to and from the holy festivals at Jerusalem.

It follows from this that the range of emotion expressed by Heb music was anything but limited. In addition to the passages just quoted, we may mention the jeering songs leveled at Job (Job 30:9). But the music that could be used to interpret or accompany the Ps with any degree of fitness must have been capable of expressing a great variety of moods and feelings. Not only the broadly marked antitheses of joy and sorrow, hope and fear, faith and doubt, but every shade and quality of sentiment are found there. It is hardly possible to suppose that the people who originated all that wealth of emotional utterance should have been without a corresponding ability to invent diversified melodies, or should have been content with the bald and colorless recitative usually attributed to them.

This internal evidence is confirmed by other testimony. The Bab tyrants demanded one of the famous songs of Zion from their Jewish captives (Ps 137:3), and among the presents sent by Hezekiah to Sennacherib there were included male and female musicians. In later times Lat writers attest the influence of the East in matters musical. We need only refer to Juvenal iii.62 ff.

By far the most important evidence of the value attached to music by the Hebrews is afforded by the place given to it in Divine service.

5. Place in Divine Service

It is true that nothing is said of it in

Three Bearded Men with Lyres (Supposed by Some to Be Jews).

(Aryan Sculpture in Brit. Mus.)

not perhaps atoned for by the tradition (Wisd 18:9) that at the first paschal celebration “the fathers already led the sacred songs of praise,” but the rest of the history makes ample amends. In later days, at all events, music formed an essential part of the national worship of Jehovah; and elaborate arrangements were made for its correct and impressive performance. These are detailed in 1 Ch. 16. There we are told that the whole body of the temple chorus and orchestra numbered 4,000; that they were trained and conducted, in 24 divisions, by the sons of Asaph, Heman and Jeduthun; and that in each
group experts and novices were combined, so that
the former preserved the correct tradition, and the
latter were trained and fitted to take their place.
This is, no doubt, a description of the arrangements
that were carried out in the Second Temple, but it
sheds a reflex, if somewhat uncertain, light on those
adopted in the First.

We are told by the same authority that every
reformation of religion brought with it a recon-
struction of the temple chorus and
orchestra, and a resumption of their duties. Thus when Hezekiah purged
the state and church of the heathen-
ism patronized by Ahaz, he set the
Levites in the house of Jeh with cym-
bals, with psalteries, and with harps" (2 Ch 29 25).

6, 12; cf also 1 Ch 15 19–21). The former has
been taken to mean "in the manner of maidens," i.e. soprano; the latter "on the lower octave," i.e.
tenor or bass. This is plausible, but it is far from
convincing. It is hardly probable that the He-
brews had anticipated our modern division of the
scale; and the word sh'minith or "eighth" may refer
to the number of the mode, while 'Alamoth is also
t4 "with Elamite instruments" (Wellhausen). Of
one feature of Heb music we may be tolerably sure:
it was rendered in unison. It was destitute of har-
mony or counterpoint. For its effect it would
depend on contrast in quality of tone, on the par-
ticipation of a larger or smaller number of singers,
on antiphonal singing, so clearly indicated in many
of the Pss, and on the coloring imparted by the

The same thing took place under Josiah (2 Ch 34).
After the restoration—at the dedication of the
Temple (Ezr 3 10) and of the walls of Jerus (Neh
12 17)—music played a great part. In Nehemiah's
time the descendants of the ancient choral gilds
drew together, and their maintenance was secured
to them out of the public funds in return for their
services.

II. Musical Theory.—It is disappointing after
all this to have to confess that of the nature of Heb
music we have no real knowledge. If

1. Dearth of any system of notation ever existed,
Technical it has been entirely lost. Attempts
Information have been made to derive one from the
accents, and a German organist once
wrote a book on the subject. One tune in our
hymnals has been borrowed from that source, but
it is an accident, if not worse, and the ingenuity
of the German organist was quite misdirected. We
know nothing of the scales, or tonal system of the
Heb, of their intervals or of their method of tuning
their instruments. Two terms are supposed by some
to refer to pitch, viz. "upon," or "set to 'Alamoth,"
(Ps 46), and "upon," or "set to the Sh'minith" (Pss

2. Not unimpressive—Music, more than any other of the
live arts, is justified of her own children,
and a generation that has slowly
learned to enjoy Wagner and Strauss should not
 rashly condemn the music of the East. No doubt
the strains that emanated from the orchestra and
chorus of the temple stimulated the religious fervor,
and satisfied the aesthetic principles of the Hebrews
of old, precisely as the rendering of Bach and
Handel excites and soothes the Christian of today.

III. Instruments.—The musical instruments em-
ployed by the Hebrews included representatives
of the three groups: string, wind, and percussion.
The strings comprised the הֶבֶן, kinnor, הַנָּבֶל or הַנָּבֶל, nēhel or nebel; the winds: the שָׁפֶר, šophar, הֶרֶץ, kerem, הַחָצְרָה, hāzērāh, הָלָע, hālē, and בּוּשֵׁה, 'ágābhah; percussion: סָפ, tsoph, מַדְדַגָּיִם, madagāyim, כֵּלַחיָּים, kēlāchāyim, מַדְלֶנִיִּים, madlnīyim, שַׁדִּילְתִים, šādīlātim. Besides these, we have in Dúl: מַטַּרְעוּּת, mṭatarūyat; מַשְׁרַקְתִּיוּת, mšarqātīyot; מַסָּבְבִיָּה, masavбиya; מַסְפַּרְנִיִּים, maspnāyim; פָּנָפַיָּה, panpāyeh. Further, there are Chaldaean forms of kerem and kithāra.

A punishment for sin the sound of the kinnor will cease.

(2) Materials.—We have no exact information as to the materials of which these instruments were made. In 2 S 6 5 AV, mention is made of "instruments made of fir wood" (ERV "cypress"), but the text is probably corrupt, and the reading in 1 Ch 13 8 is preferable. According to 1 K 10 11 f, Hiram's fleet brought from Ophir quantities of "almājāh (2 Ch 2 8; 9 10, "alpīn") wood, from which, among other things, the kinnor and nebel were made. Probably this was red sandal-wood.

### Procession of Assyrian Musicians.

(Ros-Relief from Kooyunjik, Brit. Mus.)

(1) When used.—The chief of these instruments were the kinnor and nebel (AV, RV "the harp" and "the psaltery" or "viola"). They were used to accompany vocal music. In 1 S 10 5, Saul meets a band of prophets singing inspired strains to the music of the nebel, "trum," "flute," and kinnor. In the description of the removal of the ark, we are told that songs were sung with kinnorāh, nēhelāh, etc (2 S 6 5). Again, in various passages (1 Ch 16 16; 2 Ch 7 6, etc) we meet with the expression kēlē shēr, i.e. instruments of, or suitable for accompanying song. It is evident that only the flute and strings could render melodies. The music performed on these instruments seems to have been mainly of a joyful nature. It entered into all public and domestic festivities. In Ps 61 2, the kinnor is called "pleasant," and Isa 24 8 speaks of the "joy" of the kinnor. Very striking is the invocation Ps 108 2: the poet in a moment of exhaliration calls upon the two kēlē shēr to echo and share his enthusiasm for Jah. Only once (Isa 16 11) is the kinnor associated with mourning, and Cheyne infers from this passage "that the kinnor was used at mourning ceremonies." But the inference is doubtful; the prophet is merely drawing a comparison between the trembling of the strings of the lyre and the agitation in his own bosom. Again, the Bab captives hang their kinnorāh on the willows in their dejection (Ps 137 2), and the prophets (Isa 54 8; Ezek 26 13) threaten that as Jos (Ant, VIII, iii) includes among articles made by Solomon for the temple nēhelāh and kinnorāh of cedrēm. Whether we understand this to have been the mixed metal so named or amber, the frame of the instrument could not have been constructed of it. It may have been used for ornamentation. We have no trace of metal strings being used by the ancients. The strings of the Heb (mēānim) may have consisted of gut. We read of sheep-gut being employed for the purpose in the Odyssey, xxi. 407. Vegetable fiber was also spun into strings. We need only add that bowed instruments were quite unknown; the strings were plucked with the fingers, or struck with a plectrum.

(a) The kinnor: The OT gives us no clue to the form or nature of the kinnor, except that it was portable, comparatively light, and could be played while it was carried in processions or dances. The earliest authority to which we can refer on the subject is the LXX. While in some of the books kinnor is rendered by kinnāra, or kinnīra—evidently a transliteration—in others it is teb by kēthāra. We cannot discuss here the question of the trustworthiness of the LXX as an authority for Heb antiquities, but considering the conservatism of the East, esp. in matters of ritual, it seems at least hasty to say offhand, as Wellhausen does, that by the date of its production the whole tradition of ancient music had been lost. The tr. at all events, supplies us with an instrument of which the Hebrews could hardly have been ignorant. The

---

kithara, which in its general outlines resembled the lyre, consisted of a rectilinear-shaped sound box from which rose two arms, connected above by a crossbar; the strings ran down from the latter to the sound-box to which, or to a bridge on which, they were attached.

The most ancient copy of a kithara in Egypt was found in a grave of the XIIth Dynasty. It is carried by one of a company of immigrant captive Semites, who holds it close to his breast, striking the strings with a plectrum between his hand, and plucking them with the fingers of the left. The instrument is very primitive; it resembles a schoolboy’s slate with the upper three-fourths of the sound-box cut out of it; but it nevertheless possesses the distinctive characteristics of the kithara. In a grave at Thebes of a somewhat later date, three player-like depicted, one of whom plays a kithara, also primitive in form, but with slenderer arms. Gradually, as time advanced, the simple board-like frame assumed a shape more like that afterward elaborated by the Greeks. Numerous examples have been found in Asia Minor, but from them we derive the sound-box. It may be noted that, in the Assyrian monuments, the kithara is played along with the harp, as the kinnor was with the nebel.

The evidence furnished by Jewish coins must not be overlooked. Those stamped with representations of lyre-shaped instruments have been assigned to 142–135 B.C. (D). On one side we have a kithara-like instrument of 3 or more strings, with a sound-box resembling a kettle. It is true that these coins are not of the form of the instruments shown on them has obviously been modified by Gr taste, but so completely that the Jews would hardly be likely to adopt an essentially foreign object for their coinage.

One objection raised by Wellhausen to the identification of the kithara with the kinnor may be noted. Jos undoubtedly says (4 M. vii. xii) that the kinnor was played with a plectrum, and in I Sam. 18:23 David plays the kinnor "with his hand." But even if this excludes the use of the plectrum in the particular case, it need not be held to disprove the identity of kinnor and kinnura. Both methods may have been in use. In paintings discovered at Herculanum there are several instances of the lyre being played with the hand; and there is no reason for supposing that the Hebrews were restricted to one method of showing their skill, when we know that Greeks and Latins were not.

Since the ancient VSS, then, render kinnor by kithara, and the kithara, though subsequently developed and beautified by the Greeks, was originally a Sem instrument, it is exceedingly probable, as Ries says, that the kithara and the kinnor were the same instrument. The kithara, as a smaller and simpler form of the latter instrument. The stringed instruments on the Jewish coins are later, beautified forms of the kinnor, while the Egyptian modifications represent the intermediate stage.

(b) The nebel. The nebel has been identified with many instruments. The literal meaning of the word, "wine-skin," has suggested that it was the bagpipe. Others have thought that it was the lute. Support for reference to the Egyptian nfr, which denotes a lute-like instrument frequently depicted on the monuments. The derivation of nfr from nfr is, however, now abandoned; and no long-necked instrument has been found depicted in the possession of a Semite. The kisser was favored by Pfeiffer. Its resonance-box is made of wood, and, the upper side, being covered tightly by a skin, closely resembles a drum. From this rise two arms, connected toward the top by a crossbar; and to the latter the strings were attached. The kisser has, however, only 5 strings, as opposed to 12 ascribed by Jos to the nebel, and the sound-box, instead of being above, as stated by the Fathers, is situated below the strings.

The supposition that the nebel was a dulcimer is not without some justification. The dulcimer was well known in the East. An extremely interesting and important bas-relief in the palace at Kouyunjik represents a company of 25 musicians, of whom 11 are instrumentalists and 15 singers. The process is headed by 5 men, 3 carrying harps, one a double flute, and one a dulcimer. Two of the harpists and the dulcimer-player appear to be dancing or skipping. Then follow 6 women; 4 have harps, one a double flute, and one a small drum which is fixed upright at the belt, and is played with the fingers of both hands. Besides the players, we see 15 singers, 9 being children, who clap their hands to mark the rhythm.

One of the women is holding her throat, perhaps to produce the shrill vibrato affected by Pers and Arabian women at the present day. A picture in this picture has been regarded by several Orientalists as the nebel. Wettstein, e.g., says "This instrument can fairly be so designated, if the statement of so many witnesses is correct, that nabbim and psaltery are one and the same thing. For the latter corresponds to the Arab. santr, which is derived from the Heb 'panit'en, a transliteration of the Gr psaltery." And the santr is a kind of dulcimer.

This is not conclusive. The word psaltery was not always restricted to a particular instrument, but sometimes embraced a whole class of stringed instruments. Ovid also regarded the nabbim as a harp, not a dulcimer, when he said (Ars Am. iii.325): "Learn to sweep the pleasant nabbim with both hands." And, lastly, Jos tells us (Ant. vii. xii) that the nebel was played without a plectrum. The tr of nebel by psaltery does not, therefore, shut us up to the conclusion that it was a dulcimer; on the contrary, it rather leads to the belief that it was a harp.

Harpes of various sizes are very numerous on the Egyptian monuments. There is the large and elaborate kind with a well-developed sound-box, the tr nebel also as an instrument, at its base. This could not be the nebel, which, as we have seen, was easily portable. Besides, we have a variety of smaller instruments that, while light and easily carried, would scarcely have been sonorous enough for the work assigned us the nebel in the temple services. Besides, the more we learn of the relations of Egypt and Israel, the more clearly do we perceive how little the latter was influenced by the former. But the evidence of the Fathers, which need not be disregarded in a matter of this kind, is decisive against Egypt harps of every shape and size. These have without exception the sound-box at the base, and Augustine (on Ps 43) says expressly that the psaltery had its sound-box above. This is confirmed by statements of Jerome, Isidore, and others, who contrast two classes of instruments according to the position above or below the sound-box. Jerome, further, likens the nebel to the Gr a.

All the evidence points to the nebel having been the Assyrian harp, of which we have numerous examples in the ruins. We have already referred at length to the bas-relief at Kouyunjik in which it is played by 3 men and 4 women. It is portable, triangular, or, roughly, delta-shaped; it has a sound-box above that slants upward away from the player, and a horizontal bar to which the strings are attached about three-fourths of their length down. The number of the strings on the Assyrian harp ranges from 16 upward, but there may quite well have been fewer in some cases. The dulcimer, however, does not appear in the plate bearings.

(c) Nebel 'asor. In Ps 33 2; 144 9, "the psaltery of ten strings" is given as the rendering of nebel 'asor; while in Ps 92 3 'asor is tr "instrument of
ten strings." No doubt, as we have just said above, there were harps of less and greater compass—the mention of the number of strings in two or three instances does not necessarily imply different kinds of harps.

(d) *Gittith.* The word *gittith* is found in the titles of Ps 6, 81, 84. It is a fem. adj. derived from Gath, but its meaning is quite uncertain. It has been explained to denote (i) some Gittite instrument; the *Ig* on Ps 81 gives 'on the *kithara* which was brought from Gath'; or (ii) a melody or march popular in Gath. The LXX renders that Jubal was the "father of all such as handle the harp and pipe." The Heb word here tr4 "pipe" is *'ughabb*. It occurs in 3 other places:

2. Winds  Job 21 12; 30 31; Ps 160 4. In the Heb version of Dn 3 5 it is given as the rendering of *sarr*Mhe, i.e. "bagpipe." Jerome tr4 by *organon*. The *'ughabb* was probably a primitive shepherd's pipe or panpipe, though some take it as a general term for instruments of the flute kind, a meaning that suits all the passages cited.

(2) The *haddil.*—The *haddil* is first mentioned in 1 S 10 5, where it is played by members of the band of prophets. It was used (1 K 1 40) at Solomon's accession to the throne; its strains added to the exhalation of convivial parties (Isa 5 12), accompanied worshippers on their joyous march to the sanctuary (Isa 30 29), or, in turn, echoed the feelings of mourners (Jer 48 36). In 1 Macc 3 45, one of the features of the desolation of the temple consisted in the cessation of the sound of the pipe. From this we see that Ewald's assertion that the flute took no part in the music of the temple is incorrect, at least for the Second Temple.

As we should expect from the simplicity of its construction, and the commonness of its material, the flute or pipe was the most ancient and most widely popular of all musical instruments.

Reeds, cane, bone, after ward ivory, were the materials; it was the easiest thing in the world to drill out the center, to pierce a few holes in the end or back, and, for the mouthpiece, to compress the tube at one end. The simple rustic pattern was soon improved upon. Of course, nothing like the modern flute with its complicated mechanism was ever achieved, but, esp. on the Egyptian monuments, a variety of patterns is found. There we
see the obliquely held flute, evidently played, like the Arab. nay, by blowing through a very slight parting of the lips against the edge of the orifice of the tube. Besides this, there are double flutes, which, though apparently an advance on the single flute, are very ancient. These double flutes are either of equal or unequal length, and are connected near the mouth by a piece of leather, or enter the frame of the mouthpiece.

Though the flutes of the East and West resembled each other more closely than the strings, it is to the Assyrian monuments that we must turn for the prototypes of the hālīl. The Greeks, as their myths show, regarded Asia Minor as the birthplace of the flute, and no doubt the Hebrews brought it with them from their Assyrian home. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief we see players performing on the double flute. It is apparently furnished with a beaked mouthpiece, like that of the clarinet or flagoonet. We cannot determine whether the Israelites used the flute with a mouthpiece, or one like the nay; and it is futile to guess. It is enough to say that they had opportunities of becoming acquainted with both kinds, and may have adopted both.

(3) ἀλόθ—Ἀλόθ occurs only in the title of Ps 6. The context suggests that it is a musical term, and as we explain ϭχινάθ as a general term for strings, this word may comprehend the wood-winds. RV renders “wind instruments.”

(4) ἁκόκθω.—In Ezk 28:13 AV, RV, νἄγαβὰ is rendered pipes. This tr is supported by Fetis:

the double flute; Ambros: large flutes; and by Jahn: the nay or Arab flute. It is now, however, abandoned, and Jerome’s explanation of ἁκόκθω, means the “setting” of precious stones is generally adopted.

(5) The mashrūkāḥa.—Машрукіта, found in Dn 3:5, etc, is also referred to the wood-winds. The word is derived from šārāk, “to hiss” (cf Isa 5:26, where God hisses to summon the Gentiles).

The LXX translates τύργας, or panpipes, and this is most probably the meaning.

(6) The ἱμπόνγα.—Ἱμπόνγα (in Chald sumponia) is another name for a musical instrument found in Dn(35; etc). It is generally supposed to have been the bagpipe, an instrument that at one time was exceedingly popular, even among highly civilized peoples. Nero is said to have been desirous of renown as a piper.

(7) The shophār keren.—The shophār was a trumpet, curved at the end like a horn (keren), and no doubt originally was a horn. The two words shophār and keren are used synonymously in Josh 6:4-5, where we read shophār ḫa-ḡōḇrām and keren ḫa-ḡōḇrām. With regard to the meaning of ḫa-ḡōḇrām, there is some difference of opinion. RV renders in text “ram’s horn,” in “jubilee.” The former depends on a statement in the Talm that ḫoḡerel is Arab. for “ram’s horn,” but no trace of such a word has been found in Arabic. A suggestion of Pfeiffer’s that ḫoḡerel does not designate the instrument, but the manner of blowing, is advocated by J. Weiss. It gives a good sense in the passages in which ḫoḡerel occurs in connection with shophār or keren. Thus in Josh 6:5, we would tr, “when the priests blow triumph on the horn.”

The shophār was used in early times chiefly, perhaps exclusively, for warlike purposes. It gave the signal “to arms” (Josh 6:41; 1 Sam 13:3; 2 Sam 20:1); warned of the approach of the enemy (Amos 3:6; Ezk 33:6; Jer 4:5; 6:1); was heard throughout a battle (Am 2:2, etc); and sounded the recall (2 Sam 2:28). Afterward it played an important part in connection with religion. It was blown at the proclamation of the Law (Ex 13:15, etc); and at the opening of the Year of Jubilee (Lev 25:9); heralded the approach of the Ark (2 Sam 6:15); hailed a new king (2 Sam 15:10); and is prophetically associated with the Divine judgment and restoration of the chosen people from captivity (Isa 13:5, and often).

(8) The ḫoḡrōth.—We are told (Num 10:26) that Moses was commanded to make two silver trumpets which should serve to summon the people to the door of the tabernacle; give the signal for breaking up the camp; or call to arms. These instruments were the ḫoḡrōth, which differed from the shophār in that they were straight, not curved, were always made of metal, and were only blown by the priests. They are shown on the Arch of Titus and on Jewish coins, and are described by Ios (Ant, III, xii, 6). The latter says: “In length it was not quite a yard. It was composed of a narrow tube somewhat thicker than a flute, widened slightly at the mouth to catch the breath, and ended in the form of a bell, like the common trumpets.”
The principal percussion instrument, the *tòph*, is represented in EV by "tabret" and "timbrel," two words of different origin. "Tabret" is derived from Arab *tambour*, the name of a sort of mandolin. "Timbrel" comes from Lat.-Gr. *tympanum*, through Fr. *timbre*, a small tambourine. The Arabs of today possess an instrument called the *duf*, a name that corresponds to the Heb *tòph*. The *duf* is a circle of thin wood 11 in. in diameter and 2 in. in depth. Over this is tightly stretched a piece of skin, and in the wood are 5 openings in which thin metal disks are hung loosely; these jingle when the *duf* is struck by the hand. The *tòph* probably resembled the *duf*.

Other drums are shown on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief the second last performer beats with his hands a small, barrel-like drum fixed at his waist. In the OT the drum is used on festive occasions; it is not mentioned in connection with Divine service. It was generally played by women, and marked the time at dances or processions (Ex 16:20; Jgs 11:34; 1 S 18:6; 1 K 5:4; Ps 150:4). At banquets (Isa 24:8; 30:32; Job 21:12) and at marriages (1 Mac 9:39) it accompanied the *kinîdor* and *nebhel*. In solemn processions it was also occasionally played by men.

(2) *Mrôllayim, celêltim*.—In 1 Ch 15:19 we read that "Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, were appointed, with cymbals of brass to sound aloud." These cymbals are the *mrôllayim* (in two places *celêltim*). They were very popular in Egypt. A pair made of copper and silver has been found in a grave in Thebes. They are about 5 in. in diameter and have handles fixed in the center. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief we see cymbals of another pattern. These are conical, and provided with handles.

Cylindrical staves slightly bent at one end were also used in Egypt processions. Villoteau, quoted by J. Weiss, describes a bass-relief in which three musicians are seen of whom one plays the harp, a second the double flute, while a third appears to be marking time by striking two short rods together; this was a method of conducting practised regularly by other ancient nations.

(3) *Mâna'ôn*—Lastly in 2 S 6:5 we meet with a word that occurs nowhere else, and whose meaning is quite uncertain. AV translates "cornets," RV "castanets," and in "sistras." The *mâna'ôn* may have been the *sistrum*, an instrument formed of two thin, longish plates, bent together at the top so as to form an oval frame, and supplied with a handle at the lower end. One or more bars were fixed across this frame, and rings or disks loosely strung on these made a jangling noise when the instrument was shaken. This interpretation is supported by the derivation of the word, the Vulg, and the rabbis.

**MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, mu'zik-al in' strî-o-ments (מִעְזָיָל) שׁיָדְדָה וּשְׁיָדְדֹת; "I got me ... musical instruments, and that of all sorts" (Eccl 2:8). Thus AV and ARV; ERV and ARV "conclude very many." The word occurs only here; the meaning is not certain, but it has nothing to do with music.

**MUSICIAN, mu'zik'ian. CHIEF.** See ASAPH; MUSIC; PSALMS.

**MUSTARD, mu's tard (οιμᾶν, sinâpi) (Mt 13:31; Mk 4:31; Lk 13:19; Mt 17:20; Lk 17:6)). The minuteness of the seed is referred to in all these passages, while in the first three the large size of the herb growing from it is mentioned. In Mt 13:32 it is described as "greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree" (cf Lk 13:19); in Mk 4:32 it "becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches." Several varieties of mustard (Arab. khardal) have notably small seed, and under favorable conditions grow in a few months into very tall herbs—10 to 12 ft. The rapid growth of an annual herb to such a height must always be a striking fact. Sinapis nigra, the black mustard, which is cultivated, S. alba, or white mustard, and S. arvensis, or the charlock (all of N.O. Cruciferae), would, any one of them, suit the requirements of the parable; birds readily alight upon their branches to eat the seed (Mt 13:32, etc), not, be it noted, to build their nests, which is nowhere implied.

Among the rabbis a "grain of mustard" was a common expression for anything very minute,
which explains Our Lord's phrase, "faith as a grain of mustard seed" (Mt 17:20; Lk 17:6).

The suggestion that the NT references may allude to a tall shrub Saladoada persica, which grows on the southern shores of the Dead Sea, rests solidly upon the fact that this plant is sometimes called abardel by the Arabs, but it has no serious claim to be the sinapis of the Bible.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

MUTH-LABBEN, muth-læ'ben (חַלֶּב, muth labben, "death of Ben," or "of the son"; Ps 9, title). See Psalms.

MUTILATION, mű-ti-lā'shen. See Punishments.

MUTTER, mut'er (מָתַר, hâghâh [Isa 8 19; 59 3]): An onomatopoetic word, used of the growling of a lion (Isa 31 4), of the "mourning" of a dove (Isa 38 14), or of the human voice, whether speaking inarticulately (Isa 16 7) or articulately (Ps 37 30, "The mouth of the righteous speaketh of wisdom"); cf Job 27 4; Prov 8 7, etc. Hence it is only the context that can give to hâghâh the meaning "mutter." No such meaning can be gathered from the context of Isa 59 3, and, in fact, the open shamelessness of the sinners seems to be in point. So the verse should be rendered, "Your lips have spoken lies, your tongue uttereth wickedness.

In Isa 8 19 hâghâh describes the tone of voice used by the necromancers in uttering their formulas, "that chrip and that mutter." That this tone was subdued and indistinct is quite probable. See Peck.

BURLINGTON SCOTT EASTON

MUZZLE, muzl' (חֶסָם, hâsâm; φυσός, phimôdô): According to the Deuteronomic injunction (Dt 25 4), the ox was not to be muzzled while treading the corn, i.e. threshing. The muzzle was a guard placed on the mouth of the ox to prevent them from biting or eating. The threshing ox would have ample opportunity of feeding (cf Hos 10 11). The Deuteronomic injunction is quite in accordance with the humane spirit which inspires it all through. Paul quotes this law in two places (1 Cor 9 9; 1 Tim 5 18) to illustrate his view that the "labourer is worthy of his hire." T. LEWIS

MYNDUS, min'dus (Μύνδος, Mýndos): A city of Asia Minor, situated at the extreme western end of a peninsula jutting into the sea (see Carta). It seems that the city was independent at an early date and that many Jews lived there; for according to 1 Mace 15 23, it was one of the several places to which the Roman senate, in the year 139 BC, sent a letter in their behalf. The place was important only because of the silver mines in its vicinity. The mines were worked from a very early period, even to the Middle Ages, and have therefore given to the place the modern Turkish name, Gumushku, meaning a silver mine.

E. J. BANKS

MYRA, mî'ra (Μυρα, Myra): A city of the ancient country of Lycia about 2½ miles from the coast. Here, according to Acts 27 6, Paul found a corn ship from Alexandria. The city stood upon a hill formed by the openings of two valleys. At an early period Myra was of less importance than was the neighboring city Patara, yet later it became a prominent port for ships from Egypt and Cyprus, and Theodosius 11 made it the capital of the province. It was also famed as the seat of worship of an Asiatic deity whose name is no longer known. St. Nicholas, a bishop and the patron saint of sailors, is said to have been buried in a church on the road between Myra and Andraki, the port. Here an Arab fleet was destroyed in 807. In 898 Haroun al-Rashid, the renowned caliph of Bagdad, took the city, and here Sawwulf landed on his return from Jerus. Demre is the modern name of the ruins of Myra, which are among the most imposing in that part of Asia Minor. The elaborate details of the decoration of the theater are unusually well preserved, and the rock-hewn tombs about the city bear many bas-reliefs and inscriptions of interest. On the road to Andraki the monastery of St. Nicholas may still be seen.

E. J. BANKS

MYRRH, mûr: (1) (מַר or מֶר, mûr; Arab. murr): This substance is mentioned as valuable for its perfume (Ps 45 8; Prov 7 17; Cant 3 6; 4 14), and as one of the constituents of the holy incense (Ex 30 23; see also Cant 4 6; 5 1 13). Mûr is generally identified with the "myrrh" of commerce, the dried gum of a species of balsam (Balsamodendron myrrha). This is a stunted tree growing in Arabia, having a light-gray bark; the gum resin exudes in small tear-like drops which dry to a rich brown or reddish-yellow, brittle substance, with a faint though agreeable smell and a warm, bitter taste. It is still used as medicine (Mt 15 23). On account, however, of the references to "flowing myrrh" (Ex 30 23) and "liquid myrrh" (Cant 5 13), Schweinthurf maintains that mûr was not the dried gum but the liquid balsam of Balsamomendron opobalsamum. See Balsam.

Whichever view is correct, it is probable that the σμαραγδόν, smârângon, of the NT was the same. In Mt 2 11 it is brought by the "Wise men" of the East as an offering to the infant Saviour; in Mt 15 23 it is offered mingled with wine as an anaesthetic to the suffering Redeemer, and in Jn 19 39 a "mixture of myrrh and aloes" is brought by Nicodemus to embalm the sacred body.

(2) (מַר, môt, mûr, akbêt): transliterated "myrph" in Gen 37 25, m "ladanum"; 43 11): The fragrant
rain obtained from some species of cistus and called in Arab. lādham, in Lat. ladanum. The cistus or "rock rose" is exceedingly common all over the mountains of Pal (see Botany), the usual varieties being the C. villosus with pink petals, and the C. salviifolius with white petals. No commerce is done now in Pal in this substance as of old (Gen 37:25; 43:11), but it is still gathered from various species of cistus, esp. C. creticus in the Gr Isles, where it is collected by threshing the plants by a kind of flail from which the sticky mass is scraped off with a knife and rolled into small black balls. In Cyprus at the present time the gum is collected from the beards of the goats that browse on these shrubs, as was done in the days of Herodotus (iii.115).

E. W. G. Masterman

**MYRTLE**, mûr't-l (Ct, hâdhaq; μυρρίνα, μυρρίνη [Isa 41:19; 55:13; Neh 8:15; Zec 1:8,10]); also as a name in Hadassah in Est 2:7, the Jewish form of Esther (q.v.): The myrtle, *Myrtus communis* (N.O. Myrtaceae), is a very common indigenous shrub all over Pal. On the bare hillsides it is a low bush, but under favorable conditions of moisture it attains a considerable height (cf Zec 1:8,10). It has dark green, scented leaves, delicate stary white flowers and dark-colored berries, which are eaten. In ancient times it was sacred to As-tarte. It is mentioned as one of the choice plants of the land (Isa 41:19). "Instead of the thorn

shall come up the fir-tree; and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree" (Isa 55:13), is one of the prophetic pictures of God's promised blessings. It was one of the trees used in the Feast of Tabernacles (Neh 8:15); "the branches of thick trees" (q.v.) are interpreted in the Psalm (Suk. 3:4; Yer Suk. 3, 53d) as myrtle boughs; also (id) the "thick trees" of Neh 8:15 as "wild myrtle." Myrtle twigs, particularly those of the broad-leaved variety, together with a palm branch and twigs of willow, are still used in the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles. For many references to myrtle in Jewish writings see *Jeu Enc*, IX, 137.

E. W. G. Masterman

**MYSIA**, mish'-l-a (Mysia, Musia): A country in the northwestern part of Asia Minor, which formed an important part of the Rom province of Asia. Though its boundaries were always vague, it may be said to have extended on the N. to the Sea of Marmora, on the E. to Bithynia and Phrygia, on the S. to Lydia, and on the W. to the Hellespont. According to some authors it included the Troad. Its history is chiefly that of its important cities, of which Assos, Troas, and Adrianopull on the border of Lydia, are mentioned in the NT. When Mysia became a part of the Rom province of Asia...
MYSTERY, mis' tér-i (μυστήριον, mysterion; from μυστήριον, "to initiate," one initiated into the mysteries); "initiate," "to initiate," "to close the lips or the eyes; stem μυς, a sound produced with closed lips; of Lat mutus, "dumb"); Its usual modern meaning (=something in itself obscure or incomprehensible, difficult or impossible to understand) does not con- trary to the fact that they were withheld from the light of healthy publicity.

The religion of the OT has no Mysteries of the above type. The rituals of Israel, both public and private, were open to the whole people, partook, through the representatives the priests. 2. In the OT and the Apoc the mysteries of a kind. The Gr word μυστήριον occurs in the LXX of the OT only in Dan, where it is found several times as the tr of ἦτορ, ṿepe, "a secret," in reference to the king's dream, the meaning of which was revealed to Daniel (2 18.19-27.30.47).

In the Apoc, μυστήριον is still used in the sense of "a secret" (a meaning practically confined to the LXX in the NT). Gr: (a) the secret or divine wisdom; the secret is the wisdom of Israel. The secret is the knowledge of Israel. The Apoc is the knowledge of Israel. 3. In the NT the word occurs 27 or (if we include the doubtful reading in 1 Cor. 2 1) 29 t.; chiefly in Paul (2 Cor. 4 1) and similar places, but also in passages reported by each of the synoptists, 4 t. In Rev. It bears its ancient sense of a revealed secret, not its modern sense of that which cannot be fathomed or comprehended.

3. In the NT the word occurs 27 or (if we include the doubtful reading in 1 Cor. 2 1) 29 t.; chiefly in Paul (2 Cor. 4 1) and similar places, but also in passages reported by each of the synoptists, 4 t. In Rev. It bears its ancient sense of a revealed secret, not its modern sense of that which cannot be fathomed or comprehended. It is a reference to a symbol, allegory, or parable, which conceals its meaning from those who look only at the literal sense, but is the medium of revelation to those who have the key to its interpretation (of the rabbinic
use of ἱππαζεῖν, ὀνόματι, and ὧθος, "the hidden or mystic sense"). This meaning appears in Rev 1 20; 17 5 ,7; probably also in Eph 5 32, where meaning, by what the "mystery" is or a symbol to be allegorically interpreted of Christ and His church. It also seems implied in the only passage in which the word is attributed to Our Lord, "unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables" (Mt 13 11; cf Mt 13 11; Lk 8 10). Here parables are spoken of as a veil or symbolic form of utterance which concealed the truth from those without the kingdom, but revealed it to those who had the key to its inner meaning (cf Mt 13 35; Jn 16 19). (2) By far the most common meaning in the NT is that which is so characteristic of Paul, viz. a Divine truth once hidden, but now revealed in the gospel. Rom 16 25 I might almost be taken as an definition of it, "According to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested" (cf Col 1 26; Eph 3 3 f). (a) It should be noted how closely "mystery" is associated with "revelation" (Eph 1 19) as well as with words of similar import, e.g. "to make known" (Eph 1 9; 3 3.5.10; 6 19), "to manifest" (Col 4 3 4; Rom 16 26; 1 Tim 3 16), "mystery" and "revelation" are in fact correlative and almost synonymous. The implication of the word "mystery" is that there are revealed doctrines, in contrast to the wisdom of worldly philosophy (see esp. 1 Cor 2 1-16; cf Mt 11 25); the point of contrast being, not that the latter is comprehensible while the former are obscure, but that the latter is the product of intellectual research, while the former are the result of Divine revelation and are spiritually discerned. (b) From this it follows that Christianity has no secret doctrines, for what was once hidden has now been revealed. But here arises a seeming contradiction. On the one hand, there are passages which seem to imply a doctrine of reserve. The mystery referred to in some only seems to be still concealed from others. The doctrines of Christ and of His Kingdom are hidden from the worldly wise and the prudent (Mt 11 25; 1 Cor 2 6 ff), and from all who are outside the kingdom (Mt 13 11 ff and ), and there are truths withheld even from Christians while in an elementary stage of development (1 Cor 3 1-15). On the other hand, there are many passages in which the truths of revelation are said to be freely and unrestrainedly communicated to all (e.g. Mt 10 27; 28 19; Acts 20 20 27; 2 Cor 3 12 f; Eph 3 9, "all men"; 6 19; Col 1 25; 1 Tim 2 4). The explanation is that the communication is limited, not by any secrecy in the gospel message itself or any reserve on the part of the speaker, but by the receptive capacity of the hearer. In the case of the carnally-minded, moral obtuseness or worldly blindness makes them blind to the light which shines on them (2 Cor 4 3-4). In the ease of the "babe in Christ," the apparent reserve is due merely to the pedagogical principle of adapting the teaching to the progressive receptiveness of the disciple (Jn 16 12). There is no esoteric doctrine or intentional reserve in the NT. The strong language in Mt 13 11-15 is due to the Heb mode of speech by which an actual result is stated as if it were purposive. (c) What, then, is the content of the Christian "mystery"? In the broadest sense it is the whole world-embracing purpose of redemption and the preaching of Jesus Christ (e.g. Rom 16 25; Eph 6 19; Col 2 1 Tim 3 9). In a special sense it is applied to some specific doctrine or aspect of the gospel, such as the doctrine of the Incarnation (1 Tim 3 16), of the indwelling of Christ as the pledge of immortality (Col 1 27), of the temporary unbelief of the Jews to be followed by their final restoration (Rom 11 25), of the transformation of the saints who will live to see the face of the Lord (1 Cor 13). The content is that of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the gospel salvation (Eph 3 3-6). These are the Divine secrets now at last disclosed. In direct antithesis to the Divine mystery is the "mystery of lawlessness" (2 Thess 2 7) culminating in the coming of the Antichrist. He "causes to abound in lawlessness" (2 Thess 2 7), makes secret, only in this case the revelation belongs to the future (ver 8), though the evil forces which are to bring about its consummation are already silently operative. (Besides the references in this paragraph, the word occurs in 1 Cor 4 13; 15 2; 14 2; Rev 10 7). It is interesting to note that the Vulg sometimes renders mustērion by Lat sacramentum, viz. in Eph 1 9; 3 3.9; 6 32; 1 Tim 3 16; Rev 1 20. This rendering in Eph 5 32 led to the ecclesiastical doctrine that marriage is a "sacrament."

The question is now frequently discussed, how far the NT (and esp. Paul) betrays the influence of the heathen mystery-cults. Hatch revives the theory that the use of the word mustērion is dependent on the pagan Mysteries (and in this he is followed by Anrich, who declares that the attempt to trace an allusion to the mysteries in Paul's writings is an unsuccessful; but Lightfoot admits a verbal dependence on the pagan Mysteries (Comm. on Col 1 26). At present there is a strong tendency to attribute to Paul far more dependence on one of these secret societies, and to find in the Mysteries the key to the non-Jewish side of Paulianism. A. Loisy finds affinity to the mystery-religions in Paul's conception of Jesus as a Divine God, holding a place analogous to the deities Mithra, Osiris, and Atar, in the place Paul assigned to the Son of God, to the rite of initiation; and in his transformation of the Lord's Supper into a symbol of mystic participation in the flesh and blood of a celestial being and a guarantee of a share in the blissful Immortality of the risen Saviour. "In its worship as in its belief, Christianity is a re-invention of mystery" (art. in Hibbert Journal, October, 1911). Percy Gardner traces similar analogies to the Mysteries in Paul, though he finds in these analogies, not conscious plagiarisms, but the "parallel working of similar forces" (Rev Gospel Experiences of Paul, op. cit., v. Kirsopp Lake writes, "Christianity has not borrowed from the mystery-religions, because it was always, at least in Europe, a mystery-religion itself" (The Best of Readings, p. 236). On the other hand, Schweitzer wholly denies the hypothesis of the direct influence of the Mysteries on Paul's thought (Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung). The whole question is sub judice among scholars, and until more evidence is forthcoming from inscriptions, etc., we shall perhaps vainly expect a unanimous verdict. It can hardly be doubted that at least the language of Paul, and perhaps to some extent his thought, is colored by the phraseology current among the cults. Paul had a remarkably sympathetic and receptive mind, by no means closed to influences from the Greek-Roman environment of his day.

Witness his use of illustrations drawn from the athletic festivals, the Greek theater (1 Cor 4 9) and the Roman camp. He must have been constantly exposed to the contamination of the mystic societies of Greek and Roman society and of the Mithra religion; and the chief centers of Paul's activities, e.g. Corinth, Antioch and Ephesus, were headquarters of mystery religions. We are not surprised that he should have borrowed from the vocabulary of the Mysteries, not only the word mustērion, but also, for example, "mystērion, I learned the word" (Heb 12 23, "that he initiated") (Phil 4 19). mystērion, "a secret, hidden, concealed. To be sealed" (Eph 1 13, etc); ἐπιβαλλεται, "Greek, "to be seen" (Eph 1 13, etc); ἥλιος, "perfect, the term applied in the Mysteries to the fully instructed as opposed to novices (1 Cor 2 6-7; Col 1 25, etc) note, however, that the similar use of Greek in Psalms, "eyes-witnesses, 2 Pet 1 16). Further, the secret of Paul's gospel among the Gentiles lay, humanly speaking, in the fact that it
teries exercised a great influence on ecclesiastical doctrine and practice, esp. on baptism and the Eucharist (see Hatch, Hibbert Lects, ch x). But in the NT, acts of worship are not as yet regarded as mystic rites. The best we can say is that some NT writers (esp. Paul) make use of expressions and analogies derived from the mystery-religions; but, so far as our present evidence goes, we cannot agree that the pagan cults exercised a central or formative influence on them.

LITERATURE.—There is a large and growing lit. on this subject. Its modern scientific study began with C. A. Lobeck's Apolotheismus (1829). The following recent works may be specially mentioned: Gustav Amich, Das antike Mysterienwesen (1894); G. Wobbern, Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Fragc, etc. (1896); E. Hatch, Essays in Bib. Gr (1889) and Hibbert Lects, 1888 (pub. 1890); F. B. Jevons, An Intro to the History of Religion (1890); S. Cer- tham, The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian (1897); H. Reit- genstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (1910); Herzog, The Religious Experience of Paul (1907); R. C. Lake, The Earlier Epp. of Paul (1911); arts. on "Mystery" in The Br, ed 9 (W. M. Ramsey), and ed 11 (L. R. Farnell), EB (A. Jülicher), HDB (A. Stewart), 1-vol HDB (G. G. Findlay), DCG (R. W. Bacon); arts on Apotheosis in Cremer and Grimm-Thayer ST Lexicons; the comms., including J. B. Lightfoot on Col, J. Armitage Robinson on Eph, H. Lietzmann on 1 Cor; 9 arts. in Expository "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions" by Professor H. A. Kennedy (April, 1912, to February, 1913).

MYTHOLOGY, mi-thol'ë-j. See FABLE; BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF; GREECE, RELIGION OF.

N

NAAM, nā'ăm (נָאָם, na'am): A son of Caleb (1 Ch 4 15).

NAAMAH, nā'a-ma (נָאָמָה, na'amah, "pleasant"); Na'am, Na'omah: (1) Daughter of Lamech and Zillah, and sister of Tubal-cain (Gen 4 22; cf Jos, Ant, I, ii, 2). (2) An Ammonitish woman whom Solomon married, and who became the mother of Rehoboam (1 K 14 21; 2 Ch 12 13). According to an addition in LXX following 1 K 12 24, "her name was Naaman, the daughter of Ana [Hanun] son of Na- hash, king of the sons of Ammon" (see Benzinger, Könige, in loc.).

NAAMAH: (1) One of a group of 16 lowland (Shephelah) cities forming part of Judah's inheritance (Josh 16 41). (2) The home of Zophar, one of Job's friends (Job 2 11, etc). See NAAMATHITE.

NAAMAN, nā'a-man (נָאָמָן, na'amən, "pleasantness"); LXX BA, Na'aun, Na'amân; so WH in the NT; TR, Ne'amân: (1) A successful Syrian general, high in the confidence and esteem of the king of Syria, and honored by his fellow-countrymen as their deliverer (2 K 5 1-27). Afflicted with leprosy, he heard from a Hebr slave-maid in his household of the wonder-working powers of an Israelite prophet. Sent by his master with a letter couched in somewhat perverted terms to the king of Israel, he came to Samaria for healing. The king of Israel was filled with suspicion and alarm by the demands of the letter, and rent his clothes; but Elisha the prophet intervened, and sent word to Naaman that he must bathe himself seven times in the Jordan. He at first flared the humiliation and declined the cure; but on the remon- strance of his attendants he yielded and obtained cleansing. At once he returned to Samaria, testi-

NAAAMATHITE, nā'a-ma-thit, nā'a-ma-thit, "a dweller in Naaman"; 4 Mē'na'am Bar-λλος, ho Mē'na'amōn basilea): The description of Zophar, one of Job's friends (Job 2 11; 11 1; 20 1, etc). Naamah is too common a place-name to permit of the identification of Zophar's home; LXX renders "king of the Mineans."

NAAMITE, nā'a-mit (נָאָמִית, ha-na'amî, "the Naamite"): A family which traced its descent from Naaman (Nu 26 40). See NAAMAN, (2).

NAARA, nā-ara (נָאָרָה, "a girl"): One of the two wives of Ashshur, father of Toko (1 Ch 4 5).